OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 EDWARD VII., 1909-10

VOL. XCIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE ELEVENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER TO THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY, INCLUSIVE.



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

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1909-1910

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council	Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, P.C., G.C.M.G., D.C.L.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. C. MURPHY.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir F. W. BORDEN, K.C.M.G., B.A., M.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. SYDNEY A. FISHER, B.A.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Customs	Hon. WM. PATERSON.
Minister of Inland Revenue and Mines	Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. L. P. BRODEUR.
Minister of Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. F. OLIVER.
Minister of Justice	Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH, K.C.
Postmaster General	Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., LL.B.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. WM. PUGSLEY.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. G. P. GRAHAM.
Minister of Labour	Hon. MACKENZIE KING, C.M.G.
Solicitor General (not in the Cabinet)	Hon. J. BUREAU.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... R. BOUDREAU.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL	Speaker.
Mr. G. H. MCINTYRE M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. FLINT	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. LAPLANTE	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON ..... Chief Reporter.

STEPHEN ABBOTT
E. JOSEPH DUGGAN
J. O. MARCEAU
THOS. P. OWENS
ALPHONSE DESJARDINS
A. C. CAMPBELL
GEORGE SIMPSON
R. C. DUNBAR
} Reporters.

CHAS W. BOYCE ..... Assistant to Chief Reporter.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

1909-1910

ALLARD, ALBERT—Ottawa.
ALLEN, HENRY EDGARTON.—Shefford.
AMES, HERBERT B.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARMSTRONG, Joseph E.—Lambton, E.R.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.
AYLESWORTH, HON. ALLAN B.—York, Ont., N.R.

BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARNARD, GEORGE HENRY—Victoria (B.C).
BEATTIE, THOMAS—London.
BEAUPARLANT, AIMÉ M.—St. Hyacinthe.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BEST, JOHN A.—Dufferin.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLACK, JUDSON BURPEE—Hants.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLONDIN, PIERRE EDOUARD—Champlain.
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT LAIRD—Halifax, N.S.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRADBURY, GEORGE HENRY—Selkirk.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BUREAU, HON. JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURRELL, MARTIN—Yale-Cariboo.

CAMPBELL. GLEN LYON—Dauphin.
CARRIERE, LOUIS A.—Lévis.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, E. L—Mackenzie.
CHAMPAGNE, ALBERT—Battleford.
CHEW, MANLEY—Simcoe, E.R.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CHISHOLM, THOMAS—Huron, E.R.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, ALFRED H.—Essex, S.R.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CONGDON, FREDERICK T.—Yukon Territory.
CONMEE, JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy River.
COWAN, GEORGE HENRY—Vancouver City.
CROSBY, ADAM B.—Halifax.
CROCKET, OSWALD S.—York, N.B.
CROTHERS, THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W.R.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N.R.
CURRIE, MORLEY—Prince Edward.

DANIEL, JOHN WATERHOUSE—St. John (City).
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, M. JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, CHARLES JOSEPH—Montreal, St. Anne.
DONNELLY, JAMES J.—Bruce, S.R.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Strathcona.
DUBEAU, JOSEPH ADELARD—Joliette.

ECRÉMENT, ARTHUR—Berthier.
EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELSON, PETER—Middlesex, E.R.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY R.—Westmorland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FORGET, RODOLPHE—Charlevoix.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North.
FOWKE, FREDERICK LUTHER—Ontario, S.R.
FRASER, AUSTIN LEVI—King's (P.E.I.)

GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GERVAIS, HONORÉ—Montreal, St. James.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLADU, JOSEPH E. O.—Yamaska.
GOODEVE, A. S.—Kootenay.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent. E.R.
GORDON, GEORGE—Nipissing.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE PERRY—Brockville.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HAGGART, ALEXANDER—Winnipeg.
HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HARRIS, LLOYD—Brantford.
HARTY, WILLIAM—Kingston.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.

HERRON, JOHN—Macleod.
HODGINS, GEORGE FREDERICK—Pontiac.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria and Haliburton.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

KIDD, EDWARD—Carleton, O.
KING, HON. W. LYON MACKENZIE, C.M.G.—Waterloo, N.R.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Moosejaw.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Richmond, N.S.

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID A.—Montcalm.
LAKE, RICHARD STUART—Qu'Appelle.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ADÉLARD—Richelieu.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, P.C., G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth, N.S.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, S.R.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W.R.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.
LORTIE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Soulanges.
LOVELL, C. H.—Stanstead.
LOW, THOMAS A.—Renfrew, S.R.

MACDONALD, EDWARD M.—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., S.R.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCALLISTER, DUNCAN H.—King's and Albert
MCCALL, ALEXANDER—Norfolk.
MCCARTHY, MAITLAND STEWART—Calgary.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE— Kent, W.R.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE EWAN—Saskatoon.
MCGIVERIN, HAROLD BUCHANAN—Ottawa.
MCINTYRE, GILBERT H.—Perth, S.R.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton, N.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Sunbury and Queen's.
MCLEAN, MURDO YOUNG— Huron, S.R.
MCMILLAN, JOHN ANGUS—Glengarry.
MADDIN, JAMES WILLIAM—Cape Breton, S.
MAGRATH, CHARLES ALEXANDER—Medicine Hat.
MAJOR, C. B.—Labelle.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. R.
MARTIN, ALEXANDER MUNRO—Wellington, N.R.
MARTIN, MÉDERIC—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MARTIN, WILLIAM MELVILLE—Regina.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGHEN, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MEIGS, DANIEL BISHOP—Missisquoi.

MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, N.B.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N.R.
MILLER, HENRY HORTON—Grey, S.R.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NANTEL, WILFRED BRUNO—Terrebonne.
NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N.R.
NEELY, DAVIS BRADLEY—Humboldt.
NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, EDMUND BOYD—Toronto, West.
OWEN, C. L.—Northumberland (O.) E.R.

PAPINEAU, LOUIS J.—Beauharnois.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FRED. F.—Lambton, W.R.
PARENT, GEORGE—Montmorency.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Brant.
PERLEY, GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
PICKUP, SAMUEL W. W.—Annapolis.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
PRICE, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.
PROWSE, LEMUEL E.—Queens, P.E.I.
PUGSLEY, HON. WILLIAM—St. John City and County

RANKIN, JAMES PALMER—Perth, N.R.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville.
RHODES, EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDS, JAMES W.—Prince, P.E.I.
RIVET, LOUIS ALFRED ADHÉMAR—Hochelaga.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Huntingdon.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W.R.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROY, CYRIAS—Montmagny.
ROY, ERNEST—Dorchester.
RUSSELL, JOSEPH—Toronto, East.
RUTAN, WILLIAM WINTFIELD—Prince Albert.

SAVOIE, FRANÇOIS THÉODORE—Mégantic.
SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SCHELL, MALCOLM S.—Oxford, S.R.
SEALEY, WILLIAM OSCAR—Wentworth.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E.R.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N.R.
SHARPE, WILLIAM HENRY—Lisgar.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SMITH, ALEXANDER WILSON—Middlesex, N.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Nanaimo.
SMITH, ROBERT—Stormont.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma E.R.
SPERRY, JOHN D.—Lunenburg.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester, N.S.

STAPLES, WILLIAM D.—Macdonald.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, West.
STRATTON, JAMES ROBERT—Peterborough, W.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds.
TAYLOR, JAMES DAVIS—New Westminster.
TEMPLEMAN, HON. WILLIAM—Comox-Atlin.
THOBURN, WILLIAM—Lanark, N.R.
THORNTON, CHARLES JONAS—Durham.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TODD, WILLIAM F.—Charlotte.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, N. Riding.
TURCOTTE, G. A.—Nicolet.
TURCOTTE, J. P.—Quebec County.

TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN G.—Assiniboia.

VERVILLE, A.—Maisonneuve.

WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York (O.), Centre.
WARBURTON, ALEXANDER B.—Queen's, P.E.I.
WHITE, GERALD V.—Renfrew, N.R.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WILCOX, OLIVER J.—Essex, N.R.
WILSON, CHARLES AVILA—Laval.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox and Addington.
WORTHINGTON, ARTHUR NORREYS—Sherbrooke.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

1909-1910

ALGOMA, EAST—William Ross Smyth.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Samuel W. W. Pickup.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—George H. Perley.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Albert Champagne.
BEAUCE—Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis J. Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Arthur Ecrément.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT—Hon. William Paterson.
BRANTFORD—Lloyd Harris.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. George Perry Graham.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—John Tolmie.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—James J. Donnelly.

CALGARY—Maitland Stewart McCarthy.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—James William Maddin.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON (O.)—Edward Kidd.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Pierre Edouard Blondin.
CHARLEVOIX—Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Willliam F. Todd.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—John Stanfield.
COMOX-ATLIN—Hon. Wm. Templeman.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Glen Lyon Campbell.
DIGBY—Clarence Jameson.
DORCHESTER—Ernest Roy.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUFFERIN—John A. Best.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Charles Jonas Thornton.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Oliver J. Wilcox.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—John Angus McMillan.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, S. RIDING—Henry Horton Miller.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—{Robert Laird Borden. / Adam B. Crosby.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON, EAST—Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON, WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Judson Burpee Black.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Alfred Adhémar Rivet.
HUMBOLDT—David Bradley Neely.
HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
HURON, E. RIDING—Thomas Chisholm.
HURON, S. RIDING—M. Y. McLean.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk
JOLIETTE—Joseph Adélard Dubeau.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.), E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT (O.), W. RIDING—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KING'S AND ALBERT (N.B.)—Duncan H. McAllister.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Sir Frederick W. Borden K.C.M.G.

King's (P.E.I.)—Austin L. Fraser.
Kingston—William Harty.
Kootenay—Arthur S. Goodeve.

Labelle—C. B. Major.
Lambton, E. Riding—Joseph E. Armstrong.
Lambton, W. Riding—Fred. F. Pardee.
Lanark, N. Riding—William Thoburn.
Lanark, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
Laprairie-Napierville—Roch Lanctôt.
L'Assomption—Paul Arthur Seguin.
Laval—Charles Avila Wilson.
Leeds—George Taylor.
Lennox and Addington—Uriah Wilson.
Lévis—Louis A. Carrier.
Lincoln—Edward A. Lancaster.
Lisgar—William Henry Sharpe.
L'Islet—Eugène Paquet.
London—Thomas Beattie.
Lotbinière—Edmond Fortier.
Lunenburg—John D. Sperry.

Macdonald—William D. Staples.
Mackenzie—E. L. Cash.
Macleod—John Herron.
Maisonneuve—Alphonse Verville.
Marquette—William J. Roche.
Maskinongé—Hormisdas Mayrand.
Medicine Hat—Charles A. Magrath.
Megantic—François Théodore Savoie.
Middlesex, E. Riding—Peter Elson.
Middlesex, N. Riding—Alexander Wilson Smith.
Middlesex, W. Riding—Duncan Campbell Ross.
Missisquoi—Daniel B. Meigs.
Montcalm—David A. Lafortune.
Montmagny—Cyrias Roy.
Montmorency—Georges Parent.
Montreal, St. Anne—Charles Joseph Doherty.
Montreal, St. Antoine—Herbert B. Ames.
Montreal, St. James—Honoré Gervais.
Montreal, St. Lawrence—Robert Bickerdike.
Montreal, St. Mary—Méderic Martin.
Moose Jaw—William Erskine Knowles.
Muskoka—William Wright.

Nanaimo—Ralph Smith.
New Westminster—James Davis Taylor.
Nicolet—Gustave Adolphe Turcotte.
Nipissing—George Gordon.
Norfolk—Alexander McCall.
Northumberland (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
Northumberland (O.) E.R.—C. L. Owen.
Northumberland (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

Ontario, N. Riding—Samuel S. Sharpe.
Ontario, S. Riding—Frederic Luther Fowke.
Ottawa City—Albert Allard. Harold Buchanan McGiverin.
Oxford, N. Riding—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
Oxford, S. Riding—Malcolm S. Schell.

Parry Sound—James Arthurs.
Peel—Richard Blain.
Perth, N. Riding—James Palmer Rankin.
Perth, S. Riding—Gilbert H. McIntyre.
Peterborough, E. Riding—John A. Sexsmith.
Peterborough, W. Riding—James Robert Stratton.
Pictou—Edward M. Macdonald.
Pontiac—George Frederick Hodgins.
Portage la Prairie—Arthur Meighen.
Portneuf—Michel Siméon Delisle.
Prescott—Edmond Proulx.
Prince Albert—Rutan, William Wintfield.
Prince, (P.E.I.)—James W. Richards.
Prince Edward—Morley Currie.
Provencher—John Patrick Molloy.

Qu'Appelle—Richard Stuart Lake.
Quebec, Centre—Arthur Lachance.
Quebec, East—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Quebec, West—William Price.
Quebec (County)—Joseph Pierre Turcotte.
Queen's, (P.E.I.)—Lemuel E. Prowse. Alexander B. Warburton.

Red Deer—Michael Clark.
Regina—William Melville Martin.
Renfrew, N. Riding—Gerald V. White.
Renfrew, S. Riding—Thomas A. Low.
Restigouche—James Reid.
Richelieu—Adelard Lanctôt.
Richmond (N.S.)—George W. Kyte
Richmond and Wolfe (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin
Rimouski—Jean Auguste Ross.
Rouville—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
Russell—Hon. Charles Murphy.

St. Hyacinthe—Aimé M. Beauparlant.
St. John (N.B.), City—John Waterhouse Daniel.
St. John (N.B.), City and Co.—Hon. William Pugsley.
St. John and Iberville—M. Joseph Demers.
Saltcoats—Thomas MacNutt.
Saskatoon—George E. McCraney.
Selkirk—George H. Bradbury.
Shefford—Henry Edgarton Allen.
Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
Sherbrooke—Arthur Norreys Worthington.
Simcoe, E. Riding—Manley Chew.
Simcoe, N. Riding—John Allister Currie.
Simcoe, S. Riding—Haughton Lennox.
Soulanges—Joseph Arthur Lortie.
Souris—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
Stanstead—C. H. Lovell.
Stormont—Robert Smith.
Strathcona—James M. Douglas.
Sunbury and Queen's (N.B)—Hugh H. McLean.

Temiscouata—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
Terrebonne—Wilfred Bruno Nantel.
Three Rivers and St. Maurice—Hon. Jacques Bureau.
Thunder Bay and Rainy River—James Conmee.
Toronto, Centre—Edmund Bristol.
Toronto, East—Joseph Russell.

TORONTO, NORTH—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO, WEST—Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER (City)—George Henry Cowan.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer
VICTORIA (ALTA.)—William Henry White.
VICTORIA CITY, (B.C.)—Geo. Henry Barnard.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, (O.)—Samuel Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Hon. W. Lyon Mackenzie King, C.M.G.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Alex. M. Martin.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—William Oscar Sealey.
WESTMORLAND—Hon. Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Alexander Haggart.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE-CARIBOO—Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—Joseph E. O. Gladu.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Oswald S. Crocket.
YORK (O.), C. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. Allan Bristol Aylesworth.
YORK (O.), S. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Frederick T. Congdon.

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

BLACK, J. B.—Hants.
BLONDIN, P. E.—Champlain.
CLARK, M.—Red Deer.
CLARKE, A. H.—Essex, S.
ETHIER, J. A. C.—Two Mountains.
GERVAIS, H.—Montreal, St. James.
GUTHRIE, H.—Wellington, S.
HODGINS, G. F.—Pontiac.
HUGHES, S.—Victoria and Haliburton.
KNOWLES, W. E.—Moosejaw.
MCCARTHY, M. S.—Calgary.
MCLEAN, M. Y.—Huron, S.
SCHAFFNER, F. L.—Souris.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds.
TAYLOR, J. D.—New Westminster.

Chairman:—H. GERVAIS—Montreal, St. James.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 11, 1909.

The parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 11th day of November, 1909, met this day for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Canada,

Ottawa, 10th November, 1909.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the Session of the Dominion Parliament on Thursday, the Eleventh instant, at Three o'clock, p.m.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. HANBURY-WILLIAMS, Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Capt. Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the Hon. the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Langelier and the Hon. Mr. Justice Jetté, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of Lotbinière, by which the said election was declared void.

In conformity with chapter 7, section 70, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my war rant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates and reports relating to the elections:

For the electoral district of Quebec Centre;
For the electoral district of Quebec West;
For the electoral district of Montmorency;
For the electoral district of Portneuf;
For the electoral district of Peterborough West;
For the electoral district of Quebec county.

by which the said election petitions were severally dismissed and the sitting members declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that during the recess I have received communications from several members notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz.:

Of Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, C.M.G., member for the electoral district of North Waterloo, upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, Minister of Labour;

Of François Octave Dugas, Esq., member for the electoral district of Montcalm, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

Of Wilbert McIntyre, Esq., member for the electoral district of Strathcona, by decease;

Of Hon. Robert Franklin Sutherland, member for the electoral district of North Essex, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

Of William Samuel Calvert, Esq., member for the electoral district of West Middlesex, by acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

Of Alexander K. Maclean, Esq., member for the electoral district of Lunenburg, by resignation.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts, respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that during the recess the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following members, viz.:

Of Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, C.M.G., for the electoral district of North Waterloo;

Of David A. Lafortune, Esq., for the electoral district of Montcalm;

Of Edmond Fortier, Esq., for the electoral district of Lotbinière;

Of James McCrie Douglas, Esq., for the electoral district of Strathcona.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, C.M.G., member for the electoral district of North Waterloo; introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

David A. Lafortune, Esq., member for the electoral district of Montcalm; introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

James McCrie Douglas, Esq., member for the electoral district of Strathcona; introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Frank Oliver.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the administration of Oaths of Office.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister).

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of parliament. To prevent mistakes I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In again meeting you at a season most convenient for the despatch of business, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate you on the prosperous condition of the country.

The present year, which is now rapidly drawing to a close, has been a period of steady and progressive growth. Immigration has poured into the new settlements of the north and of the west, in a copious and well ordered stream, drawn from the best elements of the British Isles, the United States and Continental Europe. Trade and commerce have made rapid advances in all directions. The revenue has almost completely regained what it had lost in the recent period of depression. Most remarkable has been the rapid recovery from the financial embarrassment which for a short time was the cause of anxiety amongst business men. In nearly every branch of business there has been a revival of activity which gives assurance of continued progress and prosperity.

Two members of my government attended the Imperial Conference called by His Majesty's government, on the question of defence. A plan was adopted after consultation with the Admiralty, for the organization of a Canadian Naval Service, on the lines of the resolution of the House of Commons, of the 29th of March last. The papers will be immediately brought down and a Bill introduced accordingly.

The new convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic, respecting the commercial relations between France and Canada, having been approved by the French Legislative Chambers, you will also be asked to confirm it.

The construction of the Transcontinental railway has made substantial advance during the year. The western division has been extended 66 miles beyond Edmonton, completing a total distance of 861 miles west of Winnipeg. Contracts have been let for 399 miles in the Mountain division; good progress was made on this work. The eastern division is now open for traffic from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction and thence, by the Grand Trunk Pacific branch, to the lake itself. The whole of the work between Winnipeg and Moncton is now under contract.

The board of engineers entrusted with the preparation of plans for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge has sufficiently advanced its work to permit of tenders being invited for the substructure.

The exploratory surveys for a railway from the western wheat fields to Hudson Bay were pushed energetically during the whole of last summer. It is hoped that a report of the operations will be placed before you at an early date.

In order to improve the facilities already afforded the public by the government railways, and to enhance their value as part of the great transportation system of Canada, a Bill will be submitted to you for the purpose of enabling the Minister of Railways, on the recommendation of the Government Railways Managing Board, and subject to the approval

of parliament, to lease any line or lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway.

A measure will be submitted to you for the purpose of rendering more effective the present legislation respecting combinations which unduly enhance prices.

Bills will also be introduced respecting banks and banking, insurance, navigable waters, and other matters.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts of the last year will be laid before you.

The estimates for the coming fiscal year will be submitted for your approval at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I pray the Almighty Lord that He may guide and bless your deliberations, and that they may bear fruit in a further increase of our country's prosperity and well-being.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved:

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses be taken into consideration on Monday next.

He said: I ask for Monday at the request of several members who are not prepared to commence the debate to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House under rule 10, said committee to be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and Messieurs Borden, Paterson, Fielding, Haggart (Lanark), Pardee and Taylor (Leeds), and that portion of rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

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

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House adjourns, I would like to mention, what I have already intimated privately to the Prime Minister, that to-morrow, probably on the motion to adjourn, we would like to discuss some delays in judicial appointments in the province of British Columbia.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect to have laid upon the table of the House the report of the proceedings of the recent Defence Conference; also whether there are any documents relating to the treaty with the French Republic which have not been brought down, and which ought to be brought down; also whether the government has in its possession any reports or information which ought to be laid upon the table of the House touching the operation of the recent United States tariff, more especially as it may possibly be affected by any treaty obligations into which the country has entered or may propose to enter; also whether there are any documents or any information of any character touching the position of the Waterways Treaty which the government propose to lay upon the table of the House.

I would like also to inquire whether or not the report of the resignation of Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden as chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway is correct, and whether the government intend laying the papers touching that matter upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know whether my memory will be equal to the task laid upon me by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). He seems to be in an inquisitive mood. With regard to the conference which took place in London, I cannot tell him when the correspondence will be laid on the table, but I hope it will be early next week. As to the treaty, I am not aware of any such correspondence. As to the United States tariff, perhaps the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) can give my hon. friend some information.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As to the French treaty, all the papers having any bearing on the subject were submitted to the House last session Nothing has occurred since that time. At the moment, I am not aware of any papers on the subject to be laid before the House, but I will make inquiry, and if there are any, I will bring them down. As to the American tariff, there is no correspondence on that subject. Each of us may have his own impression as to what the effect of the tariff may be on Canadian affairs. But, inasmuch as we are not able, at present, to forecast what may be the judgment of the United States government in regard to the interpretation and application of the tariff, we did not think it expedient that the government should at present take any action or make any statement on the subject. The proper course, we thought, would be to await the action which the United States government, in its wisdom, may see fit to take with regard to the minimum and maximum tariff.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to the Waterways Treaty, the matter is under ad-

visement. At the moment, there is no correspondence to be laid before the House, though there may be later on. With regard to the resignation of Mr. Lumsden, I will call the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to the matter and probably an answer can be given to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 12, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending March 31, 1909.—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals, report of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, for the same year.—Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

Report of the Postmaster General, and report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, for the same year.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Auditor General (vols. i and iii). Report of the Superintendent of Insurance, and the Public Accounts of Canada, for the same year.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture, and report of the Experimental Farms, for the same year.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue. Report of Inspection of Weights and Measures, and report on Adulteration of Foods, for the same year.—Hon Wm. Templeman.

Report of the Department of Customs for the same year.—Hon. Wm. Paterson.

Report of the Department of Justice, for the same year.—Hon. A. B. Aylesworth.

Report of the Department of Labour, for the same year.—Hon. Mackenzie King.

Report of the Department of the Interior, report of the Department of Indian Affairs, and report of the High Commissioner for Canada, for the same year.—Hon. Frank Oliver.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and report of Steamboat Inspection, for the same year.—Hon. Sydney Fisher (for Hon. L. P. Brodeur).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

ADJOURNMENT—JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN, Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I would like to bring to the attention of the government and the House, a matter connected with the administration of justice in British Columbia, which I would have considered worthy of presenting to you, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of sufficient public importance to justify me in moving specially the adjournment of the House if this oportunity had not been afforded. I think we all admit and realize that the power of appointment to public office in this country, or in any country possessing representative institutions, is a trust to be exercised in the public interest, and in no wise for party interest or for party consideration. That principle, whether it is acted upon or not, is recognized in every country in the world which possesses a government and institutions analogous to those which we happily have in Canada. The legislature of British Columbia in 1907 passed an Act constituting a court of appeal for that province. I do not propose to refer to that statute at any length. The second section enacted as follows:—

There shall be and there is hereby constituted a provincial court, to be called the Court of Appeal, which shall consist of a chief justice, who, as long as the present Chief Justice of British Columbia continues to hold such office, shall be styled the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, and three other judges to be called justices of appeal.

Section 6 provided as follows:—

The Court of Appeal hereby constituted shall be a superior court of record, and, to the full extent of the power of the legislature of the province of British Columbia to confer jurisdiction, there shall be transferred to and vested in such court all jurisdiction and powers, civil and criminal, of the Supreme Court of British Columbia and the judges thereof, sitting as a full court, that were held and exercised prior to the passing of this Act and all other appellate jurisdiction and appellate powers, statutory and otherwise, and howsoever arising or conferred, that have heretofore been held or exercised by the Supreme Court sitting as a full court.

Then it went on to enumerate more particularly the jurisdiction to be vested in the court of appeal so constituted. Section 14 of the statute provided for the sittings of the court, and declared that it should hold four sittings in each year, and it gives the day on which each sitting should commence, the first sitting of the court being fixed for the first Tuesday in January, and so on throughout the year. This section also provided that, in addition to the above sittings, the court of appeal might hold special

sittings, either at Victoria or Vancouver, for hearing any appeals that might be heard at the next regular sitting at either of such places. And finally, section 30 of the Act provided that the Act should not come into force until a day to be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That enactment was followed by a necessary Act of the Parliament of Canada, which is chapter 10 of the Acts of this parliament for 1908. Sections 1, 2 and 4 of that Act provide that certain jurisdiction which had heretofore been conferred upon and was to have been exercised by the Supreme Court of British Columbia, sitting as a full court, should thereafter be exercised in the province of British Columbia by the court of appeal as constituted by the Act of the province of British Columbia to which I have alluded. Section 3 of the Act made provision for the salaries of the judges, and section 5 provided that the Act should not come into force until the Act of the legislature of British Columbia which I have already quoted from had been brought into force; and thereupon this Act of the Parliament of Canada should come into force upon a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor general in Council.

I am informed that communication was sent to this government as far back as the month of May, 1909, to the effect that the Act of the legislature of British Columbia from which I have quoted would be brought into force by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the first day of September, 1909; and I presume that intimation was given to this government in order that they might make the necessary arrangements for the appointment of judges and of a chief justice; so that as soon as possible—immediately, if possible, upon the proclamation of the British Columbia Act—the court should be constituted and proceed to carry out the jurisdiction and perform the duties which were imposed upon it by the British Columbia statute and by the statute of the Parliament of Canada of 1908.

The Act of the legislature of British Columbia to which I have alluded to was accordingly brought into force by the proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the first day of September, 1909. I have the British Columbia Gazette containing the proclamation in my hand, but I do not suppose there will be any conflict as to the fact. It appears that although the Act was proclaimed on the first day of September, 1909, and although by the statute of British Columbia the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of that province sitting as a whole court has been transferred to that court of appeal, there have been up to the present time no appointments to the positions which were necessary in order that that court should be fully constituted so as to proceed with the performance of its very important duties. In the first place, I would like to ask the government why it is, that there has been this extraordinary delay on their part after they had received, as I am informed, full notice and information as far back as the month of May last, six months ago, that the Act would be brought into force on the 1st of September last? I would further ask the government why it is that the confusion and the embarrassment and the delay to public business and the uncertainty in matters of legal procedure which must necessarily result from their inaction in that regard have been allowed to come to pass? I may say that there have been very unpleasant rumours prevailing in the province of British Columbia, especially of late, as to the reasons which have influenced the inaction of the government. There have been rumours to the effect that gentlemen who are taking a very active part in provincial politics at present, and whose names have been mentioned as possible judges to be appointed under the statute, have had some sort of intimation or some sort of understanding that their claims to positions upon the bench of that court would be very favourably considered by this government in a certain contingency. Now, any rumour of that kind is a decidedly unpleasant thing, and I am sure every man in this House will agree that any such condition would be absolutely a disgrace to the administration of justice in Canada. I would first inquire from the government whether or not there has been directly or indirectly any promise made to, or any understanding with, any of these gentlemen who are now actively engaged in the provincial campaign in British Columbia, as to the recognition of their claims when the appointments come to be made to this court of appeal? In addition to that, I have to ask that a definite and explicit answer shall be given to the question: why, when the province of British Columbia has constituted a court which in the judgment of the people of that province is necessary, and why when this parliament has been advised of that action and has taken the necessary steps to place upon the statute-books of Canada the enactment to which I have alluded, why is it that in view of all these circumstances the government of this country has allowed no less than ten or eleven weeks to elapse during which legal business, so far as the Court of Appeal in British Columbia is concerned, has to remain at a complete standstill, or to be in such a state of confusion and uncertainty as to be absolutely detrimental to the public interests of the province? Under these circumstances I thought it no more than right that I should bring to the attention of the House and of the government the matters to which I have alluded thus briefly. I do venture to think

that it is a subject upon which the answer of the government should be given categorically, fully and explicitly so as to reassure, if possible, public opinion not only in British Columbia but throughout the Dominion in regard to these important matters.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, with the general observation with which the hon. gentleman opened his remarks, and as to the impropriety and undesirability of making any question affecting the constitution of the courts or appointments to judicial offices matters to be bandied about between one political party and another in this country, I am sure every one who listened to him will cordially agree. And, but for the observations which at a later period of his remarks fell from his lips one might have been in doubt whether the point of the statement with which he opened was directed towards this government or towards the provincial government of British Columbia. This legislation under which the court of appeal of that province was established is now some two years and six months gone; it became the law of the province of British Columbia as long ago as April, 1907. And, one who has followed the course of public affairs in the province of British Columbia might have been given rather to wonder why there was such extraordinary delay—to quote the words of the hon. gentleman—in the putting into force of this statute which presumably the legislature of British Columbia when it passed it, thought provided for wants which the province then had and of which the province itself felt the need. The provincial statute establishing the court of appeal was passed in April, 1907, and assented to on the 25th of that month. The parliament of this Dominion happened to be then in session, but it prorogued two days later, on the 27th of April, 1907, and long before any official notification of the passing of this particular statute could reach us at Ottawa. I am free to say—I wish to conceal nothing—I am free to say that during the spring of 1907 I had the pleasure of a personal interview with the First Minister of British Columbia, then on his road to the old country, and I was perfectly aware some weeks before this parliament prorogued on the 27th of April, 1907, that legislation of this character was under consideration in the legislature of British Columbia, and that in all probability it would become law when the assent of the Lieutenant Governor was given to the statutes of that session. But I had not seen a copy of the statute, and knew nothing of its provisions except what was conveyed to me in the personal interview to which I refer. I suppose accordingly no one would attribute any blame to this House, at any rate, or to the parliament of the Dominion, in the circumstance that there was no legislation by the Dominion parliament during the session of 1907 to supplement that of the province of British Columbia. It was impracticable that it should be so. I do not think that any one in British Columbia expected that it would or that it could be done. If there were no other reason why this parliament could not act during the session of 1907, the circumstance that the legislature of British Columbia chose to postpone the putting into force of their legislation until a proclamation bringing it into force should be issued, was in itself a sufficient reason why this parliament could not be blamed, at any rate, if it did not pass the necessary legislation providing salaries for the judges of the new court during the session of 1907.

During the session of 1908, and notwithstanding that the Act of the provincial legislature establishing the court had never yet been brought into force, this parliament passed its legislation providing for salaries to the judges of the new court, and providing that the legislation of this parliament in turn should not become effective until a proclamation to that effect was issued by the Governor General in Council; and as far as the department of which I have charge is concerned, I might, I think, offer a sufficient answer to the observations of the hon. gentleman, by stating that I am not in a position to make recommendations for the appointment of judges in British Columbia until the Act of this parliament providing for their salaries has been brought into effect by His Excellency. But I am taking no such position. So far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to assume responsibility for any delay in issuing the proclamation by His Excellency in Council bringing into force the Dominion Statute providing for the payment of salaries to the judges of the court of Appeal in British Columbia.

Now how stands the matter as far as dates are concerned? In April, 1907, the court was constituted in British Columbia, the statute not made effective or brought into force. In 1908 this parliament provided the salaries, the statute not brought into force. The statute of this parliament was assented to in July 1908. If there had been any crying need for this new court in British Columbia, if the five judges they already had were unable to cope with the business of the court so that they needed four additional judges, one would suppose that those who were charged with the responsibility for the administration of justice in that province would at least have acted then with promptness, and when the salaries had been provided by the necessary legislation of the Dominion parliament; and when nothing remained but the bringing into force of the provincial Act consti-

tuting that court, and the appointment of judges to that court, one would suppose, if there were necessity for prompt action, we should have had something done during the summer months of 1908. We had nothing done.

The hon. gentleman refers to unpleasant rumours on the subject at the present time. I wonder if he heard any rumours twelve months ago. I wonder if he heard during the summer of 1908 and rumours that these judicial positions were being made pawns in the political game, that the government of British Columbia were waiting in hope that the elections of October, 1908, might bring a change of government at Ottawa. That delusion was dispelled on the 26th of October last by the electors and yet the government of British Columbia did nothing toward bringing this Act into force. Months passed, nothing was heard about the matter. The hon. gentleman says he is informed that this government was informed as long ago as May last that this statute would be brought into effect on the 1st of September then following. The information which the hon. gentleman has, so far as I am aware, is slightly inaccurate. I do not know to what he alludes. So far as I am aware, there has been nothing in the way of an official letter, or a private letter, or of anything in writing, to any member of this government. I do not know what may have passed in the way of conversation between any of my colleagues and any gentleman from British Columbia. I know only of what passed with regard to myself, and that is simply this: That last spring, I think in April, possibly in May, but somewhere about either the end of April or the early part of May, the attorney general of British Columbia was in the city of Ottawa on his way to the old country. He called upon me, we discussed this subject; he left me with the statement that this statute would be proclaimed on the following day, that he had made all arrangements for bringing it into force before he left Victoria, and that he was going straight to the telegraph office to send a telegram which would lead to the issue of the proclamation, and that I might look for the Act being brought into force within the next few hours. I thought that it would be so, I expected it would be so. I was here for some few weeks after that date, quite expecting I would hear any morning that this statute had been brought into force. Nothing was said to me about the 1st of September as a date when this Act would be brought into force, I had no idea when it would be done, but that it was going to be done, as I understood, forthwith. And when weeks passed, and months passed, and I heard nothing, and when although not in this country during the summer, I was in reasonably close touch with the progress of Canadian affairs and heard and saw nothing in the newpapers or otherwise of any bringing into force of this statute, I honestly thought that the opinion which I had previously in my own mind, whatever it was worth, namely, that this statute would never be brought into effect, was the correct one. I had the impression, which the event has demonstrated was entirely erroneous, I admit, but I had the impression that instead of going on and constituting a new and independent court of appeal calling for four additional judges, practically doubling the number of their judges in the province of British Columbia, a substitute arrangement increasing the number of the present judges of the existing court would be adopted, and that this statute would be either repealed or allowed to become a dead letter. I remained under that impression, no doubt I had no foundation for it, but it simply rested as a matter of my own inference and deduction until I returned to this country some four weeks ago. I was told then, perhaps the first day I was back in the office, certainly within a day or two, that the British Columbia Statute constituting the court of appeal for the province had been proclaimed, and had been brought into effect as from the 1st of September.

Then, my delay at any rate in acting in this matter counts from that time, and I must bear any responsibility that may rest upon me for the circumstance that, since I reached Canada some four weeks ago and up to the present time, I have not made any recommendation for the appointment of judges to this court or any recommendation that our Dominion statute providing for the salaries of the judges of this court should be brought into effect by proclamation. That, of course, is more or less a formal step which can be taken at any time and which, it seemed to me, there was no necessity should be taken until I was prepared to make my recommendation of the individuals who should constitute the new court. Now, in that respect, I wish to be entirely frank and open with this House as I have been in my communications with the attorney general of British Columbia on the subject. I received a telegram from him some ten days or so after I had returned calling my attention to the fact that under the British Columbia statute the first sitting of the court of appeal would take place on the first Tuesday in the month of November—the second day of November instant. I looked at the statute to verify my recollection. I saw that the statement was entirely accurate. But side by side with that provision of the statute, I noticed the provision which the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has referred to to-day, that the court of appeal, when constituted, could hold a special sitting at any time it pleased. The regular sittings are to be on the first Tuesday of the months as I recollect it—of January, May, September and

November of each year; but special sittings at either Vancouver or Victoria may be held at any time. Accordingly, it was manifest that if there was no court in existence on the second of November, 1909, but if the court was brought into existence by the Dominion proclamation and by the appointment of judges at any day thereafter prior to the next regular sitting of the court, the new court could go to work immediately upon the judges being sworn in, if it saw fit to do so. I wrote at once to the Attorney General of British Columbia pointing this out, as I regretted any embarrassment that the delay of even one day would cause in what, I suppose, may be called public business—in the private business of the litigants to be accurate. I am sorry that should be the case. Delay in any litigation is always an injury to the suitor, and, indirectly, to every interest connected with it. But I was not ready to make the recommendations of the individuals which it was my duty as Minister of Justice to make to His Excellency in Council, and I stated to the Attorney General of British Columbia with complete frankness, exactly the position I was in in the matter. It is not, I think, desirable that such things as the personnel of a court should be made—at any rate beforehand—a matter of public discussion. It is not, in that view, desirable that I should go into the same particularity on this occasion that I did in writing a letter—which, while not a private letter, was more or less of a confidential character—to the attorney general of the province; and I will simply say this with regard to the contents of my letter to him; I pointed out that my own view was that it would make for the increased confidence of the public of the province in the new court of appeal if it were not to be composed altogether of new men without previous judicial experience; that it would be in the best interest of the administration of justice in the province that some of the members of the new court of appeal should be men who already had had judicial experience in the province, and that if that course were taken, while the new court of appeal would be constituted, there would be a breaking up of the present or existing court for the trial of causes, and that, unless appointments were contemporaneously made to the vacancies which promotion would cause, there would be vacancies on the bench for the trial of causes, a greater embarrassment to the business of litigants by the inability to carry on all the assizes or sitttings for trial which might be appointed to be held during the time when the positions of judgeships might be vacant. I have not had any answer to my communication. I do not know whether my ideas in the matter commended themselves to the attorney general or not. I have no doubt he has many other things to think of at the present moment than such details as I am referring to, and I have no astonishment to express that I have not received an answer. But in the absence of an answer I adhere entirely to the view I expressed in that letter, that it would be an inconvenient thing to make appointments to the court of appeal until I was in a position to make my recommendations for all the appointments that were to be made, and that it was in the true interest of the general public, and, in the interest of the administration of justice in the province, that no appointment at all should be made until I was ready to make all the appointments. And I am not yet ready to do so. I could name one man; I could name more than one man; for that matter I could name many more than the number of judges to be appointed—who are men, I think, fully qualified and eminently fit for the position. But the appointment of judges to any court, especially to a superior court, and more especially to a court of appeal for a province, is a matter about which, I think, any one charged with the responsibility of making the recommendations or selections ought to go reasonably slow. And the head and front of my offending in this matter is that I have now delayed some four weeks in the consideration of what course should be taken as to these appointments and that I am proposing to delay still a little longer. But I trust that before the end of the present month these appointments will be made and the court of appeal for British Columbia enabled to start upon its work. In the meantime, the situation is that which I have described. And, if the province of British Columbia and those in charge of the administration of its affairs can wait patiently with this statute on their books for a period of two years and four months before they choose to bring it into force, I think the delay between a court of appeal sitting on the 2nd of November and possiblv of the second day of December is not one for which this government or the Department of Justice can properly be held in any way to blame.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). I do not intend to detain the House for more than a moment or two in the discussion of a subject which is so largely legal in its bearing as the one now before the Chair. It is with some diffidence that any layman must rise in this House to touch upon matters that affect directlv the legal profession, for on this floor one has the felicity of finding lawyers in front of him, lawyers behind him, lawyers to right and to left of him ready to volley and thunder. It is, however, of some advantage occasionally to get members of my own profession, that is the farmers, as, after all, not only

are they allied to the basic industry of the country, but I do believe that in some of these legal matters the assistance of the farming fraternity would tend at least towards simplicity, efficiency and the necessary cheapening of the processes of law. I think, therefore, that the House should not have in its membership too great a quantum of lawyers, and it is perhaps well that a farmer and not a lawyer should come to this House from North Essex.

The question raised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has, I think, been well raised. It is felt by everybody in British Columbia, be he litigant or non-litigant, that we have suffered very much from the law's delay. It is hard enough, Heaven knows, for the average individual to get into the clutches of the law, and it is very much harder for him to be eating out his soul with anxiety while a decision is pending. Our position is very much harder at the present moment when we have absolutely and literally no court of appeal existing in the whole province and have not had since the first of September when this proclamation came into force. I do not wish to dilate on the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) as to the delay on the part of the province in proclaiming this matter, but we have heard it stated, and I have every reason to believe that it is true, that due notice was given to the Minister of Justice here as long ago as last May, that it was the intention of the province to proclaim this Act on September 1, or at the end of August and, ipso facto, therefore, there would be absolutely no way in which a man in British Columbia could appeal because there would be no court of appeal until judges were appointed by the Dominion government. The Minister of Justice (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) has, it is true, expressed his wish not to see judicial matters mixed up in politics, and yet he took on himself, I think rather illogically, rather unnecessarily and perhaps in a somewhat undignified way, to state that this Act was not proclaimed by the government of the province of British Columbia because it was hoped that after the election of 1908, the government of Canada might be of a different political complexion. If that is so, and if the Minister of Justice, taking that lofty idea, thought he could attack a province for delay on account of political reasons, it was evidently and abundantly clear that he should have taken particular pains to keep himself clear of the criticism which he might incur by leaving a whole province void of a court of appeal when some of the gentlemen who may be on that court are now taking part in an election campaign against the present provincial government. The Minister of Justice (Mr. A. B. Aylesworth) has stated that he very much regrets the delay, that he has not been ready to decide on the personnel of the court and he does not wish to discuss that question in the House. That is a sentiment in which we would probably all agree, but I would point out to him that the personnel of the bench has been very freely discussed all through the province of British Columbia by Liberal newspapers, and name after name has been bandied about in those newspapers as the names of gentlemen who are to fill positions on this court of appeal. So far has it gone that some time ago despatches were published in the chief Liberal newspapers announcing that the appointment would shortly be made of the late leader of the Liberal opposition in British Columbia, a gentleman who has the unfailing respect of all people in British Columbia, Liberals and Conservatives, and that gentleman and his friends seem to have attached such full credence to that report that he retired from the leadership of the Liberal party in British Columbia and, to his credit, is not taking any part in the campaign now in progress. I do not know that this can be said of several other gentlemen whose names have been mentioned. The Minister of Justice (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) says that these matters should be kept entirely free from party political influences Unfortunately it does not always come with the best grace from the Minister of Justice, when we have had in the past in British Columbia the spectacle of judges shortly before an election, before their resignations had been accepted, taking part in party politics, and then stepping down from the bench into the party arena. In 1907 we had an extraordinary spectacle when a gentleman who had been in party politics in British Columbia and who had been rewarded by being appointed to the important position of governor of the Yukon—I refer, of course, to Mr. W. W. B. McInnes, a very energetic and strong champion of the Liberal cause—went up to the Yukon, and behold Mr. Henderson stepped down from his position on the bench, went into party politics, was defeated in 1907, and was rewarded by being appointed to Mr. McInnes' place as governor of the Yukon while the Dominion government compensated Mr. McInnes by putting him on the bench. When we have such an extraordinary shuffle as that, well may the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. B. Aylesworth) say that the judiciary ought to be above party politics. I would like to re-emphasize the fact that at this time every man in British Columbia is in this position that if he wants to appeal a case, he cannot appeal it simply because we have no such thing as a court of appeal in British Columbia, and have not had since September 1. The Minister of Justice (Mr. A. B. Aylesworth) concluded his remarks by saying that he knew of a great many gentlemen who would make very excellent judges. Possibly he does, possibly we all do, but he says although he

knows of many qualified for the position, he intends to go a little slowly, to wait a little longer, and he added significantly that he would probably make the appointments before the end of the month. It is an extraordinary coincidence that the British Columbia elections are to take place on November 25. There is no doubt in my mind that when these elections are decided it will be far easier for the Minister of Justice to give the awards. It leads to the suspicion that in some cases it may be a party decision and that these gentlemen will decide it according to the political merits of the case, but not judicially. I think we are justified in coming to some such conclusion as that. It is unfortunate that whatever delays may have occurred, even assuming that there was delay in proclaiming the Act on the part of the provincial government, in view of the fact that the Minister of Justice has taken this high stand, he did not immediately put a court of appeals into effect by proclaiming it and by appointing judges before the heat of an election campaign and so relieved himself and his party from any criticism of this kind.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey) Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. B. Aylesworth) gives as a reason why the Act was not brought into force promptly that he believed the provincial government did not intend to bring the Act into force until after the elections in October, 1908. I scarcely think that is the kind of reason the Minister of Justice should give to this House, but if that were so then, on October 28 last, the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. B. Aylesworth) knew that all ideas of that kind had been dissipated and the only reason for delay would be that he would think the British Columbia legislature would not bring the Act into force until after the following general election. It has been urged that because the British Columbia legislature remained inactive for a period of two years and four months there was therefore no great urgency for bringing the Act into force and appointing the judges. But the point that we desire to make, and practically the only point, is that the Minister of Justice knew, or he should have known—I have no doubt that he did know—that the minute the British Columbia Act came into force it abolished all machinery for appeals in that province. The Attorney General of the province of British Columbia away back last May desired the Minister of Justice to know that the British Columbia Act was going into force because he knew that just so soon as that Act was brought into force, if there were no judges immediately appointed, the whole machinery of the appellate court of British Columbia would be completely clogged. It is no justification for the Minister of Justice to say that at the time that the Act came into force he was away in Europe. There should be some person in his department who could at once bring into force the Act providing for the salaries of the judges. The fact that the Act was passed two and a half years ago is all the more reason why this government should be prepared now to appoint the judges. They recognized the existence of the British Columbia Act when they passed the Act in 1908 and they must have believed that the Act providing for the creation of the court was going to be brought into force. They passed that Act fixing the salaries of the judges of the particular court in question and they must have come to the conclusion that the Act constituting the court was going to be brought into force. The Minister of Justice says to-day on the floor of this House that he has more applicants for these positions in British Columbia, competent and willing to fill the positions, than the four or five positions to be filled. That being the case I ask him why he does not appoint the judges forthwith. This is not the first time that a question of this kind has been brought before the House, because, in January, 1907, a similar charge was brought against the Minister because of his failure to fill a position on the bench in Nova Scotia. On that occasion what was the answer of the Minister of Justice? His answer was: I do not believe that any inconvenience is being suffered by litigants in Nova Scotia because of there being only six judges instead of seven. He said: I do not believe the absence of one judge is an impediment to the administration of justice in Nova Scotia; if I did I would immediately appoint another judge. But, in this case in British Columbia we have not a single judge appointed and the whole machinery of justice, as far as the appellate court in British Columbia is concerned, is completely clogged. The answer would be that there being no judge in British Columbia who could carry on the appellate court work, there should be an immediate appointment. In what position will some of these litigants be placed? It is true that the court is constituted, but it is an inanimate thing until the judges are appointed. If a litigant desires to apply to the court of appeal for leave to appeal, there are no judges to hear the appeal and these appeals have, in many cases, to be made within a limited time. A criminal may be lying in jail waiting for leave to appeal to the court and he remains in jail because the government have failed to appoint these judges. For these reasons I say that there has been no sufficient reason shown why these judges should not have been appointed. It is, as my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) says, a curious coincidence that these appointments are not going to be made until after the provincial general elections. Is the Minister of Jus-

tice going to make up his mind within the next ten or fifteen days? Has he not all the material and all the information now upon which he is going to make these appointments, or is he going hereafter to British Columbia for information to enable him to select the men whom he is going to appoint immediately after the next provincial election?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction of a statement that I understand the hon. gentleman has attributed to me. I understand that he attributed to me the statement that I had more applicants for these positions than there are positions to be filled. I said nothing of the kind and I beg to assure the hon. members of this House that there is not an applicant for one of these positions that I would think of recommending.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Perhaps I did not make it clear, but what the hon. gentleman did say, I think, was that he could name more good men suitable for these positions than there were positions to fill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at four o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November 15, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Pelletier and the Hon. Mr. Justice Lemieux, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a report relating to the election for the electoral district of Montmagny, by which the said election petition was dismissed and the sitting member declared duly elected.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Edmond Fortier, Esq., member for the electoral district of Lotbinière, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The Forty-second Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to Marine.—Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the order for the consideration of the motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session be now called, and that the same until disposed of have precedence over all other business except the introduction of bills and questions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. ECREMENT (Berthier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, custom will be my excuse for being so bold. Custom requires that some young, unexperienced member be entrusted with the task of commenting the speech from the Throne. It affords an opportunity for teaching him a lesson which may turn out to be profitable to him; besides, it affords an opportunity for the House to show indulgence, the greatest virtue of men and especially of leaders of men.

I feel deeply grateful for the honour bestowed upon me, and which the electoral district of Berthier, whose representative I am, is especially entitled to claim for itself. But I have good reason to hesitate at undertaking such a task, considering that I am expected in the course of a few minutes to review a series of questions which it will take the House the whole session to dispose of.

Bound as I am to merely give a very general idea of the government's policy, I should certainly be in fear of minimizing its importance by too summary a judgment, were I not aware that experienced and leading politicians are to follow me up and take occasion of this period of peace and tranquility, to deal fully with these great undertakings referred to in the speech from the Throne.

Such a task is not always congenial to a beginner; many difficulties are in his way, some of which are personal to himself; a youth is often taken to task for being youthful. But if years impart experience, youth endows one with a capacity for work and a willingness to work; and I would feel some satisfaction if though everything else might be wanting, the quality of sincerity was found to inspire my utterances.

It is customary, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of each session, to review briefly the general condition of the country. It would be unbecoming on my part to break away from the custom generally followed, and particularly at a time when complying with the usage cannot but be an agreeable task, since, as several of my predecessors have done, I am bound to submit a favourable report.

On the other hand, however pleasant the task of pointing out the really good features in a policy, I must say that it is not solely with the object of eulogizing the government that I intend showing the connection between the wisdom of the policy they propound and the satisfactory state of business.

We have just emerged from a very trying period of depression. Our neighbours to the south have been severely shaken up;

and, while I am not called upon to set forth the influences which have brought this about, it will be in order to recall how disastrous the effects of this crisis have been and how well founded were our apprehensions in this regard. However, things did not turn out as we had surmised, and the depression from which the United States suffered did not affect our country possibly to the same extent as it did most European countries, some of which, such as Germany, show heavy deficits in their finances, while others, such as England, are trying to find out some means of making the revenue meet the expenditure, at the very moment when our Minister of Finance is reducing taxation and announcing large surpluses.

While it was inevitable that so great a disturbance in the financial condition of such an extensive country as the United States, should in turn have a depressing effect on the general business of our country, on the other hand our business and financial institutions were not imperilled in consequence; they victoriously withstood the storm. Now, if it is only a matter of fairness to praise very highly the foresight and wisdom of our business men under the circumstances, we should also be frank enough to acknowledge that a large share of these happy results is attributable to this government.

Let us be frank about it, no country would have been able to withstand such a crisis, if the management of its public affairs had not on the whole been sound, if it had not been protected against sudden changes in the financial world by means of a strong and secure financial organization, the result of several years of political effort, of several years of administrative forethought, with the object of warding off all possible danger and ensuring an ever increasing prosperity.

The main factor in the continuance of that prosperity has been an ever increasing tide of immigration, kept under strict control and particularly well selected. No one will deny that such prosperity is an actual fact. It would be an easy matter for me to quote figures which are familiar to you; they are very telling, and in that respect would prove useful to me; but preferably I shall follow the advice of a leading member of the party opposite and for once endeavour to find proofs other than statistics as evidence of our country's progress. The fact to which I refer has not been sufficiently insisted upon, it having only slowly come to light, though of late in a striking fashion: I mean the expansion of Canada abroad, outside of its own boundaries.

We have reached a point in our history when nature, vanquished by us, is freely giving up its treasures; all classes of society are equipped and ready to win the battle in the economic field. We are making the best of our own resources.

From now on, Canada will attract more and more the attention of foreign peoples who concern themselves with all our country may do, or think, or wish. Thinkers have their eye on Canada; its products, its possibilities, its resources are discussed, estimated and its future commented upon.

'Among new countries,' writes a leading economist, 'Canada is the one which most attracts attention.' 'It is a country whose progress cannot be impeded,' writes a former minister in the French cabinet. And you are familiar with the following quotation from another author particularly well informed in a book intituled 'Le Canada et les deux races': 'In a near future, no doubt, the Dominion's economic progress will be enormous and largely comparable with that of its gigantic neighbour, the United States.'

In connection with this parallel between our country and the United States, I may be allowed to state with what deep sense of regret we who had enjoyed the happy condition of things created by the treaty of 1854 and that of Washington, witnessed the setting up of that wall at the prompting of the protectionist spirit of our neighbours, the outcome of which action will be to induce us to seek elsewhere other openings for our products. Such is the great work to which our government is devoting itself when endeavouring to develop means of transportation throughout the country. There is possibly no other means whereby to the same extent the development of the country could be brought about, or enforced, if I may so express myself.

It is not incumbent on me to deal anew with the matter of the Transcontinental railway. Nearly fifteen hundred miles of that railway will soon have been completed, a gigantic undertaking to which the right hon. gentleman has had the glory of attaching that name which so often led us to victory.

That question, as well as that of the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge,—the promise of which, given to us as solace on a day of mourning, is now being fulfilled,—should be kept apart from party strife and considered as a national undertaking. It should be looked upon solely as a masterful and beneficent attempt to improve conditions and with which sectional views or prejudices should not be allowed to interfere. We are to-day in possession of the marvellous results secured by the Caandian Pacific railway, not only as a business proposition, as a business concern, but as a means for the country's development.

In connection with the proposed Hudson Bay railway, what wonderful things might be accomplished through the building of a new line running across the Laurentian highlands, somewhere north of Berthier and reaching Montreal,—since according to experts that would be the easiest route,—at the same time putting the commercial me-

tropolis in touch with that great inter-ocean line of railway! What wonders would it not do, from the standpoint of immigration, agriculture, industry and colonization generally, throughout those unexplored districts. It would be a repetition of what the Canadian Pacific railway accomplished in the Canadian west, which is largely indebted to that company for its development.

Promoters and business men are anxious for a settlement of this question. What has been done in the past should be our surest guide for the future, and I cannot insist on it too strongly, our future prosperity lies in the development of our means of transportation. Right here I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to quote an opinion recently expressed by an eminent engineer, and which I select purposely among others, because I take it to indicate clearly, notwithstanding its brevity, not only the desirability, but the necessity of such development. 'The ability of the manufacturer and business man, the wealth and resources of a country, however great, are not sufficient by themselves to ensure success. It is, furthermore, necessary that the public means of transportation to the distributing points should have their full development. Under certain circumstances, the reduction in the cost of transportation may become the main factor towards cheap products.'

It is that same progressive policy which has induced the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) to exert himself to the fullest extent with a view to developing that means of transportation which has been so aptly termed 'the St. Lawrence undertaking,' and also with a view to pushing ahead the deepening of the channel to a uniform depth of thirty-five feet. Thus better lighted and made still safer, that route, 110 miles shorter than that connecting New York and the Great Lakes, will challenge all competition and carry the ocean, as it were, to the very heart of the continent. The outcome will be that underwriters will have to cut down their rates and exporters to ship their goods through our territory and over our waterways. If I dilate somewhat on that point, it is on account of its evidencing on the part of the government an unrelenting desire to improve and make perfect that public means of transportation.

Parliament is to be called upon to consider in the course of this session a Bill amending the Banks Act, and another amending the insurance laws. Both sides of the House agree as to the desirability of such legislation. That will dispense me with going into an examination of the provisions of these Bills, the wisdom of which all readily acknowledge, resting as they do on an uncontrovertible principle of equity and justice. That, of course, does not detract in any way from the credit due to the government for the spirit of fairness shown under the circumstances.

That same spirit of fairness will be instrumental in putting a stop to the formation of illegal trusts and monopolies, an abuse which has been going on for some time past and which should not be tolerated in this country.

Let me now take up another point in the speech from the Throne; that of naval defence. I quite realize that this is in many respects a difficult, I might say, a thorny question, considering the rather extreme view of it taken by some people. At this turning point in our history, one cannot but be moved by what the historian terms the uncertainty of human events. It was to be expected, then, I was going to say it was unavoidable, that numerous objections should be forthcoming and a diversity of opinions expressed following on the announcement of the carrying out of that measure which the Canadian people have been considering for years past. However, as Guizot puts it, 'One must keep up with the times and with the trend of events, and be courageous enough to speak out the whole truth to one's countrymen and contemporaries.'

We claimed and obtained from England the right to conclude our treaties. That monument dedicated to the business interests of our country and over whose frontispiece we read the Franco-Canadian treaty, a treaty which we will be called upon to ratify in the course of this session, is not the less advantageous. We boast, and rightly so, of being in full possession of the privileges of democracy; we occupy in the business world a most enviable position; we proclaim through the mouths of our public men, here and in foreign lands, that Canada is large enough, rich enough and proud enough to cease remaining a colony and to become actually a nation. Notwithstanding which we would leave to others the task of protecting our frontiers, our territory, that growing trade and the routes followed by it, those coasts where our fishermen and merchants have shelters and safe harbours. We would close our ears to that mysterious voice which entices youthful nations to take the necessary means for ensuring their growth, from the material as well as from the moral standpoint! No, our statesmen, anxious for the welfare of Canadian interests as well as for the welfare of the interests of the mother country, for over a century the defender of our rights and franchises, our statesmen, I say, have been urged solely by a sense of national pride and self-respect, when, after listening to the various views voiced from divers quarters, they set aside the proposals of those who were favourable to a direct contribution towards the support of the Imperial navy, as well as the senseless grop-

ings of others, and come out with a distinctly Canadian policy.

The creation of that navy which will offer new openings to Canadian youths and further opportunities for the display of energy and ability by our Canadian workmen, will as we are assured, be Canadian-built, Canadian in its uses, and Canadian in its management Let us hope further that it will lead to the establishment on Canadian soil of large shipyards wherein, to meet the pressing needs of the Canadian trade, merchantmen will be built either through a grant from the Dominion government or the imposition of a duty on ships built in foreign lands.

'There is no escape from destiny,' once said the victor of the world, on board the 'Northumberland.' So it is with nations as with individuals. It is then a task worthy of our leaders to make to-day preparations for the future, unflinchingly, though at the same time unostentatiously. To-morrow all adverse opinions, all criticisms, will give way to admiration at the enviable position our country will occupy, with greater liberty and independence.

Such are, Mr. Speaker, the proposals of the government. They one and all spring from the same inspiration, and it is one that makes for progress. Indeed the great mainspring of all government projects, which persists under a variety of forms, is a desire to do right, and whenever possible to do better still.

I am quite ready to acknowledge that youth is apt to be carried away by deceptive appearances, but there is no deception in believing that improvement is always within reach, providing there is proper guidance, there is no deception in hoping for one's country a constantly brighter and greater future. There is no deception possible for whoever follows that venerable and glorious leader, supported by his colleagues, sustained by the House, working hand in hand with the whole Canadian people, all united in one common expectation. Then, satisfied as to the necessity of developing unceasingly our powers, we will have the satisfaction of seeing Canada play a more important part, not only on the continent of America, but among the nations of the world in whose company it has just been admitted, conscious of its strength and justly proud of its youthful activity.

I have the honour to propose that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to the speech from the Throne.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, we are living under parliamentary institutions, absolutely free from imperial interference, and it therefore appears desirable that we should from time to time be reminded of the source from which we have our being as a parliamentary body. And about the only material and substantial evidence of the tie that binds us to the motherland was presented to us on Thursday afternoon, as it is annually presented to us at the ceremony of the opening of parliament. According to ancient usage and custom, His Majesty's dutiful Commons, attended at the Senate Chamber and there learned from the speech of His Excellency the causes for which parliament was summoned. According to usage, equally ancient and respected, we are required to acknowledge this speech in a suitable reply. The honour and distinction of seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Ecrément) that an humble address be presented to His Excellency has fallen upon me. I thank the right hon. the leader of the government for so honouring me, and I assure him that I have accepted the task, as I trust I shall accept every other serious duty in life, with a full sense of its responsibility. The mild and balmy weather we have enjoyed since our arrival at the capital and the lingering tints of autumn remind us that we have been invited to the discharge of our duties somewhat earlier than usual. Surely to begin earlier is to end earlier and my hope is that we shall have completed our labours before the melting winter's snows have overflowed the Chaudière; and I trust that diverse councils or overmuch speaking may not shame my expectation.

In His Excellency's speech he dealt with many important subjects, but it is my purpose to limit my observations to three or four. The first subject that appeals to me is that of immigration. I have always felt that Canada can never expect to achieve her destiny until her vast prairies and important stretches of land shall be peopled by a sufficient and contented population. Last year, I am happy to say, was a year unique in our history as respects the number of immigrants who landed on our shores. I am not going to inflict upon this House any statistics, and I trust the House will pardon me if I indulge one statistical quotation.

The number of immigrants arriving in Canada for the fiscal year, ending 31st March, 1909, was as follows:

IMMIGRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR, ENDED MARCH 31, 1909.

Great Britain	52,901
Continent	34,175
United States	59,832
	146,908
From Great Britain—	
England and Wales	37,482
Scotland	11,810
Ireland	3,609

The following are the figures of immigration for the six months ending September

30 last, compared with a similar period of the previous year:

	6 mos. to Sept. 30, 1909.	6 mos. to Sept. 30, 1909.	Increase.
Ocean ports..	64,447	.....	
From United States..	56,486	.....	
Total....	120,933	100,471	20 p. c.
Estimate for the whole year	175,000.		

Now, Sir, while we in this country are always willing to open our doors to the best immigration that comes to us from Europe —from England, from Ireland, from Scotlan and from the other countries who have contributed to our population for many years, there is a peculiar interest involved in the immigration which we receive from the United States. That is an immigration which is not forced upon us by reason of undesirable or unhappy social conditions at home or by reason of any inability on the part of these people to find profitable employment in their own country. They come to us voluntarily because they believe that in the great Canadian northwest there is a future which far exceeds the prospects that lie before them anywhere else in the world. I would ask our friends from the west to treat well these immigrants from the United States. Their coming here is a repayment to some extent of the debt which the United States owed to Canada for many years by reason of the immigration they received from Canada under less happy conditions than those which exist at the present time. This is to us a notable and glorious fact. Instead of the tide of migration setting from Canada, and the maritime provinces to the United States as it was heretofore, to-day the tide of migration is from the United States to Canada. In the United States Canadians found comfortable, prosperous homes; they found the doors of opportunity in every walk of life open to them. There was no position in the social, intellectual and industrial life of that great country to which a Canadian was not welcome or to which he might not aspire. I trust that the same will hold good with regard to the immigrants coming into this country from the United States. They are worthy of the warm welcome which Canadians will always give them, and let us hope that while immigration comes to us from the United States it will always be of the quality and class that characterized the immigration from that country into Canada during the last twelve months.

I do not propose to make reference to the question of finance and trade; these were dealt with by my hon. friend from Berthier. But there is one matter mentioned in His Excellency's speech which has a great fascination for me—the subject of railways. I am pleased that the day has come when the government can afford to undertake the projection of a new railway into the great west. I observe that surveys and plans have been completed for the Hudson Bay railway, and, in the ordinary course of things, I would expect that the policy that the government enunciated some time ago in that regard would be carried out and that the construction of a railway to Hudson bay will be one of the undertakings of the not far distant future. But while we rejoice that the people in the west are receiving what was coming to them and what belongs to them in the matter of railways, I am glad that the government have not overlooked the position of affairs in the maritime provinces. It was my privilege last session to support the resolution of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Hon. H. R. Emmerson) with respect to the absorption of certain branch railways by this government. I had scarcely hoped that the efforts of my hon. friend, who has conducted a vigorous and persistent campaign all along the line on that subject, would have borne fruit so early. The suggestion of his Excellency that the government would take power to lease certain branch railways is a fulfilment of the dearest and best expectations of my hon. friend from Westmorland and myself. I do not purpose going, this afternoon, into the question of the Intercolonial or setting forth the reasons why the people of the maritime provinces may reasonably look forward to a degree of railway development greater than they have heretofore enjoyed. There is a great field for the exercise of the benevolent policy on the part of the government outlined in that paragraph of his Excellency's speech. I trust that the government will carry out this policy vigorously; and while I cannot hope that they will enter into the purchase or leasing of all the railways that it is desirabe the Intercolonial should control in the near future, I would hope they will make an early start and that one or two branches connecting with the Intercolonial may be acquired at an early day.

One other question referred to in the speech from the Throne appears to me as having great importance, the question of enhanced prices of certain manufactured goods. I notice that his Excellency has referred to that, and intimates that the government intend to propose further legislation to prevent the enhancement of prices of goods that may be the subject of combines. I must confess to a fear that there is an activity abroad in the combining of industrial enterprises that bodes no good to the consumer in this country. We have from time to time been informed through the newspapers that large and

important industrial enterprises are being absorbed by larger enterprises, or are being combined into what are called mergers. And there is already some evidence that the result of these combinations and mergers is to enhance prices very materially as regards certain lines of goods necessarily consumed by the people of this country. Far be it from me to detract from the energy or enterprise of these captains of industry who, by their talents for organization, their financial genius and splendid optimism, have consummated what are known in this country as mergers but are known in other countries by harsher and less delectable appellations. It is our duty to study public questions and evolve policies on public issues in the light of the past history of other countries similarly circumstanced with ourselves, and I believe that the time has come to limit to some extent the exercise of those talents for promoting mergers recently so much in evidence in this Dominion. 'Predatory wealth' is a term that happily, so far has had no meaning or application in relation to our industrial finances and I conceive it to be the duty of parliament in so far as it may properly do so by legislation to make it absolutely impossible for that opprobrious expletive ever to become engrafted upon the language of this country.

There is only one other question that I should refer to, and that is the question of naval defence. That question has already been dealt with by my hon. friend from Berthier, but, as it is an important one, perhaps the House will pardon me even if I go over ground that he has covered. The resolution passed unanimously by this House on the 29th of March last calls for action on the part of the government for the purpose of crystallizing that resolution into an active and vigorous policy with respect to naval affairs in this country. I confess that I was in a haze as to what was best for Canada to do. Not being a military or naval man, I had to exercise such judgment as I was able to arrive at after having heard the speeches of the leaders of the House on that occasion. But I wanted to know also what naval experts thought of the policy of this country and through it of the policy of the Imperial government, and I was pleased to learn, some months after this resolution was passed, that Lord Charles Beresford had delivered himself on that question. Speaking at the Australian annual banquet in the city of London, on June 29 last, Lord Charles Beresford said:

> The government was wise to ask a conference to assemble in this country to discuss this all-important matter. There was no doubt that the question of imperial defence was in the minds of the Dominions, because they had shown us at home that they thought we were getting a bit sleepy, not looking facts in the face, and the fact was further emphasized by the offer of money for the purpose of building what were called Dreadnoughts, but which he preferred to call battleships. . . . The great object was to help one another, and he thought the best way was for the Dominions to make proposals for defending themselves.
>
> The best investment for the colonies was to build cruisers with which to protect their trade routes. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
>
> The vessels should be under the administration and control of the Dominions, but in case of war ready to join the imperial fleet.

I confess that I was glad to observe that Lord Charles Beresford agrees with the policy of this House as regards the vote given on the 29th of March. I am pleased to see that the government felt called upon to make some practical move as regards the policy that was adopted on that occasion, and I observe that that resolution has been strictly adhered to. There appears to be some difference of opinion in this country as to what particular form Canada's assistance to naval defence should take, but so far as the hon. members of this House are concerned I think there will be no difference of opinion in view of the vote that was given here last session on that subject. Now, I have no strong views with regard to this question. A cash contribution is an alternative proposal: but it appears to me that that savours somewhat of feudalism, a spirit that we got away from hundred of years ago. I think Canada would do well to move slowly in this regard, to form the nucleus of a navy for its own coastal protection and for its own purposes as regards naval defence in co-operation with the imperial navy should occasion arise for co-operation with the stronger force. When the proposals come down, I have no doubt, there will be a discussion on the question, and, perhaps, with more light upon the subject we may all be disposed to give some further expression to our particular views in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, history affords us many instances of alliances having been formed among nations for the purpose of mutual assistance and support, to repel the attacks of other powers, and to assist each other in aggressive warfare. These alliances, however, having been based upon no higher law or nobler sentiment than fear on the one hand or hate on the other, if we except those sordid and selfish instincts, that frequently coveted the territory of some weak and unoffending neighbour, fell apart when self interest or expediency demanded new combinations; and the countries that were to-day leagued together, to-morrow sought new allies to conquer and destroy their friends of yesterday. The policy of the government as regards naval defence foreshadowed in His Excellency's

speech, is the opening of a new and striking chapter in the world's history. Great Britain, the foremost nation in the world, with her lusty and vigorous daughters, four other nations in vigour, promise and resource—Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa—united together in a quintuple alliance for the protection and enfranchisement of the British race in every quarter of the globe. In this alliance, fear, or hate, or covetousness will have no place. It will be held together by ties of blood and kinship, by devotion to British institutions, and by the recollection of what Great Britain has done to uplift the burden of oppressed mankind in every region and every clime, bonds that are enduring and indestructible.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Ecrement) that an humble address be presented to His Excellency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to discuss the motion which has been presented to the House, I would like in the first place to express the sympathy of those sitting to your left for the family and friends of Dr. Wilbert McIntyre, late member for Strathcona, a gentleman whose fairness, whose courtesy and whose genial disposition endeared him to every member of this House, on whichever side of the Speaker he sits. Speaking for every one on this side of the House, as I am sure I can also speak for every one on the other side of the House, we tender to the family and friends of the late Dr. McIntyre our most sincere and hearty sympathy. His death is a loss, not only to this House, but to the whole country; because, in addition to the qualities to which I have alluded, he was a man of more than ordinary ability, and one who devoted himself with the greatest possible industry to every public question that came up for the consideration of parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate in no purely formal manner the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Ecrement) who moved the address of His Excellency, and who did so in very happy terms and with great eloquence; also my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), who spoke with very great ability, and for the most part very happily.

With respect to the growing time which has been alluded to, I notice a distinct difference in the tenor of the speech which has been put into the mouth of His Excellency from that which we heard last year. I noticed in the gracious speech of His Excellency last year, that attention was called to a world wide depression, and it was indicated to us that this world wide depression had in some inevitable way been extended to our own country. There was a suggestion that the depression was prevailing throughout the world, and that no effort of any government could possibly have prevented it from reaching Canada. But this year I do not observe any reference whatever to the world wide prosperity which is enjoyed by every civilized country at this moment, the inference of course being that the great advance and growth which have been happily manifest in Canada, and the rapid recovery from the depression of last year, are altogether due to the fact that we have upon the treasury benches of Canada today that wonderful aggregation of ability and talent which now presides over our destinies. Well, I suppose there must be a difference in the way in which you look at it one year and the way in which you look at it in another year. But, after all, those of us who give intelligent consideration to such matters know that world wide prosperity and world wide depression are beyond the control of any government, or of any combination of governments. We are happy indeed that Canada in the past eight or ten years has had her full share in the world wide prosperity, we are glad of it, we rejoice in it, and we trust that it will long continue.

But there were one or two matters in connection with the growth of this country as to which I did not observe any allusion in the remarks, either of the hon. gentleman who moved the address or of the hon. gentleman who so ably seconded it. It has been a growing time in Canada, and it would be strange indeed if Canada did not share in this world wide prosperity. But have any of these hon. gentlemen considered the way in which the public expenditure of Canada has been growing in recent years? I have some figures that were made up for me not long ago, and they were of so startling a character that I sent for the public accounts, because I did not believe that they could be correct. I did not realize that the public expenditure of this country had grown to such an extent. But I found upon examining the public accounts that the figures given to me were correct. I found that, taking the ten years from 1886 to 1896, the aggregate revenue of this country amounted to $371,000,000, in round numbers. I found that, taking the ten years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, the aggregate revenue of this country amounted to $692,500,000; in other words, I found that during the past ten years the present administration have received from the people of this country—because the money could come from no other source—$321,500,000 more than was received by the late Conservative administration during the last ten years they were in power. I imagined to myself what a good,

stalwart Liberal of the old school might say, coming to this parliament or coming into this House to-day, having regard to the pledges and to the declarations of principle which he had heard on so many public platforms before 1896, when he learned that in ten years $321,500,000 had been collected by this government in excess of what the people had paid to the Conservative administration during a similar period before 1896. Well, he would say in the first place that he was glad the revenue had been so abundant, but he would say also, 'When our friends went into power, when we assumed the reins of office in 1896, there were $258,000,000 of public debt in this country. We had complained of the growth of that public debt, we had deprecated it, and I have not any doubt but that out of the $321,500,000 of surplus excess of revenue which the Liberal ministry has received from the people of Canada in the last ten years, the whole of that public debt has been wiped out.' Well, then, he would be told: 'No, it has not been all wiped out.' He would say: 'At least $200,000,000 must have been wiped out, because that would leave $121,500,000 excess of revenue to supply all the growing needs of this developing country.' He would be told: 'No, $200,000,000 have not been wiped out.' 'Well, then,' he would say, 'surely $100,000,000 of the public debt must have been wiped out, because that would leave to the Liberal leaders who are in power to-day $221,500,000 to supply the needs of the rapid growth and development of this country. He would be told: 'No, the public debt of this country has not been decreased as much as that;' and if he seemed to be a man of robust health, capable of standing the shock, he would be told that the public debt of this country has been increased by nearly $66,000,000. I did not observe any allusion to this somewhat rapid and remarkable growth in the speech of either the mover or seconder of the address.

But, it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that these are figures which call for some comment, and they are figures which have already evoked some expression of opinion from great financial authorities outside of Canada. I may be told, perhaps, that the National Transcontinental railway undertaking has absorbed a very large amount of this. I have taken the trouble to look into that and I find that, excluding the Quebec bridge, about $52,000,000 was expended up to the 31st March last in connection with the National Transcontinental railway, and that, including the Quebec bridge, a little more than $58,000,000 has been expended in connection with that undertaking. So you can put the National Transcontinental railway out of the matter altogether by deducting the amount expended upon it from the increase in the debt, and you will find, after balancing the accounts in that way, allowing $58,000,000 of debt for expenditure upon the National Transcontinental railway, that you have $321,500,000 of excess revenue beyond that which was received from the people of this country in the period of ten years before 1896, and you still find that the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches to-day have spent the whole of that enormous sum and have also increased the public debt by $7,000,000. Not only that, but $46,000,000 in the increase of the public debt to which I have alluded took place in the past year, and inasmuch as we have spent only $52,000,000 up to date upon the National Transcontinental railway we can foresee from the figures brought down by the government themselves that between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 still remain to be expended upon that gigantic undertaking before it shall have been completed.

Passing from this question of the expenditure upon the Transcontinental railway itself, I do not observe a reference in the speech from the Throne to the probable date of the completion of the undertaking; nor do I observe, in the speech from the Throne, any reference, or any information whatever, as to the date at which the Quebec bridge will be completed. I think that these are matters upon which we might well be enlightened by the Prime Minister when he comes to address the House. We know that very severe comments have been made by the late president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, who has spoken in very indignant tones and in very severe language as to the extraordinary delay which has taken place in the work of construction between Winnipeg and Quebec. I would like to know, if possible, at what date the government expect that the road will be completed, and at what date they expect the Quebec bridge will be completed. Have they any reasonable idea, which they can vouchsafe to the House as measurably correct, as to when either of these events will take place; and if, as we assume the event will be, the Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Quebec and the remaining portion of the line from Quebec to Moncton will be first completed, what do they propose to do with these portions of the road during the period when the Quebec bridge will be still in process of construction? We are all aware in this country that traffic, once routed in a particular direction, is very difficult to move, and we are all aware that the traffic coming over the National Transcontinental railway may get routed in directions which are not thoroughly in the

interests of the people of this country; at all events, not in the interest of the great maritime ports of Canada. I think the matter to which I have directed the attention of the government is one of considerable importance, and I do trust that we will have from the Prime Minister, when he comes to address the House, some reliable information as to these very important questions.

I did not observe any reference in the speech from the Throne to the waterways treaty. The Prime Minister was good enough to tell us a day or two ago that the matter is still under the consideration of the government. If it is still under the consideration of the government I cannot reasonably expect any very definite information to-day, but I think the decision of the government, as soon as it is made, should be announced to the House in order that there may be an opportunity for debate, because I still adhere to the view which I expressed last session, and, I think, the previous session as well, that this treaty, inasmuch as it involves, to a certain extent at least, territorial rights, ought not, according to the modern and, I think, the better British practice, to have been entered into without having been made subject to the ratification of this parliament. Inasmuch as that course was not pursued it is only right and absolutely in the public interest that we should have all the information in regard to it as soon as possible.

I remember also, that the Prime Minister, at the concluding session of the imperial conference of 1907, proposed to the conference a certain famous resolution. I do not know whether many hon. gentlemen in this House can remember it thoroughly or not because the matter seems to have faded pretty well out of the public view in the meantime. As a matter of fact it concerned what was called the All-red line and the Liberal press throughout the country heralded the idea of the All-red line as one which had sprung in full armour, like Minerva from the brain of Jove, from the brain of the Prime Minister of this country. So, a resolution was introduced in the concluding days of the session of 1908—I think it was—the matter was placed before parliament for its consideration and the resolution, in the terms proposed by the government, was eventually passed. During the last session of parliament I asked for some information as to the position of, and as to the progress, if any, which had been made in this affair, and, as far as I recollect from the reply of the Prime Minister, it did not seem that any great progress had been made up to that time in that direction. It is possible that some progress has been made in that direction and if so I have no doubt the Prime Minister will give to this House all such information as may be available in that regard.

Allusion is made in the speech from the Throne to the French treaty. I do not desire to say one single word in regard to it which would in any way embarrass the government in its consideration of what appears to be a very difficult question. I have under my hand the tariff recently adopted by the United States of America. Every hon. gentleman in this House who has given any consideration to this question at all knows the terms of the second section of the American tariff of 1909. The second section of that tariff provides that the rates set forth in section 1 of the Act shall be the tariff to be levied in the United States upon goods coming from all foreign countries together with 25 per cent ad valorem in addition thereto unless the President of the United States shall after taking into consideration the fiscal measures of other countries, come to the conclusion that the United States has in every respect reciprocal and fair treatment from such other countries, and shall make proclamation accordingly. In the absence of any such proclamation by the President of the United States—and, of course, he has to depend, as we understand, for his advice in that regard, upon a board of experts whom he has appointed—every article exported from Canada to the United States, or from any other country to the United States, shall be subject not only to the tariff set forth in section 1 of the Act but to 25 per cent ad valorem as well. I do not to-day propose to enter into any debate upon the bearing of the treaty with the French Republic, but I shall venture to bring to the attention of the government a consideration of our relative trade with France and with the United States during the past three years. Our aggregate imports from France during the past three years amounted to $24,798,756; our aggregate imports from the United States during the same period amounted to $546,622,404 or about 25 times greater than those from France. Our exports to France during the same period of three years amounted to $6,392,400 and our exports to the United States during the same period amounted to $285,146,337 or nearly fifty times as much. Under these circumstances I must confess that a consideration of the French treaty will involve some matters of serious import, and when that treaty does come to be considered I trust we shall have from the minister in charge of it some definite information as to what effect its ratification may have in connection with the probable effect of the United States tariff.

The hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address made some reference to the paragraph in the speech from the Throne which alludes to the subject of

naval defence, and which is in the following language:

Two members of my government attended the imperial conference called by His Majesty's government, on the question of defence A plan was adopted after consultation with the admiralty, for the organization of a Canadian Naval Service, on the lines of the resolution of the House of Commons, of the 29th of March last. The papers will be immediately brought down and a Bill introduced accordingly.

I was a little in doubt during some portion of the remarks of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) as to whether Canada was still a portion of the British empire, but I trust nothing has occurred since we entered the House of Commons to-day to lead us to the conclusion that we are not still a part of that great empire. I am glad to believe that Canada still floats the British flag. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) rather adopted a tone which would lead one to think that he was speaking of four or five absolutely independent nations who for convenience might see fit to enter into a joint alliance for purposes of defence. I shall not discuss the naval question this afternoon; it will be time enough to do that when the government proposals are brought down. I do not propose even to allude to some rather remarkable speeches which have been made by members of the cabinet, if the public press is to be trusted. I do not yet know whether the gentlemen in question have been properly reported, but I have heard that at least in one case the minister disclaims the language attributed to him. All I have to say is that if those eminent Liberal journalists who have been proclaiming that I am entirely in favour of the government proposals, imagine that any such proposals as those which have been outlined in at least one of these speeches will meet the approval of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, they are labouring under an entire misconception. I neither oppose nor denounce these proposals because I do not know what they are. We are very happy indeed to say to His Excellency the Governor General, that we thank him very much for his gracious speech, but in doing so we do not concede for one moment that we are restricting our right of action in any way in respect to whatever proposals the government may see fit to make. Like the other proposals of the government, reasonable and fair consideration will be given to them, and the sooner they are brought down the better. In fact, the sooner we get to work the better, because I entirely agree with my hon. friend from Richmond that we should all endeavour to expedite the work of parliament this session, as at every session. We are ready to begin work as soon as possible. Let the government get their committees appointed, let them bring down their measures, let them come on with their work and we will work as hard as they to expedite the public business.

In the brevity of my speech I am at least giving an earnest of my desire to expedite the business of the House, but I cannot conclude without congratulating the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon his elevation to the cabinet. Might I remind the House that this is the sixth occasion on which the Prime Minister has gone outside of the House of Commons for a cabinet minister, and it is the fifth occasion on which he has gone outside of parliament altogether to make a selection. We on the opposition benches had nothing to say about that. Indeed the Prime Minister explained the situation to us two years ago when he said that he always endeavoured to select the best man, and inasmuch as he could not find the best man, or a sufficiently good man within the ranks of his supporters in the Commons, he was naturally obliged to go outside. But, these hon. gentlemen who have been passed over need not imagine that their usefulness is gone for they will still be required to vote for the Newmarket canal and things of that kind. In that way they will be able to contribute to the fighting strength of the Liberal party, if not from the treasury benches, from the benches immediately behind. I trust the Prime Minister will be good enough to furnish the House with information on the matters to which I have alluded so that we may get down to business and begin the actual work of the session as early as possible.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, when in the month of May last this House was prorogued, it was understood that the government would endeavour to so shape its course that the session of parliament would be called to meet for the despatch of business in the early part of November. Parliament has been called at the appointed time according to that programme, and in this as in all other instances the government has faithfully discharged its duty. Of course, for this we have received very little credit but with this government virtue is its own reward, and its ambitions no other. Meeting thus early in the season I agree with my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) that we should see the blessing of a prorogation early next spring. Indeed there is no reason why parliament should not be prorogued long before the melted snows have passed over the Chaudière Falls. And if I may be permitted to recall a recent utterance of my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on this subject he stated, if I am correctly informed, that if the government brought

down its measures promptly, the session would be reasonably short. That is not, I think, the proper way to put the matter. The session will be reasonably short if the opposition is not unreasonably verbose; but I confess, after experience, that I have my doubts as to that, though I may be mistaken. If we find that the opposition have had a change of heart, that they have turned over a new leaf, and that, in addition to the art of speaking, of which I know they are masters, they have learned the art of stopping speaking, then I will be the first to proclaim the fact to a grateful people.

I must extend my congratulations to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He has set a good example, which I hope will be followed by those behind him. I must also offer to him my very sincere thanks for the generous manner in which he has spoken of our departed friend, the late Dr. McIntyre. Nothing could be too good to say of Dr. McIntyre. He was one of those rare men, who, to a brilliant intellect joined a kind heart, and he had nothing but friends on both sides of the House. I also appreciate the generous compliment which the hon. leader of the opposition paid to my friends, the mover and the seconder of the address. Indeed, in the course of a long experience it has not been my fortune to hear on such an occasion utterances at once so brief, so pertinent and containing so much matter.

I am afraid that I cannot meet all the requests that my hon. friend has made to me. I cannot discuss all the questions he has raised. I do not see any occasion at present for discussing the prosperity of the country. We are prosperous, and we do not grudge the prosperity of other nations, because we claim that Canada is more prosperous than any other country.

Neither do I propose to discuss at present the expenditure of the country. My hon. friend has stated that during the ten years in which we have been in office we have taken from the public $321,000,000 more than the Conservative party took from them in the same length of time. I do not dispute this, but I have not observed because of this any discontent on the part of the people of Canada. It has been an easy task for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to get money from the people. My hon. friend the member for North Toronto recalls the days when he was Minister of Finance, and he will agree with me that he was sleeping on a bed of thorns, whereas my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is sleeping on an easy pillow. He has no difficulty in getting the money he requires, because he has a wealthy population to draw upon, whereas my hon. friend the member for North Toronto was drawing money from an impoverished people. If ever there was a period in the history of Canada when the people were contented and happy, it is this period in which we live.

Neither do I feel called upon at this moment to discuss the question of the completion of the Transcontinental railway. I can leave this to a future time, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will give all the particulars to my hon. friend. The same remark applies to the question of the Quebec bridge. But before I leave the point raised by my hon. friend as to the completion of the railway, I would observe that the remarks of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, the President of the Grand Trunk railway, were hardly justified and have been falsified by the event. He complained that the line from Winnipeg to the Lake Superior branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific had not been completed, and that therefore this year the railway could not serve to carry the crops of the Northwest to Lake Superior. I am happy to say that since the words of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson were uttered, the railway has been completed and opened for traffic, and that at this moment wheat is being carried over it from the prairie provinces to Lake Superior.

With regard to the waterways treaty, we have about made up our minds on all points except one, which requires some further consideration, and it will be our duty if we come to a conclusion on this point during the present session, as I hope we shall, to communicate it to parliament as soon as it is arrived at.

I have nothing to say at present on the French treaty. According to my own view, neither the French treaty nor anything in the legislation of Canada can be construed as an act of discrimination against the United States, and therefore the article in the American Tariff Act does not apply.

My hon. friend has not discussed the question of naval defence, which is the very question which I think on the present occasion should be discussed, for this reason, that the policy which was adopted unanimously by this House last session has been singled out for attack in quarters from which we had reason to expect support. Last session, when the House unanimously came to the conclusion that Canada should organize a Canadian naval service in cooperation wtih the British Admiralty, we informed parliament that we were going to send to Great Britain two members of the cabinet for the very purpose of discussing that question with the admiralty. Shortly afterwards, His Majesty's imperial government called a conference of all the self-governing colonies for the purpose of discussing the larger question of imperial defence. Two ministers of the cabinet, as we informed the House were appointed to attend that conference, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) and my hon. friend the Min-

ister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). They went as soon as the session was over. They attended the imperial conference and also had a protracted and careful conference with the admiralty, and they came to a conclusion, which will be placed before the House at an early day. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who was not heard on this question during the last session, has been heard since, and he complained of the silence maintained by the government. He not only complained but deprecated that the report of the conference had not been laid before the public, and in somewhat harsh and violent terms, interpreted this silence as concealing some nefarious intention. He asked, with some excitement, why this secrecy? I am happy to say to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that there has been no secrecy, and if there had been, who would have been hurt? Certainly not my hon. friend, because on this question he does not want any action to be taken. I have only to tell him that no action can be taken on the report of the conference until the papers are brought down, and therefore there is no reason why his happiness should be marred. There has been no secrecy, for this reason. My hon. friend knows that it is a rule between several parties, that when a conference takes place the report of it is not made public without the consent of all the parties to it, and I can tell my hon. friend that the papers will be brought down here and in Great Britain on Wednesday of this week. Perhaps, as suggested by my hon. friend opposite, it would be better to wait until the papers are brought down, but I think, on the contrary, we should now have a word or two on the subject. If we had reason to believe that the policy laid down here last session is to be adopted now by the opposition, as it was adopted then, there would be no reason to utter a single word. But it appears that it is not a happy family which we have to-day sitting on the other side. It appears that it was not the angel of peace, with words of persuasion and conciliation, which presided over their recent deliberations, but rather the demon of discord:

> 'With ruin upon ruin, rout on rout,
> Confusion worse confounded.'

Let me recall to the House the enacting part of the resolution passed last session. It was in these words:

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

Sir, this resolution is clear cut. There is

no ambiguity about it. It is as precise as words can make it. Parliament stands there unanimously committed to the policy that Canada shall organize a Canadian naval service, to act in co-operation with the British admiralty, and to be organized for the purpose therein declared, namely that the superiority of Britain on the high seas shall be maintained. Nothing could be clearer. This resolution was not adopted as a snap vote, but deliberately and unanimously. The motion of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) upon which it was based, had been on the Order Paper more than six weeks when it came up, and therefore nobody was taken by surprise. Yet the ink of that resolution was scarcely dry when we heard whisperings on the other side that the policy therein laid down did not altogether suit the party. These whisperings became murmurs, and the murmurs have now turned into ominous rumblings. I must give the generalissimo of the forces and his first lieutenant the credit of having, up to the present, stood manfully by their guns, whatever they may do afterwards, but behind them, in the rank and file, there are some young bloods clamouring for something more spectacular, and high up in the councils of the party, in the very staff itself, there is at least one who, like Lucifer, has said 'non servism', I shall not serve, and who like Achilles, has spurned the authority of Agamemnon, and has withdrawn sulking under his tent. In the first category we have my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Magrath) who at least has the courage of his conviction and who has come out openly and somewhat ostentatiously with the declaration that nothing will satisfy him except a contribution in money from the Canadian into the British treasury and of such an amount as will at least build a Dreadnought. I understand a similar position has been taken by my hon friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron) whom I do not see in his seat. I understand it is taken also by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), and by a good many sitting opposite who voted for the resolution of the House last year but have changed their minds and now want something else.

I have this to observe, that this question is not a new one. It was debated last year, and parliament then came to the unanimous conclusion that the help should not be in the form of a money contribution but in an organization of a Canadian naval service. The question is far older than last year. It is one that has come up before on many an occasion. It was debated at the conference in London in 1902 and the resolution then adopted, seven years ago, was exactly the resolution adopted by this House, last March. That resolution was to the effect that the assistance to be given

the motherland by Canada would not be in the form of a money contribution which was then asked but respectfully declined—but in the form of an organization of our own forces. I may be permitted to recall again the paper which was placed before the conference by the Canadian ministers who attended the conference of 1902.

At present Canadian expenditures are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side as well. . . . In conclusion the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities. and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self government, which has proved so strong a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

This paper was placed before the British empire and before the Canadian people seven years ago. At that time we were sharply taken to task by certain portions of the Conservative party, although our action was never challenged on the floor of this House. We were taken to task on the ground that we should not have an organization of our own but give a contribution to the mother country. The example of Australia was quoted against us. At that time Australia was paying a certain proportion of its revenue to the imperial exchequer for the purpose of aiding the imperial navy. The contribution, if I remember rightly was in the neighbourhood of £200,000. This contribution enabled the government of the mother country to maintain in the Pacific an imperial squadron; and we were told that this policy, which Australia was following out, was the one we should adopt. But time has shown that we were in the right since Australia itself has now come to our policy and is no longer contributing to the imperial treasury but is organizing a squadron of her own in her own waters.

There is in the Toronto 'News' of a recent date a suggestive article upon this point. It is not an editorial article but simply a news paragraph giving the context of the Bill introduced in the parliament of Australia after the conference which took place last summer in London. Australia no longer contributes to the British treasury but has come to what I may call the Canadian plan of having a force of her own. According to the Toronto ' News ':

The adoption of the Australian Defence Bill recently introduced in the Commonwealth parliament will mean building operations on such a scale that by 1912 the Commonwealth fleet will relieve and replace the present imperial squadron in Australian waters.

Henceforth this will be replaced by a squadron built and maintained by Australia. It is to be composed as follows:—

The new fleet is to consist of one armoured cruiser of the ' Indomitable ' class, three armoured cruisers of the ' Bristol ' class, and six destroyers with the necessary complement of submarines. . . . Its annual cost is estimated at $3,750,000.

The difference between $2,000,000 and the actual annual cost is to be provided by the imperial government until Australia can assume this entire burden. The new arrangement will save Great Britain from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 annually.

The service will cost $3,750,000 a year. But the whole of that burden is not to be carried by the people of Australia; it is to be divided between Australia and Great Britain, Australia to assume $2,000,000 a year and the remainder to be contributed by Great Britain. Under this arrangement it is no longer Australia which contributes to the imperial treasury, but the imperial treasury which contributes to Australia. Nor is that all. There was great excitement last March when the news was flashed across the ocean that New Zealand was to contribute a Dreadnought to the imperial navy. Even there in New Zealand also public opinion has been moving. I find again in the Toronto 'News', which seems to give special attention to these matters, an important announcement with regard to New Zealand. New Zealand was given as an example for Canada and other self-governing dominions to follow and copy, but it now appears that New Zealand is coming to the policy of Canada. The Toronto 'News' says:

When the German peril first became acute, New Zealand unhesitatingly offered to donate a Dreadnought to the British admiralty. But, according to the arrangement agreed upon at the defence conference in London, the lesser Britain in the southern seas is to spend its money in providing the Pacific with an ' Indomitable.'

It goes on to say that the ' Dreadnought ' which is to be contributed by New Zealand is to be put in Chinese waters, and proceeds:—

This is the situation to-day, but the Wellington correspondent of the London 'Morning Post' reports a tendency towards a gradual change of opinion in favour either of a local navy or of joint action with Australia. The leader of the opposition in parliament thinks that some arrangement may still be made whereby the two southernmost British commonwealths may work together in defending themselves and the empire. One Wellington newspaper sees nothing to stimulate local sentiment in the placing of New Zealand's ' Indomitable '

upon the Chinese coast, and envies Canada and Australia the fleets which they are to possess, man and operate.

It is not for me to offer any suggestions to my hon. friends on the other side, but I may venture to ask them to reflect upon this—that if the British empire is to remain strong as it is to-day, it will not be by compelling the daughter nations to revolve as satellites around the mother country but by allowing every daughter nation to develop itself to the fullest extent possible so that it may add strength to the whole.

Now, I have presented to the House one side of the opinion amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. There is also another side. I have presented the side of the ardent; now I come to consider the side of the supine. But if I qualify those who are inactive by applying to them the word 'supine,' I use a term that is not sufficiently strong. If I were to do them justice, I think I should be obliged, if I may do so without violating parliamentary propriety, to borrow a term from American political slang and say that these gentlemen are of the party of the 'stand-patters.' The chief of that class is my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think it quite right to discuss this question, referring to papers in the case and not give those papers to parliament? I do not think it is at all fair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is just as fair for me to answer the speech of my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier as it was for him to make that speech before the papers are laid before the House.

Mr. MONK. But it is an ordinary rule of debate that an hon. member should not, in speaking in this House, refer to papers that are not before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And it would have been well for the hon. gentlemen not to speak outside of parliament until he had the papers before him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) might have told his hearers that there had been an occasion when he might properly have spoken. He might have spoken last session when this resolution was before the House and when others spoke though he did not. He has changed his mind apparently. At a banquet which was tendered him in the town of Lachine, in the division of Jacques Cartier, he might then have told his friends that he had lost a good opportunity of thundering his objections to this policy last session. I recollect that my hon. friend was in his seat on the 29th of March last. He did not speak—he stood pat even then; he did not offer any objection, nor did he by speaking express approval. But on the more recent occasion to which I allude he did not hesitate to speak, and spoke apparently by the book. He gave a wealth of objections against the policy adopted here last session, and in which he was a participator in that he did not challenge a vote upon the question. He voted for the resolution, but, having voted for it, without more information than he has to-day he chooses to attack the policy of the government, the policy of his own party, and to declare that he will not stand by it. That was what the hon. gentleman did just eight days ago to-day.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not competent for my right hon. friend to discuss a subject referred to in a speech from the Throne and in that connection to refer to documents which are to be produced unless those documents are laid upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not discussing any question which is not properly before the House; I am discussing a resolution passed by parliament last session and an attack made upon that resolution by my hon. friend eight days ago to-day.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have your ruling on the point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the well-known practice that if reference is made to documents, those documents must be produced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What reference have I made to documents? I would have much preferred that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) should not discuss this question until the papers are before the House; but when he chooses to attack the policy of a resolution passed in this House, speaking in the province of Quebec and attempting to arouse prejudice there, I have the right to refer to it here. The speech which he delivered——

Mr. MONK. I do not think that such an imputation should be made by my right hon. friend unless he is prepared to point out what language of mine was designed to arouse prejudice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell the hon. gentleman at once. The hon. gentleman told the audience which he addressed eight days ago to-day that our project of building a navy would cost annually $20,000,000. I say that that is an appeal to prejudice. If it was not, what was it? My hon. friend will be glad to know, I am sure, when those papers are brought down, that he was altogether astray. My hon. friend will be glad to know that his assertion was not only astray, but was three or four times astray, and I presume that when he sees the papers they will cause him no little surprise. Then, to undeceive the good electors of Jacques Cartier who, since his speech have been unable to sleep

on account of the nightmare which it caused them, he will be glad to tell them that these tall figures are altogether wrong, that they are merely the imaginings, the dreamings, the vapourings, the vagaries of the hon. member whom they have unwisely entrusted with their confidence. But that was not the only thing he said. My hon. friend also said that if we were to build a navy we would be drawn thereby into European wars. Need I say to my hon. friend that whether we have such a navy or not, we do not lose our right to self-government; that if we do have a navy, that navy will go to no war unless the parliament of Canada, including the hon. gentleman, choose to send it.

My hon. friend also blamed the government for proposing to begin the organization of a naval force. What is the object of that force, what is the occasion? We never had one before, and why should we have one now? he says. It is true, we never had a naval force before. I remember a time when we had no railways, when we had no public school system But at the present time we have railways and we have school systems. And if now we have to organize a naval force it is because we are growing as a nation; it is the penalty of being a nation that we have to bear. Sir, I know of no nation having a sea coast of its own which has not thought it advisable to have a navy of its own. I know no nation which has a large sea coast but no navy. I speak under correction—there is one, I think Norway, and even that country has some naval defence. But Norway will never tempt the invader; there is nothing in Norway to tempt an invader. But Canada has its coal mines, its gold mines, its wheat fields, and its vast wealth may offer a temptation to the invader; and that is the reason, as was stated last year by the hon. member for North Toronto, that the time has come when we should move on. It was proposed that we should either make a money contribution or that we should do what would organize a naval force of our own. We have proposed to adopt the latter course.

There is one thing, however, on which I can agree with my hon. friend—perhaps he will permit me to agree with him. I am always glad to agree with him when I can do so. He told his electors of Jacques Cartier:

> This is a Canadian question, we must view it from a Canadian standpoint primarily.

In this I quite agree with my hon. friend, it is a Canadian question, and we should deal with it as a Canadian question primarily. But there is something more than that. My hon. friend was right in saying this, but he did not go far enough, there is something else. We are Canadians, but we are something else also, we are British subjects. We have to consider this subject, not only from the standpoint of our status as Canadians, but we have to approach it from the standpoint of our status as British subjects. It is conceivable that the interests of Canada and the interests of the mother country may vary upon some questions. That has happened in the past, and it may happen again. When that happened in the past it was the part of statesmanship to reconcile the conflicting interests, and if they happen to clash again it will be the part of statesmanship to reconcile them again on broad lines. But I am happy to say that, in so far as I can see, at all events—and in this matter I express my own opinion—in the present instance there is no clashing of interests between Canada and the mother country. Whatever is done for Canada will benefit the mother country; whatever is done for the mother country, will benefit Canada. Let me say also to my hon. friend that if we have duties to perform as Canadians, we have also duties to perform as British subjects. If we have rights, privileges, and responsibilities as Canadians, we also have rights, privileges and responsibilities as British subjects. But my hon. friend, in discussing this question, ignored altogether that side of it, he discussed it from the Canadian point of view alone. He should have gone further and should have discussed it from the point of view of our status as British subjects. We have to recognize our duties and responsibilities in that double capacity. When we approached this question and declared to the British authorities, as we did in 1902, that we would relieve them from the necessity of looking after the defences of our coasts which they had hitherto done, we were performing our duty as British subjects, and when we declared that we would undertake that task ourselves and keep it under our control, we were performing our duty as Canadian citizens.

I have to say to my hon. friend that I hold in my hand at the present moment a letter which I received a few days ago from a friend who was a visitor in the city of Rome, wherein is narrated an incident which throws a striking light upon the rights and privileges connected with our British citizenship. My hon. friend knows that there is in the city of Rome a Canadian college built a few years ago by priests of the Society of St. Sulpice of Montreal, and maintained by them for the education of young Roman Catholic students in theology. At the date of my friend's letter, on the 16th of October, the city of Rome, like many other cities in continental Europe, was in the throes of a violent commotion, occasioned by the execution of Professor Ferrer, in Barcelona. Riots were imminent at different points of the city. The Spanish embassy at the Quir-

inal, the Spanish embassy at the Vatican, and the Austrian embassy had to be guarded by strong detachments of the Italian army. Streets and public squares were filled by an infuriated mob swearing vengeance, yelling and hurling threats at convents and religious communities of all descriptions. My friend asked the reverend father superior of the college if he was not apprehensive of danger for the Canadian college. Mark the answer. I commend it especially to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

'Non, j'arborerai le drapeau britannique, si nous sommes attaqués. Le drapeau britannique est notre talisman ici.'

'No,' said the reverend father superior, 'I will hoist the British flag if we are attacked. The British flag is our talisman here.'

Sir, it is impossible not to be struck by the similitude of events which occurred something like 1900 years ago and which occurred again almost identically in our own day. Nineteen hundred years ago, at the time when the empire of Rome had reached the summit of its power, Paul of Tarsus, in the course of his labours as an apostle of Christ, was attacked by a mob; his life was in imminent peril. He bethought himself of His Roman citizenship; he had only to utter the words 'I am a Roman citizen.' This was his talisman, and at once he was safe from the mob. Now in our days, only last week, in the city of Rome, once the mistress of the world, whose name alone carried such prestige, a disciple of Paul of Tarsus labouring also in the cause of Christ, is also attacked by a mob. He bethinks himself that he is a British subject. He bethinks himself that he belongs to an empire which, for power, majesty and prestige can rival the empire of Rome in its palmiest days. And, as his talisman, he unfurls the British flag, the moment the noble colours are spread to the breeze over the famous city the mob is awed, all danger is past. I have to make this remark to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Wherever there are rights, wherever there are privileges, there are likewise duties and responsibilities and, so long as we enjoy the rights and privileges of British citizenship, so long we must, we shall, we will assume and accept all the responsibilities that appertain to British citizenship. These are the sentiments with which we should approach this question. I say 'we.' What do I mean? I mean Canadians of all origins, of all races, of all nationalities. I mean Canadians from the east and from the west. I mean Canadians of all the provinces, and above all—Canadians of the province of Quebec who claim the honour of being descended from a race which has always stood foremost in chivalry, in enthusiasm and in idealism.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I do intend, notwithstanding the invitation of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to discuss this naval question on this occasion, but just before I come to that, in view of what the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the Prime Minister said, and as something in the way of a just appreciation of the late member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre), I wish to pay him one great and substantial tribute in regard to his public conduct last session in this parliament. I raised a question on that occasion as to the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific railway. I thought that a great injustice was being done to the country. I pointed that out, and the hon. member for Strathcona, and the hon. member for Assiniboia supported me in that position. I think I can make the fact clear to the House by reading a very short quotation from a prominent English paper, London 'Truth.' London 'Truth' is noted for its financial articles, which are always written in the first person. In the issue of the 13th October this appears:

A week ago I referred to the likelihood of an early issue of shares by the Canadian Pacific. The official announcement has been made, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy intimating at the meeting held last week that the company would issue $30,000,000 of new shares to those registered on November 15th in the proportion of one new share for every five held. It is officially stated that the price of issue will be $125. There was a little disappointment in places at the company's departure from its former practice of making new issues at par, but the market was prepared for the board's change of policy in view of the opposition to issue at par lately encountered by the company in the Canadian parliament a matter with which I dealt at the time. It seems to me that the company's action achieves the object not often obtained of pleasing both sides. By issuing the shares at $125, instead of par, the board gains $7,500,000 of capital, and conciliates the Canadian trading community, while it is still able to offer the shareholders a handsome bonus.

The member for Strathcona has put this to his monument—and the people of the Northwest will appreciate it—that a year ago he raised his voice in this country against a capitalization in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway that was against the public interest, he stated his view in this House, he was supported by the hon. member for Assiniboia and myself, and the result is that the Canadian Pacific railway, in spite of itself and its intentions, has to-day $7,500,000 in its treasury for the building of branch lines in the Canadian west if it chooses to so employ that money. If there were more

men from the west who would stand up in this House as that hon. gentleman did on that occasion there would be better treatment for the farmers of the west in regard to the transportation question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to come to this question of naval defence. While I may not add anything new to the question, or throw any great light upon it, still I do want to get the House down to the actual situation, whatever it may be, in discussing it, especially in view of statements that have been made on recent occasions by members of this House and statements that are now being made in the press by correspondents who, in some way, seemed to think that Canada has no duty to perform in this matter. If I deal for a few minutes with some things that we all know, I intend to deal with them largely for the information of the country, and, I think also, for the information of some hon. gentlemen who are to-day members of this House. While I say this I wish to put in a plea now for the very fullest discussion of this question. There must be freedom of discussion upon this question. Every side must be heard, every province must be heard, every citizen of Canada must be heard on so important a matter. But I do trust, and I am confident that out of this discussion there will come a policy upon which the whole of the Canadian nation can be united. I believe that when we come to our final action it will be the action of a united nation and assist that desirable result. I wish to try and make clear what I conceive to be a few of the basic principles of the situation. The first thing I wish to establish—and it requires sometimes to be established, although the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have admitted it to-day—is that Canada is an integral portion of the British empire. The Prime Minister alluded to it to-day, but you often hear people discussing this question who seem to evade that issue. One way in which I wish to establish that, and I think I can establish it, is to take this little book, the British North America Act, and see what it says in reference to this subject. In its opening paragraph, or preamble, it says:

> Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. . . .
>
> Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, in this present parliament assembled.

Then the Act follows. What does that mean? It means that to-day this country is under the British Crown and that the House of Commons of this Dominion of Canada was organized and created by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. When you read some of these discussions that take place in the country you discover that they evade the whole fact that we are a creation of the parliament of the United Kingdom and that we are under the British Crown. If you go on in the Act for two or three sentences more you will read the following:

> Provisions of this Act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the heirs and successors of Her Majesty, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Article 9:

> The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

Clause 15 reads as follows:

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

Article 17:

> There shall be one parliament for Canada, consisting of the Queen, an Upper House styled the Senate, and the House of Commons.

Therefore, in this constitutional Act which creates the Dominion of Canada it is most clearly set out that Canada is a part of the British empire, and that this parliament is the creature of the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Let me read the oath that every soldier who joins the Canadian militia takes; and I suppose the same oath will be taken by the members of our naval force now:

> I, A B, do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty.

And every member of this parliament takes this oath:

> I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King Edward.

The royal titles—and now I come to a point which is very significant—the royal titles as used in all our official documents read:

> Edward VII, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the seas, King, defender of the faith, Emperor of India.

And to-morrow were a declaration of war made against our King it would be against Edward the Seventh of Great Britain and Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the seas, which of course would include Canada. War against Great Britain means war against Canada. Were the German Emperor to declare war against Great Brit-

ain to-morrow, even before the declaration were made public it might be the policy of the German empire to have her ships in front of Halifax and on the way up the St. Lawrence to Quebec, just as the Japanese fleet has destroyed the Russian fleet before any overt declaration of war was made. Canada is an integral part of the British empire, Canada belongs to the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the seas. Canada is subject to any attack that England herself may be subject to, and the people of this country should understand that they are of the empire, that they are with it; that they are exposed to the same hostility as any other part of the empire may be subject to, and that it is their duty to be prepared to defend that empire and in defending it to defend ourselves. But there is still more striking language in a document which is not set out in any of the statutes but which was prepared by a committee of this House some years ago and the form of which was agreed to with unanimity. The people of this country do not know so much of that document as we who are members of this House because it is the form of prayer used daily at the opening of our proceedings here and it contains the political and religious creed of the great bulk of our people. There are two or three petitions in it that I wish to bring before the House and before the people of the country and I read them with the utmost reverence. The prayer reads:

> Most heartly we beseech Thee with Thy favour to behold His Most Gracious Majesty King Edward, and so replenish him with the grace of Thy Holy spirit that he may always incline to Thy will and walk in Thy way, endue him plenteously with heavenly gifts; grant him in health and wealth long to live; strengthen him that he may vanquish and overcome all his enemies;
>
> Most gracious God we humbly beseech Thee as for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and His Majesty's other Dominions in general so especially for this Dominion that Thou would'st be pleased to direct and prosper, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honour, and welfare of Our Sovereign and his Dominions.

So in this daily prayer this House recognizes that Canada is a part of the empire; we pray for its prosperity; we pray that peace may prevail in it, and that His Gracious Majesty should vanquish and overcome his enemies. And, not withstanding that, there are men writing in the press of this country who say that in some way Canada can be of the British empire and yet not recognize the responsibilities that are set out in the oath of office in the British North America Act and in other official documents. It surprises me that any one who professes to be a Canadian can say that Canadians are not responsible for the defence of the empire. And what is there about the British empire that interests us? First of all the British North America Act confers upon us the British system of government as the system which is best suited to us, and which we believe is best suited for government generally. It is better than the autocratic system of Germany, it is superior to the system of the United States; and as England is the mother of free parliaments, and as we are the beneficiaries of this grand system of government, why should we not defend it? But more than that, the British empire stands to-day the hope of humanity and the greatest factor in the progress of the world that history has ever known. The British empire is to-day the hope of the oppressed people of all continents; it is the hope of the struggling people in Europe, in South America, in all countries on the globe where the aspirations of the people are for higher things. The greatest calamity that could befall the world—worse than the decay of the Roman empire, which fell because it probably deserved it—would be that the British system of government should be in any way confined in its scope for good and its mission to promote the welfare of the human race. Another thing, under the British system has developed that blessing of freedom to express public opinion which really governs the world to-day and which flourishes throughout the British empire as in no other. We as Canadians, in our own interest, and in the interest of humanity as well, are bound to recognize our duty as subjects of the empire and to assume our responsibilities, whatever they may be, for its defence.

Now, Sir, in view of the fact that the mother country has called our attention to the state of her defences and of our own, we are just now at the parting of the ways. We must choose whether we are to be of the British empire or not. There may be four courses open to us, but there are only two of any great concern. In the first place, we may say that Canada shall remain one of the partnership of free self-governing British states working together for common purpose and mutual defence. I believe that is what we will say. Or we may cut ourselves adrift and become a separate nation and pursue our own policy irrespective of all external conditions. Or we may sink our individuality and become a portion of the United States. Or, as a fourth possibility, we may remain within the empire while refusing co-operation, which to me is unthinkable because unpatriotic and repulsive to the people of this country. We must do one of two things; we are at the parting of the ways, and we have before us only the choice of Heracles, to choose the course that is with virtue, with honour, and with duty, or the contrary. Our choice must be whether we are to be with the empire or to separate from

the empire. There are people in this country who support both of these ideals, and neither is repulsive to any one, as they are on the line of progress. Some day this country may drift into complete independence, which would not be contrary to the rights of the people; but as long as this country is a part of the empire, and as long as that relation is what is set out in all these constitutional documents, and as long as we swear these oaths of fealty and loyalty and devotion to the crown of Great Britain, we must choose one of two courses, either to be of the empire or to be not of the empire. Then, if we choose to be of the empire, we must assume our responsibilities, and assume them in a generous way. There are certain incongruities that attend on a declaration of this kind. Some of them have been stated in the press and in debate in the country, and there is something to be said for them. One of these incongruities is this, that if the mother country chose to pursue a policy that brought her into wars or made her less competent to defend herself, we might be dragged into wars due to the neglect or the bad judgment of the mother country. The very German scare of the present time is based on the fact that England, by pursuing a certain fiscal policy, has given her markets to Germany and her work to the work-people of Germany. While the British people are told that it is cheap bread they want, it is really work that they want, and they would have that work and that bread if England changed her fiscal policy. I wish to say, as a citizen of this country and a member of this House, that inasmuch as Great Britain has intimated to us that she desires our assistance, I claim the right to discuss and criticise the present policy of the British government. My sympathy is entirely with the present government in their desire to bring about social reform, which is badly needed in Great Britain; but there is also needed a substantial tariff reform in the direction of keeping the British market for the British people and keeping the work of England for the working people of England instead of sending it abroad; and the one man that England and the empire needs to-day is the man who has force enough to tell the British people that their duty is to go on both in the work of social reform and in the work of tariff reform, and that with these two things they will get right at home that revenue which will make them strong and competent to resist any invasion that might threaten.

In view of the propositions which I have laid down, it is the duty of Canada to-day to come to the assistance of the empire; because this day of freedom which dawns so slowly and which we all speak so well of may be suddenly eclipsed, and the day of conscript nations, the day of feudalism, the day of warlordism may be revived, and humanity and human progress may be thrown back for centuries. In the face of these things it is our duty to find out what our responsibilities are and to live up to them. England has given free parliaments and free institutions to the world. Our system is modelled on the British system and we are proud of it; and if we intend to work it out to better results, we must assume our responsibilities. The imperishable glory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is the monument she has erected on this North American continent, and in that I include with Canada the great republic to the south of us. That is a monument unequalled in the history of the world. The most wonderful democracy this world has ever seen is on this North American continent, and it is the creation of the people of England. The English people having erected such a monument, can any man say, even a citizen of the United States, much less a Canadian citizen, that he would for one moment fail in his duty to uphold that monument and maintain that democracy? Those who would attack the British empire would attack that democracy of this continent of America if they could, and dominate it with warlordism and feudalism. So that the issue at stake is not a small one, but a vital one—the greatest issue that has ever come before the Canadian people. We are at the parting of the ways; we must choose one thing or another, and I know that we will choose a policy which will be a policy of honour and will be in support of the mother country; and when this nation, as a united nation, works out that policy and settles what it will be, it will receive the support of every province of Canada, notably that of the province of Quebec.

Now, I want to come to the question of what our policy should be. Should it be one of building a navy or should it be a contribution to the old country in helping it to carry on its navy. It could possibly be both. If war should break out to-morrow, our policy would have to be the first, and we should give a generous grant, because we could not possibly, in that event, hope to build a navy in time to help the empire in its day of stress. I recall now a proposition to establish shipyards in this country. Some years ago I happened to say on the floor of this House—I do not know that I got a great deal of support—that what Canada required to do in the development of a national policy was to establish a great naval industry in the maritime provinces, and in the basin of the St. Lawrence, and that we could not start too soon. Canada is growing into one of the great commercial naval countries of the world. It lies between the two great continents of Asia and Europe, so that all the traffic be-

tween these countries must pass through it. Therefore, Canada is bound to have a great mercantile marine. An evidence of that is the way in which our great railway companies are developing mercantile marines. The Canadian Pacific railway has become the owner of an enormous fleet, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern propose to go into the same business, we have the Allan steamship line and other great lines which centre in the old country and we shall require an immense Canadian marine on the Pacific. This will involve an enormous amount of shipbuilding in this country. There are to-day enough ships required for the trade of this Dominion to occupy a half dozen shipyards. Let us establish these in the basin of the St. Lawrence, in the maritime provinces and British Columbia as well. On that ground alone we should have these great shipbuilding yards in this country. There is only one way in which to get them quickly, and that is to offer inducements to the great firms of England, Ireland and Scotland to come over and establish shipyards for the building of a British Canadian mercantile marine. They could then be used for the building of Canadian ships of war should that be required. I am not afraid to assume the responsibility of creating a Canadian navy for the defence of Canada or for the assistance of the empire, or even of giving a contribution to aid the empire should the day of peril come. No Canadian will object to that. We hear it said that if we give a contribution we should control the distribution of it. I do not quite agree in that doctrine. We are free to give it if we choose. We are free to give the mother country $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 forthwith for the maintenance of the integrity of the empire and are thereby not departing from the principle of controlling our own expenditure. In hundreds of ways we give grants of money, the expenditure of which we never control. That is altogether different from our paying taxes and having no control over the expenditure of these taxes. When we imposed taxes on our own people, the people have control over the expenditure through their representation in parliament. But if a tax should be imposed on us by a British parliament—which it is perfectly free to do—we should be justified in refusing to pay unless we had our say in the disposal of the money. But there is nothing unpatriotic or unconstitutional or humiliating to Canadians if they choose to give a substantial contribution to the British parliament for the purpose of defending the empire. That might be the quickest and easiest way to settle the difficulty, and it might make any nation, who might contemplate an attack on the British empire, think twice before doing so. To my mind, and I think I express the opinion of the bulk of Canadian people, there would be nothing wrong in this government giving immediately a grant of money to help the mother country and in establishing a navy, if necessary. But the fundamental requisite of a navy is that it must be efficient and removed absolutely from politics in so far as that can be done. Efficiency in their navy is the one thing which the people of the empire think they have. There have been scandals in that navy, but these have been removed, and the finest service in England, in fact in the world to-day is the British navy.

On my own behalf and on behalf of the people I represent, and I think largely on behalf of the people of Canada, I am prepared to say that we are British as well as Canadians. We are part of the British empire and are prepared to assume all our responsibilities as such, whatever they may be, for the purpose of maintaining the integrity and the honour of the empire and the integrity and honour of the Canadian people.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are one or two points on which I wish to say a few words in connection with the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. There is one omission—an omission which I did not look for especially this year. Neither in the speech from the Throne or the address in reply is there any allusion to the bountiful crops with which we have been favoured. Up to the present the government has rather prided itself on being in a sort of partnership—silent though it may be—with Providence, and on previous occasions they have acknowledged that partnership and been rather proud of it. What has happened in the meantime I do not know, but I do know that in this particular year, if you take quantity, quality and value, there has been a record crop throughout the Dominion and certainly there never was a year in which bounteous crops and good prices were so essential to the prosperity of the country. But strange to say, the government—for what reason I do not know—have omitted any mention of that fact and have tried to produce the impression that it is all owing to a prospective Hudson Bay railway, a present and much enduring Grand Trunk Pacific railway, immigration and other things, combined with that virtue which is always present with the government and for which my hon. friend took credit to himself this afternoon; these have been the causes, and these alone, which have produced this great prosperity of the country according to the right hon. gentleman. Let us ask ourselves what the prosperity of this country would have been if, instead of having a bounteous crop

of good quality and with good prices ruling, we had had a very poor or indifferent crop? Why is it that my right hon. friend has thrown Providence overboard and now takes all the credit to himself and his government for the prosperity of the present year? Hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken have talked—very guardedly I must say—of the finances of the country. They have referred to the fact that the times of depression seem to have passed and that the revenue seems to be increasing. And they have also dwelt—though lightly—upon the fact that there was a surplus for the year, of, I think, a million dollars. Now, we have a piece of business machinery of great extent, of immense cost and of diversified powers, to wit the Intercolonial railway. When I look at the accounts of the Minister of Railways, I find that in the year 1908 there was a deficit in the operation of the Intercolonial railway of a little over $800,000. And I find that, in order to have no more of a deficit, some $3,800,000 of money borrowed in the market or taken from the taxpayers has been expended on the Intercolonial railway and charged to capital account. Now I call the special attention of the Minister of Finance to this because it illustrates the vicious system of book-keeping under which he gets surpluses from current revenue—even though small surpluses. At the end of the last fiscal year, the Intercolonial had sixty express and baggage cars, 140 refrigerator cars, 7,096 box cars, 1,199 hoppers, 414 locomotives and other kinds of rolling stock amounting in all to 12,539. An almost infinitesimal appropriation has been made for the purchase of new cars out of revenue account, the vast majority of the purchases of cars having been charged to capital. The life of a car is given by some authorities as ten years, while some say fifteen and others try to stretch it out to twenty. Take whichever you please. According to the canons of railway administration, and according to all honest methods of railway book-keeping, the current wear should be paid for out of current account. But instead of ten or fifteen per cent of this immense number of cars having been replaced out of current account, no less than 619 have been replaced out of capital with a very small number indeed replaced out of current account. For instance, there were 414 locomotives at the end of the fiscal year 1908. Not a single locomotive bought last year was charged to current account, while twenty-nine have been bought out of borrowed money and charged to capital. Only an infinitesimal amount of the whole replacement has been charged to current account.

Now, Sir, I say that a charge of $1,300,000 to capital account for rolling stock for the Intercolonial last year is a charge that ought not to have been made, but the current year's wear should have been replaced out of current account. That it was not so replaced is an illustration of the way in which surpluses are made for the Minister of Finance and of the tremendous evils which are allowed by the Minister of Railways. In thirteen years during which these gentlemen, business men they have called themselves, have been running a railway, a proposition that we are all familiar with, they have had deficits, acknowledged by in that time of $3,500,000 net, besides they have spent a little over $2,500,000 a year on capital account for the railway. And this period of thirteen years, be it noted, is the prime period of Canada's growth, development and business enlargement. Suppose that the directors of any other railway of equal size in this Dominion or anywhere else, after thirteen years during which railways generally were prosperous, had to acknowledge to their shareholders that they had made a deficit within that time of $3,500,000 net, besides spending $33,000,000 of borrowed capital in an attempt to bridge the chasm between expenditures and earnings, what would those shareholders think? And what should the Dominion of Canada think of men who make such a record in running a railway, which, if run on business principles, would pay every dollar of its expense and yield a profit for every mile of its operation? In the past thirteen years every great railway system in the world almost has added to its dividends, and many of them have added largely. And this so-called business government, in its management of the Intercolonial, has succeded in running up a bill against the people od $3,000,000 of borrowed capital besides mulcting them in a deficit of $3,500,000. What is the reason? The right hon. gentleman gave the reason in Toronto many years ago. He says it is not because the ministers are to blame, it is the vicious system which prevails in the administration. Why, in thirteen years, has my right hon. friend not changed the vicious system? Is it because he does not believe in changing vicious systems? Is it because from his knowledge of humanity he thinks there is some gain on the other side by having the vicious system, some gain in power or otherwise? But whatever it may be, it stands, not to the credit, but to the discredit of this government, that when other roads of equal, and many of them of lesser, opportunities have shown good profits and increased dividends and have paid interest on their borrowings, this road is in the position I have shown. So much with reference to that.

I want now to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the position as regards the United States tariff and the French treaty. I would not do this so strongly as I propose to do, were it not that the speech from the Throne intimates that

the French treaty is to be ratified. Then if the French treaty is to be ratified, I imagine that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have made up their minds as to the probable incidence of the United States tariff upon Canada. Have they made up their minds? Do they know how that will affect the commerce of Canada? My right hon. friend, in his happy go lucky way, stated that he had read it and he could not see any discrimination in it. Will my right hon. friend say that he has that from conversation with people in authority in the United States who had given him to understand that it is not meant to discriminate against Canada provided that Canada's operations go on as they are now, plus the addition of the French treaty? I do not think he will. In fact, it is impossible to tell.

But when you look at the spirit of that legislation in so far as it has been actually declared, what do we find? You take printing paper, you take pulp wood, and what is the design as actually carried out in the enactments of that treaty in force to-day? The design was that that it would discriminate against Canada with reference to chemical pulp and mechanically ground pulp and printing paper. And so you have the enactment, and you must read the spirit and intent therein; you have the enactment that on print paper, in the first place, there is a duty according to value of so much per pound. When it is worth 2¼ cents and less, the duty is 3 and 1-16th cents per pound; when it is 2¼ to 2½ cents, the duty is 3 and 1-10th cents per pound, and so on graded up. That is the minimum duty with reference to any country which puts a restriction of any kind on the exportation of wood out of which the pulp for paper is made. And what country is aimed at, and what country is meant? Canada, and Canada alone. The discrimination is that 1-10th of a cent per pound is added in the case of that country, and to that is also added the amount of the export duty, if any export duty is put upon pulpwood. Now that reads the intention of Congress into the actual item in the tariff.

There is no contingency about it. And how about wood pulp? Wood pulp in the general tariff is free, wood pulp against a country which has any restriction on the exportation of pulp wood into the United States is placed at 1-12th of a cent per pound. To what country is that directed? To the Dominion of Canada. But in addition to that, there is to be added the export duty on the pulp wood, or the equivalent of that export duty, whatever it may be. So here are two actually finished sections of the United States tariff, and their plain intent is to influence if possible Canadian legislation, and certainly to influence Canadian commerce.

What else has been actually placed in the tariff? If you look at page 80, section 2, you will find a general section. Now what is that general section? Not that something may come into force on the 31st day of March, but that on the 31st day of March, whenever it does come, and the very moment it comes, 25 per cent extra is added to every article which is imported from Canada into the United States. Now that is an actuality which, on the 31st of March, according to the enactment of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and President, will take place. So Canada will wake up on the 31st day of March and find that 25 per cent is added to the general, or as it is afterwards called, the minimum tariff. As the section reads, I believe it is open to the interpretation that the 25 per cent is not only to be added to the dutiable articles that are imported from Canada, but that 25 per cent is placed upon every article in the free list, because it says upon all articles that are imported into the United States. Now I am not going to be dogmatic or certain about it, but it reads that way, and in talking it over with an eminent United States politician not a fortnight ago, he told me that his reading of it was that it did refer to both, to the non-dutiable and to the dutiable list.

Now why or when will that be taken off? There is a power to release it. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, it goes on automatically and certainly on the 31st day of March, but there is a power to release it. Sometimes it is said that that power is the President. In one way it is the President, and in another way it is not the President. The President of the United States, according to their legislation, has not the power to make a decision of himself, a decision which is personal or of his own pleasure. It does not depend in that way upon the President of the United States. The President of the United States comes to his decision on facts which are furnished him by an expert commission which is already appointed, and which has to work out the case in every one of these different countries. Now that is a very different thing. One may say that President Taft is well disposed to this country. I believe that, I hope he is. But it does not make a fig's difference whether President Taft is well disposed or not. His commission is already appointed, and if it reports that Canada does discriminate in any way by tariff duty, by regulation, by charge, by expense added in any way, these constitutes the facts. The facts are presented to the President, and all that the President can do is to issue or not issue his proclamation according as those facts are represented. These facts will be looked into, marshalled,

and will be presented in the line of the tariff incidence of the United States Congress when it finished its work. Now these are things which actually exist and with the large trade which is involved between us and the United States and the small trade which is in question as between us and some favoured nation countries it is these things which make the gravity of the situation and, to my mind, it is a very serious matter. Now, when does the Finance Minister propose to find out what the attitude of the United States will be in reference to it? I do not know. He may have sources of information that I do not know anything of, but, it seems to me, that he will not know until after the 31st March. When the 31st March comes and these duties of 25 per cent go on over and above the rates then established, action will be taken sooner or later by the President upon the facts presented to him and we will not know what will be the mind of the United States or what will be the incidences of this tariff until that date has passed, until these facts have been presented, and until the President issues his proclamation in accordance with these facts.

I refer to this matter because I think it is necessary that the members of the House shall have the whole of these facts before them. This is a most grave and serious juncture to which we have come, and it needs very careful treatment. There are some other clauses in the tariff to which I will only refer. One is a discriminating clause providing for ten per cent additional duty on imports in other than United States vessels. This has a bearing upon Canada. If a country outside of Canada desires to export into the United States through Canada the non-contiguous country is shut off from doing that without the payment of this ten per cent additional. How will that strike some of our Canadian commerce? For instance, if articles meant for the United States start from the far East, come to Canada and approach the American border there is an importation from a non-contiguous country through a contiguous country, and it seems to me under that tariff item that it is bound to pay the ten per cent additional. More than that, there is a tonnage tax. For 25 years there has been no tonnage tax upon Canadian vessels on the great lakes going into the ports of the United States and none, of course, on our side—an arrangement agreed to long ago. This tariff enacts that a tonnage tax shall be put on absolutely of a certain amount; I think it runs at two cents per pound, but not greater than ten cents in any year, from a country contiguous to the great lakes and from some other countries. Otherwise it is larger. All these are indications which show that the purpose of the United States tariff was to make all the advantage possible for the United States and as little as possible for Canada, and, in the light of that, we must make up our minds that the facts will be very carefully looked into and that the President will issue his proclamation in accordance with the facts. The ground work, which is the last thing I wish to call the attention of the government to, is a mighty broad one:

That whenever, after the 31st day of March, 1910, and so long thereafter as the president shall be satisfied, in view of the character of the concessions granted by the minimum tariff of the United States, that the government of any foreign country imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural manufactured, or other product of the United States, which unduly discriminate against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country pays no export bounty or imposes no export duty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, thereupon and thereafter a proclamation may issue, &c., &c.

That is broad. Unduly discriminates against the United States. Discriminates in what way? Gives a greater advantage to an article coming from another country than from the United States. It may be held that this discriminates. You have a resolution of parliament that we, sometimes by proclamation shall call into effect an enactment that upon goods coming into Canada there shall be a less duty if they come in by Canadian ports than if they come in through United States ports. Could we carry that out and not be within the conditions which would bring the results of discrimination if we thereby gave a preference to St. John, Halifax and Quebec as against Baltimore, New York, Boston and other American cities? The extraordinary width of it, the inclusiveness of it, and the evident intention which is beyond contingency and already in force make a very serious problem for us to consider as to what is to be done in face of the possibility of a tremendous dislocation of trade. I am not one who believes that, our position being right, we should recede one inch because another country legislates in its tariff for its own advantage. We legislate for our own advantage and that is the only ground that we can take. But, at the same time, when such an immense amount of commerce is at stake, it becomes very important we should know where we are before we go any farther. Now, just one moment more,

if the House will allow me. No, I do not think I can take up any other subject, but I want to have one word with the right hon. the Prime Minister on the way in which he tried to do two things. The spirit of mischief was in him when he tried to raise ructions on this side of the House in reference to the subject of naval service—the spirit of arch-mischief which befitted the politician rather than the statesman. There was also present another spirit, which would have done credit to Saul of Tarsus when he became Paul the Apostle and which animated him when he made his argument to the men on his own side to stand by his policy.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I have not in the past trespassed very much on the time and patience of the House nor shall I to-night. Members from a small and distant province, are no doubt inclined to be influenced by their environment and are likely to become provincial or perhaps parochial, and when such an important document as His Excellency's speech is presented to them it may be that they read it for something which more particularly affects the part of the country whence they come. In the speech of His Excellency I find one short paragraph which refers to the Northwest country and to the province of Manitoba, and in that paragraph the Hudson Bay railway is spoken of as follows:

> The exploratory surveys for a railway from the western wheat fields to Hudson bay were pushed energetically during the whole of last summer. It is hoped that a report of the operations will be placed before you at an early date.

Here we are apprised that an exploratory survey, whatever that may mean, is in preparation and there is an expression of hope that we may see the report before long. To the older members of this House the name 'Hudson Bay Railway' is no doubt a chestnut, because it bobs up regularly from time to time and in the west it enters into our municipal and political life. Many years ago when the Conservatives were in power a railway to the Hudson bay was projected by two or three different companies, and at one time it got so far that forty miles of rails were laid in a northwesterly direction towards Lake Manitoba, but eventually these rails became streaks of rust. The Liberals of that day, perhaps very properly so, poked fun at the Conservatives and they said: Give us a chance; we will not simply talk about the Hudson Bay railway we will build it. The year 1896 came and with it the Liberal government. At the first by-election in Winnipeg after the Liberals came to power the late Mr. Jameson was a candidate in 1897. The slogan at that election was: Vote for Jameson, for progress, for the Laurier government and the Hudson Bay railway. After the death of the late Mr. Jameson the late Mr. McCreary was a candidate and the cry was the same. The people accepted his assurance and they elected him, but no Hudson Bay railway came. Then we had Mr. Puttee. True he was a labour candidate but he had the united support of the Liberals of Winnipeg and whether or not he had authority he also promised the Hudson Bay railway. Then, Mr. Bole, the member for Winnipeg in the late parliament made the Hudson Bay Railway a plank in his platform and when he was elected we thought that perhaps the whole project would die a natural death and that we would never hear of it again. From 1896 until the last election we have had a succession of Liberal candidates in Winnipeg and with them the Hudson Bay railway was a name to conjure with. It was determined apparently that the Hudson Bay railway should be one of the planks in the platform of the Liberal government at the late election. Let us see what the man who builds the railways, the Minister of Railways, says about it. Of course, when he spoke the dissolution of parliament was pending, and for the announcement of his policy he chose a public meeting in the town of Galt, Ontario. There the people could have very little interest in the project because it was calculated to take the traffic away from Ontario around by the northern seas. Although the Minister of Railways spoke in Ontario he was in reality speaking to the people of Manitoba and the Northwest over the wires and through the press. He said:

> It is going to be built and built right away.

That is very positive language. Last year I heard the hon. gentleman deliver an address on another great public undertaking, the Newmarket canal, and as I had the opportunity of seeing him and listening to his voice I was not able to come to the conclusion to whether he was serious or joking. Not having the good fortune to hear him at Galt I cannot say whether he really meant what he said when he told the people that the Hudson Bay railway would be built and built right away. But that assurance to the people of the Northwest was not sufficient, and so another little blast came to us from away in the further west. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was in Alberta or Saskatchewan doing service for his party and addressing a meeting he said:

I call attention to the robustness of the statement:

> If you want the Husdon Bay railway you must support the Liberals. If you don't want it the Conservatives are good enough for you.

And if that were not sufficient to insure the support of the people of the west, no less a person than the right hon. the Prime Minister was called upon to say something about the Hudson Bay railway. He was speaking to the people who reside on the banks of the Niagara river and the Welland canal; people who have no interest in the Hudson Bay railway because it would take traffic away from the St. Lawrence route. But, he also desired to reach the ears of the people in the Northwest over the wires and through the newspapers. And the right hon. gentleman, after telling the people of Wellington, that the Hudson Bay railway was not much use to them as it was an alternative route, he urged them to be broad minded and he told them that whatever is good for any part of the Dominion is good for the whole Dominion, and he says:

We have undertaken the construction on another railway—the Hudson Bay railway. The Hudson Bay railway I am sure does not appeal very much to the people of Welland county. It concerns more the people of the west. But I say to you, gentlemen of Ontario, and you will agree with me, that what concerns one portion of the community concerns every part of the community. Now, we have come to the conclusion that this railway is a necessity owing to the condition in which our fellow citizens in the west are placed. This railway will give an alternative or optional route. At the present time all the wheat as soon as it is tracked is sent out to Lake Superior. We want to provide another railway by Hudson bay. There will then be the present route and the Hudson bay route and the man who raises wheat and cattle will have two outlets for his production. We have been asked: 'Are you not going to hurt the trade of the St. Lawrence if you do that?' Oh ye of little faith! the trade of Canada is too great even for these two outlets. What we see coming will be more than sufficient for both of St. Lawrence and the Hudson bay routes. We have come to the conclusion that the time to build this railway is now; not to-morrow, but now; and we have surveyors in the field.

Of course, at the time the statement was made by the Prime Minister there was a red hot election pending in the west. The 'Manitoba Free Press'—you have no doubt heard of that paper; it has an annex to its building in the shape of a splendid post office—the 'Manitoba Free Press' a journal which expresses the sentiments of the Liberals of the west and is supposed to be the personal organ of the ex-Minister of the Interior, commenting on this statement of the Prime Minister, said:

This is one of the most important announcements to the west that has ever been made by the Canadian government and it will be received with acclamation by the people of the prairie provinces.

But, even the declaration of the Minister of Railways and of the Prime Minister was not considered sufficient and so the ex-Minister of the Interior in accepting the nomination of the convention at Brandon which was then the centre of an exciting electoral contest, declared that the Hudson Bay railway was a paramount issue in that election and he closed his speach with these words:

The Prime Minister proposes to build for these provinces the Hudson Bay railway. It is a fitting culmination to the policy of progress and development which the government has followed during these years. That pronouncement was a very material factor in inducing me to become a candidate for this constituency in this election, because I felt and feel now that the time has come when we men from the west have succeeded in proving that the Hudson Bay railway is no chimera, no foolish project, but one which the people of the west are bound to see carried into effect, and the time to do it is now. So, therefore, if the people of the Northwest give Sir Wilfrid Laurier their endorsement at this election, then in three or four years we may expect to see trains running to Hudson bay.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the date of that?

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. That was delivered on the 22nd day of September, over a month prior to the election on the 26th of October. We did not expect that the government would last session be able to fulfil all the promises and make good all the assurances they had given to us in the last election; but we expected that we would be given a little more this session than the expression of the hope that in a short time we would get the report of the exploratory survey.

That leads me by an easy stage to the consideration of another question which is very closely associated with that of the Hudson Bay railway. That railway will we hope, sometime run through a territory which is appurtenant to the province of Manitoba, and which we have long hoped would become a part of that province. For the benefit of the new members who are not conversant with the history of Manitoba, let me say that that province was created in the year 1870. It was a very small province, extending for about a hundred miles from north to south and about as many miles from east to west, with Winnipeg in the centre with about 17,000 people. We had a constitution which was sufficient for the government of almost half a continent. We had a Lieutenant-Governor, a senate and a legislature. We got rid of the senate, and I will state, for the benefit of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) how we did so, with promptness, neatness and despatch. The senate consisted of seven members, four constituting a majority. Jobs were created for those four at salaries a little better than the indemnity of a senator, and those four, very much to the disgust of the minority, voted the sen-

ate out of existence. It was evident, at the time of the formation of Manitoba, that its boundaries were only temporary. It was felt that it would never do to make a checkerboard of those Northwest territories and multiply provincial governments; and during the first legislature of Manitoba application was made to this parliament for the extension of the boundaries of the province and for further financial assistance. Mr. Alexander Mackenzie turned this application down, for the reason that the northwestern boundary of the province of Ontario had not been defined. In 1881, however, the boundaries of Manitoba were extended. It was known at that time that the boundaries had not been defined, but it was believed and expected by nearly every one that the northwestern boundary of the province of Ontario was the meridian which cuts the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers which, if produced northward, would cut the northern shore of Lake Superior to the east of Fort William and Port Arthur. At once there was a conflict of authority. Both Ontario and Manitoba claimed jurisdiction over the disputed territory. A reference of the dispute was made to the Privy Council. Manitoba had hoped she would have all the Lake of the Woods, Thunder Bay and Rainy River country from which the province of Ontario has reaped rich revenues in timber dues and mining licenses. But the decision of the Privy Council was against Manitoba, the boundary between the two provinces was declared to be the line running north from the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods, making the territory of Manitoba 73,000 square miles, which is not one-third of the size of either Saskatchewan or Alberta. It was thought, at the time of the formation of those new provinces, that it would be an opportune time to increase the boundaries of Manitoba and settle for all time the whole question, by making the three provinces as nearly equal in size and importance as possible. Manitoba was turned down. The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were created and were given a reasonable financial assistance for their development, and I have no doubt it is being wisely expended. But there is no reason why the province of Manitoba should not have received the same treatment. Manitoba did the pioneer work in the early days when it was a question whether or not agriculture was a profitable occupation in that country. Manitobans were living in the Northwest and Manitoba was there as a province when it took the price of two bushels of grain to transport the third bushel to market. Manitoba solved the transportation problem. She mortgaged her future for the purpose of getting reasonable rates and running lines of railways all over the province. She could not help herself without incidentally benefiting the other provinces to the west. Manitoba should be treated as she has been. We all at this distance of time appreciate the efforts made by the late Sir John A. Macdonald in bridging over the great commercial and geographical weakness of this Dominion; I refer to the vast expense of wilderness between the towns and villages of Ontario and Quebec and the fertile plains of the west. A belt of iron was thrown across that wilderness, which was the first link that was forged. We appreciate too the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald in ruthlessly disallowing railway charters for lines running from Manitoba in the direction of Duluth and Chicago. He was determined that the channels of commerce should be worn wide and deep before our railways should be subject to competition and our trade directed towards American cities. We realize the wisdom of that policy now. There was fierce opposition to the disallowance of those charters at the time, but we now appreciate that it was for the benefit of the province and the whole Dominion. But, Sir, there are other bonds which bind together the provinces of this Dominion more firmly perhaps that the steel bands of a railway, and that is the knowledge experience and the satisfaction that every province has been fairly treated by this Dominion, and that there has been no discrimination, no penalizing, no suspicion even of anything of the kind, because that would bode no good for the Dominion. That seems to have been fully recognized at the close of the last parliament, for we find that on the 13th day of July, 1908, the right hon. the Prime Minister moved a series of resolutions with reference to the Manitoba boundary, which resolutions conceded the right of the province of Manitoba to the extension, and the right hon. gentleman, in support of those resolutions, spoke in these words:

> The case of Manitoba seems to be particularly pressing. Manitoba has the smallest territory of all the western provinces, and it is a matter of public notoriety that there is in Manitoba a sentiment of disappointment, almost akin to irritation, that the province has not been as liberally endowed as the adjoining provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, which were carved out of territory of which the boundaries of the province of Manitoba could have been increased. We all sympathize with this sentiment and there is no reason that I can see why this desire for increased territory should not be gratified.

The right hon. the prime minister there admits that there is cause for irritation, and that that cause has not been removed. Well, if it be not removed the irritation may develop into a chronic sore, into positive, absolute hostility, and if there be any reason for it, must there not be delin-

quency in some quarter in connection with this business?

At the opening of the first session of this parliament, the greeting of the hon. the first minister to the members from Manitoba was certainly not a pleasant one. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman would have greeted us in that way if he had known the real facts. He told us that we are here by virtue of stuffed lists, Sir, the reverse is the fact. We are here by virtue of honest lists, but when we learned the source of the right hon. gentleman's information, we were not surprised. I shall not say a word about the ex-Minister of the Interior, as it would be contrary to the rules to say anything that might be offensive to a member of this House, but I will say that in Manitoba he had a lot of the rankest registration scamps to be found anywhere at work in any province. And when he resigned as attorney general and left Manitoba, he left us as a legacy his election law, and that law was a beauty and was beautifully administered. The lists for Manitoba were a disgrace. At great expense of time and trouble we had those lists revised before a judge, and the result of that revision, which occupied about three weeks, was to strike off about 3,000 names of bogus voters. There were about 900 names of men put on the list by the revising judge who had been improperly left off. After we had cleaned the lists, we were not very long in cleaning out those who were responsible for them. We are not here by virtue of stuffed lists. The people had before them these matters I have spoken of and the result was they elected members to sit on this side. The people had, right under their very eyes, the maladministration of the Department of the Interior, and if the hon. gentleman had been out there during the election, he would have had ample evidence to satisfy him that it was not stuffed lists but a strong political club in the hands of an honest, intelligent and indignant electorate which returned the Conservative party in that province.

Mr. THOMAS S. SPROULE (East Grey). In offering a few observations on the address, I wish in the first place to congratulate the mover and seconder on the very creditable way in which they discharged the important duty assigned them. Few could take exception to the manner in which they presented the case from their standpoint. Certainly if brevity is the soul of wit, they set a good example to members of this House. The right hon. the Prime Minister told us that he cherished the hope that this would be a short session, and in that opinion he was strengthened by the first speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that the length or brevity of a session depends very much more on the government than on the opposition. If the government, when parliament meets, have their work well in hand, if they bring down promptly the returns to which the House is entitled, if they lay on the table without delay the departmental reports and other information which the House requires in order to intelligently perform its work, then the opposition will assist the government to the best of its ability to shorten the session. But on the other hand, if the government bring down their measures only half digested and are unable to reach a conclusion regarding them for weeks, if they allow them to remain day after day on the Order Paper without doing anything, they have no right to blame the opposition for extending the session. That, however, is a state of things to which we have become accustomed under the present government.

We can all express our congratulations and gratitude to his Excellency the Governor General for the information he has given us in the speech from the Throne. We are grateful to him for the assurance that the country is prosperous. Of course, we may know more or less about the condition of the country ourselves, but such information is always pleasant coming from the high source it does, having been put into the mouth of his Excellency by his constitutional advisers, who of course have at their disposal the means of ascertaining the country's condition. But will the government tell us to what extent that prosperity is due to any act of theirs? What have they done during the year to account for that prosperity? It may be reasonable to assume that they desire to impress the people in some way or other with the conviction that that prosperity is due to something the government has done. At any rate they have not given Divine Providence any consideration for that prosperity at all; and since the government has not given any credit to Providence, we must presume that it wishes to have all the credit itself.

We are assured that immigration is pouring into the country in a well directed stream from the best elements of the British Isles, the continent of Europe and the United States. But the government forgot to put into the speech from the Throne the fact that the North Atlantic Trading Company has gone out of existence. During many years it was claimed that the influx of immigration was due to the efforts of that company, but we have now the assurance from the highest source that, even since that company has ceased to exist, immigration has been pouring into Canada in a well directed stream, composed of some of the

best elements of the British Isles, continental Europe and the United States. I am pleased to believe that we are getting a fair share of immigrants, and more care is being taken with regard to the quality of those who come to this country. Year after year, when we pointed out that in immigration quality was to be considered rather than quantity, and when we raised objection to the character of many of the immigrants coming to Canada, we were assured that none but the very best were coming to this country, farmers and farm labourers—not artisans or mechanics—the very cream of the British Islands and of continental Europe. And this notwithstanding that the Doukhobors were coming, the Galicians, the Finlanders and the people of almost every benighted country in the world. At last the government themselves were obliged to take note of the complaints concerning their immigrants that were being complained of in every part of the country. They were even obliged to deport many of them, and the reports laid before the House disclosed the fact that they have sent back thousands of these immigrants within the last few years. We have been endeavouring for the past ten years to convince them that there was urgent need for the improvement in the selection of immigrants, and it was said over and over again that the class who were coming were of the very best—that we could not expect or hope for better. But, after a time there was the admission on the part of the government that this was not correct, and now they boast of how many of these immigrants they have sent back.

We feel grateful to His Excellency for the assurance he has given us that trade and commerce have made rapid strides during the year and that in every direction the commerce of the country is expanding. One would have thought that commerce would almost have come to a standstill when Mr. W. T. R. Preston decided to leave Japan, packed his gripsack and commenced to hunt another job. He seemed to be the one man depended on by the government to regulate everything wherever he went and in whatever line he happened to be engaged. He endeavoured to do that with regard to immigration in the old country, and when he went to Japan he had not been there very long before he was in trouble with the officials in regard to trade with that country. We were told that he had revolutionized commerce so that Canada would develop immensely by reason of her increased trade with these great oriental peoples numbering 450,000,000. In a short time, he was obliged to leave, and he is now away hunting a new field. Notwithstanding this, we are told that trade is rapidly developing, and for this we certainly should be grateful.

We are told that the construction of the Transcontinental Railway has made substantial advance during the year. And very reasonably might have been added, so has the debt. For one of the greatest increases in the debt of this country for the last forty years has been made in the last year or year and a half. The government have been pushing on the Transcontinental railway and expending money right and left. We know that the statement has been made, and, I think, established to the satisfaction of almost every business man in this House that a great deal of that money was improperly expended, that there was overcharging, that there was wrong classification, extravagance, improper making of contracts and graft in connection with almost every part of this business. This was emphatically denied two years ago. Complaint was made by Mr. Hodgins, the engineer, and there was an inquiry, and a whitewashing report handed to this House by the majority of the committee engaged in the work. Notwithstanding that, we have the undeniable fact that the very parties who above all others interested in this matter, the railway company themselves, declare that there was over-classification, that there was improper expenditure, and I understand they intend to go into the courts in order to establish the fact. This is exactly what was brought out by the evidence in the committee, notwithstanding the whitewashing of the commissioners by the report. But that is not all. I have here the report of the Auditor General, and I notice that that officer raises objections. There is correspondence between the Transcontinental Commission and Mr. Fraser, the Auditor General, on the subject. One of the letters of the Auditor General reads as follows:

Audit Office, Ottawa, Jan. 25, 1909.

Sir,—I have not received a reply to my letter of Jan. 5, re payments to M. P. & J. T. Davis and Macdonell & O'Brien on the Hogan & Macdonell contract for 'excavation of foundations, solid rock,' at three times the schedule rate for solid rock.

'Three times the rate.' That was practically the contention of Mr. Hodgins, viz., that by the improper classification of the material, the contractor was being paid three times as much as he was entitled to. But the government contended, and established to the satisfaction of the majority of this House, that there was nothing wrong about it. In another letter, the Auditor General says that not only three times the schedule rate was paid, but that three times the amount done was charged up in progress estimates given. That is another device for paying out to their favourite friends more money than the country ought to pay for this work. And that is going on to-day.

And what did the commission do when the Auditor General asked for information? They practically told him that it was impertinent on his part to ask such questions, and they passed a resolution refusing to give him the information. This is the beautiful commission that is spending so much money. And the Auditor General was obliged to go to the Justice Department, and he is sustained by that department after being turned down by the Transcontinental Railway Commission. So, if the road is being built rapidly, the money is being spent rapidly. There is nothing about this in the speech from the Throne. Nor have we further information concerning this correspondence of the Auditor General, yet it is something concerning which we should be well informed in order to deal with this question.

We often hear this government boast that they are a business government. I think one of the speakers to-day referred to that. In the speech from the Throne we are kindly told that the engineers of the Quebec bridge have sufficiently advanced this work to permit of tenders being invited for the substructure. Now, this business government started to build that Quebec bridge many years ago, and when the matter was first broached in this House they told us that they were prepared not only to do a great work but to do it wisely and expeditiously. They got a corporation of their own to commence the building of it—a corporation that put up $63,000 in all to build a bridge that will cost over $9,000,000 and then took out $64,000 in salaries, and finally handed over to the country for several millions a bridge that had fallen and was lying at the bottom of the river. We are now told that the engineers are prepared to invite tenders for the substructure.

The government expressed the hope that this session would be a short one, but they have not given this House a word of information with regard to these plans, what kind of a bridge is going to be built, where it is to be put, whether they can use the substructure of the old bridge or not, whether it is to be a cantilever bridge, a swing bridge, or what not. And we are going on to commence the construction of another bridge which will cost in all probability $8,000,000 or $9,000,000, without any of this information.

But we are told this is a business government. This business government started in with a great undertaking which was going to be a valuable outlet of the Transcontinental Railway, which was to be ready in 1910 or 1911. But there is not a single stroke of that work done yet. This business government has spent $6,500,000 of the country's money, and there is nothing in the world to show for it except the twisted iron in the bottom of the river. I say there has been more money squandered, sunk in that undertaking by this business government than was spent on all the parliament buildings at Ottawa up to the last few years—on the three great blocks, and the Langevin block—all these cost less than $7,000,000, and no more than was squandered in that undertaking by this government on that Quebec bridge. Let the people of Canada know these things, and ask themselves where this business government has justified its name. Where is their intelligence with respect to economy? What wisdom and prudence have they shown, when all this money has gone, and Canada has nothing to show for it to-day but the wreck of the bridge that is lying in the bottom of the river?

His Excellency thought we ought to feel grateful because we are starting out in another undertaking of the same kind. Well, we are obliged to thank His Excellency for the information that exploratory surveys for a Hudson Bay railway have been pushed expeditiously during the summer. As my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) says, that is an old question which has been running on like the famous lawsuit of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce, ever since this government came in. I remember when it was first started and we were told that there was going to be a fine outlet for the grain of the west, and what a wonderful change it was going to work when this government built the Hudson Bay railway. Every year they were going to commence it, especially when an election was coming on in the west, then they were ready to commence operations. They were not going to be like their predecessors, they were in earnest. Well, now, after being in power fourteen years they tell us through the mouth of His Excellency that exploratory surveys have been pushed energetically during the whole of last year and he expresses the hope that they will be able to lay a report on the table during the present session. I suppose that will be all, and next year we will have something more in the speech from the Throne about it. Well, we all feel very grateful for the assurance that we will get the papers, because there are many lines in which papers are very useful, and give us information which we might otherwise have to make a long fight to obtain.

Now we have another piece of valuable information, and that is that the government intend to introduce a Bill to give them power to lease or purchase branch lines connected with the Intercolonial railway, that road in the operation of which they have had such large deficits every year, notwithstanding the fact that all that goes into the building of that road, nearly all of it, is charged to capital account instead of to the earnings of the road every

year. It is not a paying concern. But the leasing of these branch lines, we are told, is going to make it very profitable to the people living in the vicinity, and in the interest of the whole country as well. Now if they manage the branch lines as well as they have managed the road since they have come into power, I do not think the country will have much cause to congratulate itself. Yet we are told from time to time that these branch lines have never paid, that they are a bill of expense to the owners, that they are in a dilapidated condition, and that many of them can never pay. It must therefore be a consoling piece of information to the House and the country to be told that we will lease these branch lines from the owners and give them a substantial amount of money for them and add them to a road that has never yet paid, and will be still less likely to pay with these additional burdens tacked on.

We have another piece of information which is valuable, and that is that the government propose to introduce a Bill with regard to combinations in restraint of trade. We heard a great deal about that many years ago. The government, through the mouth of their Finance Minister, told this House, I think in 1897, that the only effective way to deal with combinations in restraint of trade was through free trade, and the government took power in a Bill to take off the duty from any article when it was the subject of a combination formed in restraint of trade; that article was then to come in free. I remember bringing this subject up in two successive sessions. I remember the arguments that were addressed to this House by Mr. Garrow; who is now a judge on the bench. He tried hard to induce the government to punish those parties who were engaged in combination in restraint of trade to the detriment of the consumer and to the detriment of all interested parties. But the government said it could not be done, that the only proper way to control them was by ascertaining where there was a combination in restraint of trade, and to take the duty off the articles so effected, and allow them to come into the country free. Now application was made to the government to do that in the leather combine. Mr. Garrow brought that up. I brought it up two sessions afterwards, but the government refused to do anything. They let that combine continue its operations to the detriment of Canada, to the detriment of the consumer, and they did nothing to prevent it. But I will tell you what they did do. There was a law put upon the statute-book many years ago by the late member for West York, the Hon. N. Clarke Wallace to punish those who were combining in restraint of trade. The government so amended that Bill that they made it useless. It provided that wherever people combined to enhance values or raise prices, they became amenable to the Criminal Code and could be punished. But the government amended that Bill by providing that wherever it was proven that a combination unduly enhanced values or increased prices, they should be punished, but they threw the onus of proof upon the complainant. We were told by the high authority of the late Sir Oliver Mowat himself that the Bill was practically no good, because you could not go into court and prove what was unduly enhanced value. I made an effort two years in succession to get that Bill amended and leave it as it was at first, so that it might be of some value and that you might start a prosecution under it. I succeeded at last; for some reason the government were kind enough to allow me to get this amendment through the House, and shortly afterwards these combines were attacked, and parties went into court to punish them, and what was the result? The government took up that Bill, amended the law again, put it back where it was before, these prosecutions stopped and they have never gone on from that day to this. That from a business government that was going to do something to prevent combinations in restraint of trade! Did they ever step in that direction except with reference to paper? Did they ever undertake an inquiry in regard to that subject although the allegations were made to them by their own friends over and over again that in various lines combines were detrimentally raising prices to the consumers of this country? Did they take any interest in it? — none whatever except in that one case. In that I believe they did in a partial way and they are entitled to commendation for what they have done. I would suggest though, that, whatever that Bill may be, it should be something that will be effective rather than something to be paraded before the public and telling the people what wonderful things they are going to do, but which the experience of future time will prove they never will do. They have had it in their power to restrain these combinations and they have made no effert to do it except in the one instance I have cited; therefore, we have the right to reach the conclusion that they are no more likely to do it in the future than in the past. But, they parade this before the country to-day as something they are going to do for the benefit of the country and for which the country ought to be devoutedly thankful.

I would like to say one word in regard to a report I see of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in Montreal on Saturday. I shall read his own words. Speaking of Canada he says:

They could and did legislate for themselves and make their own treaties with other nations, and it was probable that in the near

future Britain would discontinue the practice of sending a representative of the Crown to them.

I presume a Governor General. I think the people of Canada will be greatly startled——

Mr. GRAHAM. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) allow me? Having been a newspaper man myself, I very seldom rise to a point of order or ask for any correction. As a matter of fact, I never made such a statement or referred directly or indirectly to anything that could be construed into such a statement.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I think the Minister will thank me for giving him this early opportunity to make that denial which I accept with all pleasure. I was going to go on and read another portion in reference to naval defence, but if he denies that in advance, I will not read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. The same speech. His memory cannot be so bad but that he must remember what he did say or some of the subjects that he spoke about. If he will be good enough to tell us what he did say, we would like to hear from him. Well, he does not take the opportunity of denying it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not heard it yet.

Mr. SPROULE. He says that:

In his opinion they would be making a huge mistake by presenting either ships or money to Britain. He was most strongly opposed to contributing one dollar towards any fund, unless they retained the right to decide as to how that dollar was to be expended. They should manage their own affairs in their own way.

Then, let the Canadian people know that no matter what the emergency may be, the Minister of Railways and Canals is opposed to giving one dollar, or one ship, or one cent towards the assistance or support of the mother country unless we have the right to expend the money just as we like ourselves. Then he goes on to say:

—and he was sure that Britain would not attempt to deprive them of the right to do so. A great deal had been both said and written regarding the possibility of war with Germany but he could not conceive of any reason why Canada should be disturbed on this account.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is very proper that I should set my hon. friend right for fear that he would say that I did not——

Mr. HUGHES. Set yourself right, not my hon. friend right.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not myself. It would not be so hard to set myself right as some other people, but I accept the task even of setting them right. As a matter of fact, the reference which my hon. friend has read has been broadened very much. I made it very clear, speaking for myself, that I was not alarmed about the German war scare and that, notwithstanding whether there ever had been a German war scare or not and altogether outside of it, Canada had a duty to perform.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman ought to be grateful to me because they have read this all over the country and I have given him an opportunity of setting himself right. He sat in this House all day and did not deny it, did not say a word about it; I have given him an opportunity of putting himself right and I think he should be grateful. If it went out to the world that it was none of our business, that we were not interested in the German war scare, that we did not care a continental about Great Britain, what would the people think of our loyalty to the British empire of which they hear so much? I have read this at the present time for the purpose of giving the hon. gentleman an opportunity of either denying it or admitting it. He has chosen to deny it. I accept the denial which he has made with all respect to him. Part of it he has not denied or said anything about and therefore I assume it is correct.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to continue this debate longer. There are some other subjects touched on which we will have an opportunity of dealing with when we have certain papers before us and we will be in a position to deal with them more intelligently. I can only express the hope, that the government, in their desire for a short session, will facilitate the work of this House, as they ought to do to assist us in making a short session, by giving parliament the information which parliament requires and which it ought to have as soon as any subject is brought to this House, or when any important subject is to be dealt with, and which information, whether they have it in their departments or elsewhere, ought to be put in the possession of the House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed at failing to see an allusion in the speech from the Throne to a matter which, it was currently reported, would be made the subject of investigation by a committee of this House. I refer to the question of the revision of the procedure of the House. I believe, Sir, that a great majority of the voters of Canada would be pleased to know that the rules of procedure of the House of Commons are to be revised with the purpose of expediting business. There has been for some years a strong feeling

amongst our constituents that matters drag too slow here, with in consequence great loss of time and money. I at one time, thought that the trouble was in the length and frequency of speeches, while this is certainly responsible for part of the delay, I feel that the procedure is at fault. Long windedness should cure itself when we remember that with very few exceptions all the long speech makers of last parliament were defeated. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are like a mechanic trying to do business with tools fifty years behind the times. In the older hemisphere I admit that a succession of merchants may carry on business in same stand and under same methods for hundreds of years with success, but, Sir, in this new land a merchant who has made a competency by the time he is sixty-five will lose it all in the next ten years if he keeps on the the same old way Our rules were founded on those of the mother of parliaments, but, Sir, I regret to say we have not kept pace with her in the changes of same; some suitable to this country, some not. It is a striking fact that amendment of procedure was almost from the beginning to end treated without party spirit, not as an issue between two great parties, but as a problem for House of Commons as a whole (Redleigh, page 125-6). In proof of above statement that the great majority of Canadians wish shorter sessions I say that newspapers of all classes and politics have advocated same and from the Atlantic to to the Pacific. I quote a few to prove this. The Regina 'Leader,' Halifax 'Herald,' Seaforth 'Expositor, Manitoba 'Press,' had column editorials all in favour.

I find in different countries that the procedure on budget legislation is as follows: In Belgium, explanations to items added to estimates. In France, a committee on budget, general report. In Germany, a committee of thirty-three, who examine the papers and ask for further explanation when needed. In the Netherlands, five separate committees of chamber examines estimates. Each of these five named to draft report. In Spain, budget committee standing thirty-five in all, majority report made to House with any alterations decided on. In Peru budget must be presented to congress within fifteen days after assembly, it is then referred to a committee. It is already on 'Hansard' how few Bills we pass for the time occupied in comparison with other countries, and when comparing our legislation with Great Britain's, we must bear in mind that Great Britain has only one parliament for all and we have provincial houses to take off a great part of the work. The United States congress lasts on an average five and a half months. During the second season of the 58th congress, 20,074 Bills and resolutions were introduced and 4,904 measured and 3,992 Acts passed both Houses. (See Reinsch on American legislatures. pages 300-1, while in the sessions of the Canadian House of Commons for 1908 lasting nearly eight months seventy-seven Public Acts and 173 Private Acts were passed. The difference is greatly accounted for by the procedure. In the 58th Congress there were fifty-five standing and ten select committees in the Senate of the United States varying in size from three to seventeen, and there were sixty-one standing committees in the House of Representatives varying from five to nineteen.

The newspapers throughout Canada from Halifax to Vancouver, newspapers of both sides of politics I am glad to say, commenting on my remarks on this subject last session, all favoured shorter sessions and greater despatch of business. I quote the following:—

'Toronto Mail':

There is no doubt a disposition to address parliament at too great length.

'Victoria Colonist':

There is such a thing in political archery as drawing the bow too far.

'Wingham Times':

Foreshadows a Bill to amend present rules of parliamentary procedure with a view to expediting transaction of public business and preventing waste of time in useless debate.

'Halifax Herald':

The extraordinary length of the sessions of parliament and the consequent enormous expense has often been the subject of comment and the need of reform has been recognized.

'Globe', June 25, 1909:

Parliament with a great four years off has a splendid chance this year of showing that it is a business institution and not merely a voice.

'Globe', July 18, 1908:

The 4th session, 10th parliament, longest on record, 234 days, but the actual business was in a large measure compressed into the final six weeks.

'Toronto News':

Inflexible rigidity is one of the grave defects of machinery of government. The British constitution readily adapts itself to changing conditions.

'Canadian Presbyterian':

There is no good reason for any member speaking more than once on any one topic when a Bill is in Committee of the Whole.

Parliamentary oratory is at present a by word for prolixity, diffuseness and resulting tediousness, compression would tend to improve it.

'Globe', June 18, 1908:

Day after day is wasted because a few members abuse to the extreme their privilege of speaking again and again in the committee of reply.

'Saturday Night' says:

We fiddle with a programme that is petty and peanutty.

'Toronto Star', April 17, 1909:

With the growth of Canada the business of parliament has outgrown the old procedure. The House of Commons ought to be able to agree upon some businesslike way of doing its business.

'Manitoba Free Press', February 23, 1909:

Such an outrageous wasting of the time of parliament at enormous cost to the country should be made impossible by the adoption of rules of debate and procedure such as no other parliament in the world is without, the indemnity to the member being only a fraction of the daily expense of having parliament in session.

I have, Mr. Speaker, taken the liberty to draft a few rules which I believe if adopted would result in saving the time of parliament. These rules are very simple and I shall submit them for consideration.

Rule No. I. Answers to all questions to be in writing and to be laid on the table and not read, or, be printed in the orders of the day or on 'Hansard.'

This will not prevent the answers being explained in the House if necessary.

Rule 2. Estimates to be first brought before committee consisting of all members. The committee will sit in committee room on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., and if necessary while House is sitting. All non-contentious items to be brought up in bulk in the House and contentious ones separate, but this not to prevent any item to be challenged in the House.

This is the rule in the English parliament. The system followed in the Canadian parliament in reference to the estimates is absurd. The minister is supposed to explain them but in reality he may not know anything about them and so his deputy sits next him and the accountant sits next him again and the information is transmitted backward and forward and a great deal of time is lost. If the minister happens to be a gentleman who is friendly to every one in the House his items go through with a rush, but otherwise he is bothered considerably and in the end the items go through without any real explanation being offered. I submit, Sir, that the business way to do this is to have a committee of the House sitting every day of the session at ten in the morning. Let the minister give notice a week ahead that his estimates will be brought up at a certain date and then let him be prepared with his clerks and with his documents to give the information and let every hon. member if he wishes be allowed to ask questions. Then, the items which were not contentious should be passed in the House en bloc. The contentious items could be discussed, and in that way months of the time of the House would be saved. These are the other rules I submit:

3. A member only to be allowed to speak once to any item brought up in Committee of the Whole House.

4. The Speaker to be authorized to prevent members from repeating themselves or reiterating other members speeches.

5. The Speaker to allow quotations, referred to in members' speeches to be placed on 'Hansard' without being read, if he sees fit.

6. Where a member makes a motion for papers, letters, documents, to be brought down and the government grant the motion, no discussion is then to be allowed in advocacy of the motion.

7. A set time should be decided on for bringing down of the estimates each session and so many days allotted to each department similar to the English practice (page 109 Redleigh.)

8. Wednesday evenings to be utilized for work.

Rule 7 is in force in the English parliament, and although I have doubts as to whether it would work here, I have added it. As to the rule about sitting on Wednesday evenings, my contention is that we come here to work and if there is one evening to be taken for play or recreation it should not be Wednesday evening. It is the only evening in the week outside of Thursday that all the members are here and as we all know well most of the estimates are put through on Friday night when very few members are present. I submit that either Monday night or Friday night should be the night set apart for social gatherings or rest if rest is needed. Now, Sir, I have given notice to-day of eight Bills to be introduced by me. They are Bills which I introduced last session and as some parts of those were adopted last session I only propose to ask the consideration of the House to such provisions as were then not adopted. I have been found fault with for introducing too many Bills in parliament, but I cannot suggest any possible way by which less of the time of the House would be taken than by putting my ideas in the concrete form of a Bill. Every one knows that a private member cannot have legislation passed in this House, nor do I consider that it is the province of a member of the opposition to put legislation on the statute-book. His first duty in this House is to criticise the administrative acts of the members of the government, in whose hands the people of the country have placed the government for the time being. Let me mention some of these Bills: The Bill respecting load lines on ships; the Bill respecting injuries

to persons due to motor vehicles; the Bill to provide for the government inspection of vessels not now inspected; the Bill respecting wireless telegraphy on ships; the Bill respecting offensive weapons and capital offences; the Bill respecting assaults against the person; and the Bill respecting the saving of daylight. If I desired to pick out two or three from these, I could not do so, because they are all good. Now, I desire for a few moments only to refer to what concerns more and comes closer to the plain people than anything else under the sky, that is, the enormous increase in the cost of living. Wages are much higher than they were ten years ago. Still the dollar to-day will not buy much more than half what it would then. I propose to suggest a reason and also a remedy, and to bear me out in my contention I propose referring to some reliable and prominent newspapers. I contend that the chief cause of the great increase in the cost of living is the high prices carried by the combines which are fostered under the present customs law. Shortly after the change of government in 1896 the free trade Finance Minister took the tariff out of politics by substituting for protection the words 'tariff for revenue only,' and there the tariff has virtually remained ever since. Now, Sir, I do not propose going into a discussion of the tariff or whether the Finance Minister was right or wrong, but I do consider that under the circumstances the Conservative opposition are not bound to stick to protection and be called high protectionists. In fact, Sir, I think that under the circumstances certain parts of the tariff should be lowered, and I propose bringing in a resolution to that effect respecting agricultural implements. While it may be necessary in the interests of certain manufactured articles that a combine or merger, as it is sometimes called, of factories or corporations should be, it may be necessary or beneficial in the interest of those institutions, still, Sir, I contend that where the people of Canada through its government protect the combine or merger from outside competition, then the same government acting for the same people should see that said combine or merger does not unduly charge said people for its goods. Shortly after the accession to power of the present government the Finance Minister spoke on this question, and I believe he proposed trying to remedy any evils by orders in council; but he finally realized what work this would be and how anything he did might be misinterpreted, and he desisted and ever since has only referred complaints to the remedy under the Criminal Code. There is no question as to this remedy being under the circumstances futile and a dead letter; and I quote the hon. the Finance Minister's own words:

Toronto Star, March, 1909:

> I venture to say that if you attempt to reach combines by the ordinary procedure of law, without any other penalty than that enforceable by the courts of law, you will have great difficulty in reaching them. The efforts made in other countries to reach combines in that way have not been very successful.

This is the great truth which is now being pressed upon the government in vain. He asserted:

> Even with the amendments we are now making, the element of protection will remain in the tariff to a considerable extent. One of the evils to the protective system is that it inevitably leads to the formation of combines in our country as the recognition of the fact, by manufacturers and others who may engage in forming combines for unduly enhancing the prices of commodities, that the duty on like articles imported into the country can be removed by order in council.

There is no combine or merger of the people, and this remedy could not be utilized without such.

There is one way, and one way only, and I submit an adequate way of remedying this great grievance, and a way which will be of great benefit to the government and country in other ways. I refer to a permanent commission of men skilled for the purpose, men above politics, who will bring their whole energies and time to the study of the intricate question and do full and fair justice between the producer and the consumer. To-day if a producer thinks an alien is importing goods and in any way evading the duty or part of the duty by under-valuation or otherwise, all he has to do is to report the matter to the nearest customs officer, and immediately the whole machinery of the government is investigating the offence; but if a consumer or retail dealer believes he is charged unjustly or that there is a combination in restraint of trade, he has to fight it himself, which is an impossibility. Why should it cost the newspapers $2,000 to fight this paper combine? It cost thousands to prosecute the plumbers' combine in Toronto. The advice of such a commission to the government on tariff legislation, apart from combines, would be invaluable. How can any finance minister, no matter of what party, give adequate research and thought to tariff charges or making when you consider all his other duties? There is no question that the corporations and trusts have the United States legislative bodies in their iron grasp, which once closed is hard to open. Don't let us fall into the same error.

I speak, Sir, on behalf of the consumers of Canada, and I say to the manufacturers that my only desire is to see a body of

skilled, reliable and impartial men appointed to see that the manufacturers and consumers both get fair and honest treatment. There is no use in my taking up the time of the House in specifying articles which the combines charge too much for. Their number is many. There is hardly an article, from leather to wash goods, from rubber to tacks, that it would not pay to have the charges for investigated.

The 'Toronto Star,' November 13, 1908, says:

A protective tariff established with the aim of building up Canadian industries and employing Canadian workmen at fair wages soon becomes an instrument for furthering trade combinations and conspiracies to rob the consumer, the speculator follows the settler and lives upon his labour.

'Toronto Star', February 3, 1909:

Tack combine in trade war. Effect on general commercial conditions is wholly bad, after driving out opposition by low prices, prices are raised too high.

'Toronto Star', February 17, 1909:

Grange meeting at Forest asked Dominion government to investigate at cost of government charges made re combines and remedy. Combine is the modern robber baron.

'Goderich Signal':

Decidedly uneasy feeling among old time Liberals at position re combines taken by Mr. Fielding. 'Huron Signal' goes so far as to say, that the fact that it was even necessary to present such a request constitutes a disgrace to the government. The 'Signal' contends that the government should have acted of its own motion without waiting for a request to perform the duty, which it has by formal enactment laid upon itself.

The 'Kingston Standard' says private persons cannot afford the cost to fight a combine. If any one tries, he is a marked man. It cost newspaper men $2,000 to fight the paper combine.

The 'Toronto Globe':

Two things should be done; those found guilty of extortion in connection with the combines should be punished and the tariff conditions which favour unjust combines should be changed.

'Star,' February 3:

It has come to a pretty pass in this country that if a man may not sell or may not buy where and how he pleases, but such is the fact. Commercial and social life is being strangled by this exercise of privilege on the part of guilds controlling the supply of the necessaries of life. It has come to pass that no man can go into any business without the consent of his rivals, and agreement to conduct it as they dictate.

One retail merchant says the domestic combine on which owing to the tariff on imports, I am forced to depend for supplies, could put me out of business to-morrow and I simply dare not be quoted in opposition to what these combines are doing, said one dealer.

'Toronto Star', February 10:

Circular to retailer reads won't deal unless your buy from no one else and sell at our prices.

'Toronto Star,' February 13:

Canada's Combine Law a delusion and a sham.

United States case quoted says, 'a combine is an illegal organization and cannot invoke law.'

'Toronto Star', February 6, 1909:

One, well informed in regard to the situation, has estimated that the advanced price list will result in the collection of between three and four hundred thousand dollars more from the users of woodenware in Ontario than was collected last year on the same volume of business. Over 25 per cent above American prices.

The 'Toronto Star' says:

The speech of Y. M. McLean, of South Huron, in the House of Commons, was an able argument for a more effective use of the tariff law for the suppression of combines. The tariff law provided that on proof of the existence of a combine in any article, the government may reduce or remove the duty on that article. It is a good law, but it is a dead letter because the means of enforcement are not provided.

I had purposed, Mr. Speaker, making some reference to naval matters; but as the government are going shortly to bring down their policy on this subject, I shall wait in the hope that when they do bring it down I shall be so satisfied with it that I shall not be able to say anything. It is not a matter of politics. It is a matter affecting the whole of Canada for all time.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other elements of national strength besides armies and navies. The most important element of all is the fibre of the race. A new nation derives its whole character and has its whole future determined by its first settlers, unless subsequent immigration is so extensive as to submerge the original population. It needs little study to see of what great value to a people a national type is. The absence of a national type is a loss to every man, woman and child. The question of the effect of large foreign immigration is not between us and the immigrants, but between our children and grandchildren and theirs. We are trustees for the future. We are laying the foundation for the last great nation; it rests with us how well built those foundations will be, and what kind of men shall inherit the country after we are gone. Two Englishmen, George Washington and Alex-

ander Hamilton, founded the United States and from 1776 to 1830 it grew from less than four million to almost thirteen million people, an unprecedented increase of 227 per cent and wholly out of the loins of their own people. They acquired a national type and characteristics of a strong, sturdy, moral self-reliant people. The height, weight, and chest measurement was steadily rising. Since 1880 these measurements are all decreasing, and the moral, physical and mental average lowering, due wholly to the immense immigration of people from inferior races, the small birth rate among native citizens and the great birth rate among foreigners. Up to 1880 the bulk of immigrants came from the sturdy races of northwest and western Europe—Scandinavians, Germans, French, Anglo-Saxons, good physique being the rule, and loathsome and contagious diseases extremely rare. In immigration heredity is far more important than environment or education. With the congestion of population in the great cities of western Europe, too many people are ill fed, ill clothed, ill sheltered and in consequence physically and morally weak. There is this to be said, however, of the Keltic race; men and women when lifted out of squalid poverty and despair into a broad land, where there is food and clothing for those who labour, invariably do well, after the shaking up and down of a Canadian winter and summer, they take a new lease of life and breathe in the air of freedom and ambition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend. that we should profit by the example and lesson taught by a nation which has gone through what we are now face with. A nation founded by men of the same fibre as Canadians and grown up under similar conditions and climate. I, of course, refer to the United States. I hand in, Sir, a map from a United States standard work, showing where the undesirable immigrants that have lowered the average standard of United States inhabitants come from, and I give notice that I propose introducing to this House a Bill prohibiting all immigration from Europe south of 44 degrees North latitude and East of 20 East longitude, and from Turkey in Asia. The United States native birth rate before 1830 increased the population fast enough. The birth rate was lowered among native Americans by the immense immigration, so sets out Hall on immigration and its effects upon United States issued in 1907. Why should we not keep for our own descendants and old country relations this fair heritage of ours, and be as Goldwin Smith savs a contented people dwelling in a land of milk and honey.

The above remarks were carefully compiled some weeks ago. Since coming here, I happened to see in the reading room on the first page of ' Life,' the first social paper of the United States, a picture representing metaphorically what I have been saying. There is a great purple land with a great rock close to the ocean. On that rock stands a noble figure of a red man, one of the original owners of the soil. Behind him stands a tall man, with a goatee, with straps on his boots, and with the usual hat worn by Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam lifts his foot and pushes the red man off the rock. Then I turn to the other page, where I see standing on the same rock the same tall man with the goatee and the straps on his boots, and behind him crouched the figure of a man wearing old clothes and with a beard and a hooked nose—the same type of which seventy-five thousand were starving in New York last winter, and that man lifts his foot and kicks Uncle Sam off the rock and is left standing there alone. Let such immigration be absolutely prohibited. We have the power to do it. There is no better asset to Canada or any other country than a strong, sound immigrant from our own stock. The best citizens we have are those of our own race, and I ask why, instead of doing as President Falconer says we are doing, going too fast—why should we not go a little slower and keep this country for our own people and the descendants of the people from whom we sprang. I have given considerable thought to this matter. (I am not here simply giving my own idea but those expressed by experts and students and official reports). It is sometimes thought proper to relieve the discussion of a serious subject by indulging in a lighter vein and I would ask the House to indulge with me while I tell this story. The province of Ontario some years ago called on its county clerks to say how many farm labourers were required in each county. The replies, of course, came in. Middlesex wanted so many and Oxford so many, and so on. But in one county the county clerk happened to be away and his wife was doing his work and she wrote back: we do not want any, we grow our own. I submit that no better policy could be followed. Military and naval matters are all right in their way, but there are other things besides ships. Drake's guns would not have barked so loudly or strong had it not been for the men behind them, the fibre of the men is what counts. That is what we have to look to—the fibre of the men. An immigrant's heredity counts before environment or education. There is one great race trouble to the south, and that is race suicide. I would submit a solution for that great difficulty, one which is likely to affect this House in the near future, which is fast coming here except to the province of Quebec.

There is the question of woman suffrage, which is on the way and is bound to reach

us. Mrs. Pankhurst is on the road. I have a precedent for the remedy I propose, and it has come to me from a high ecclesiastical dignitary. While the spinsters of Canada have a right to vote on their own land, if the married women should come to the government and ask for the ballot, instead of putting a tax on bachelors or giving a bounty to large families, I would say give the women the right to vote if they carry out the duty they owe to their country as women and wives, on the clear principle, well defined, of 'No Babies no Ballots.'

Motion (Mr. Ecrément) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

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

That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into a committee to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 16, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is made necessary by the construction put upon section 340 of the Railway Act by the Ontario Court of Appeals in a case decided this last year. That section is the one that provides that the shipper shall not be bound to accept anything less than his ordinary and actual damages unless he signs a contract which must be approved by the Railway Commission. The Court of Appeals said they could decide whether one contract was like another, and that where they differed in some respects the shipper was bound by the contract he signed notwithstanding it had not received the sanction of the board. In my opinion the law of 1903 was intended to make the jurisdiction of the board absolute as regards these railway contracts and did not intend that any court should exercise that jurisdiction in any respect. I introduce this Bill so that the intention of the Act be made clear and distinct. It also provides that where the railway company insists on a higher rate of freight in order to guarantee against full loss, but wants the shipper to take lower rate and lower liability the company must allow the shipper the choice of paying the higher rate of freight and being fully protected against loss if he wants to, and not compel him to accept a reduced liability without any option.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is to limit the appeals from the Board of Railway Commissioners. At present it is very doubtful that any time limits exist. Any party who accepts an order from the Board of Railway Commissioners may appeal against that order to the Supreme Court.

Now, I think the House will agree with me at once when I say that orders made by the commission are supposed to be carried into effect immediately ; they are not made unless there is immediate necessity for making them. And, as it has been found that the commissioners feel that they must grant leave for appeal almost at any time and under almost any circumstances, I wish, by this Bill to limit that kind of appeal. The very object of appointing the Railway Commission was to give speedy justice in railway matters, and, where a difficulty arose, to apply the remedy as promptly as possible. The purport of that part of the Bill relating to this matter is that the board should not grant leave to appeal after thirty days from the making of their order. If any party, whether railway company or any other, feels himself aggrieved by an order of the commission and desires to appeal, it is reasonable that he should make up his mind within thirty days and make application for appeal. The second provision of this Bill is that leave to appeal to the Supreme Court should not be granted unless some doubtful question of law is involved and unless serious injury or loss will result from immediate compliance with the order sought

to be appealed from. It should not be available for delay only. That, I think, will commend itself to the judgment of the House. The third provision is that no appeal, even though leave be granted, should lie if it is not proceeded with within sixty days—that is, within thirty days after leave to appeal is granted, the party should proceed and not have the delay, as they may now, without any time limit whatever.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill relates to the subject of level crossings. The legislation of last session, I think will be found, when subjected to more careful scrutiny than was possible in the last days of the session, to be unjust to the extent at least to which I propose to amend it. The Bill of last session provides that a railway, if incorporated after a certain time, must protect the crossings whether upon the level of the highway or otherwise entirely at their own expense. I propose to amend section 238a, as amended last session, by adding the following:

And where the railway has been constructed before the passing of this Act and is permitted by the board to pass over any highway crossing at rail level, the municipality shall not be ordered to pay any portion of the cost or expense of protecting such crossing unless and except it is otherwise provided by agreement, approved by the board, between the company and the municipal corporation.

That, I think, speaks plainly for itself, and it is not necessary for me to take up time or weary the House by explaining it further.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have no desire to take up time at this stage. I think it is evident, however, that the proposed amendment is subversive of one of the principles of the Bill passed last session. It clearly makes it impossible for the board to divide the cost among the parties interested. Under the Act as it is now, it is left to the discretion of the board to say whether the municipality shall pay anything or not.

Mr. LANCASTER. In some cases.

Mr. GRAHAM. It leaves it to the discretion of the board.

Mr. LANCASTER. In some cases only.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill will be subversive of that principle. I am utterly opposed to it, as I understand it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LANCASTER.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is precisely the same Bill that I introduced last year and that passed its first reading, but was among the innocents slaughtered owing to the shortness of the session. Under the existing law, if a contract is entered into between a municipality and a railway, and the railway receives subsidies under the contract but afterwards breaks the obligations it enters into under the contract, the corporation of the municipality can apply to the board and obtain relief. But, as the law stands, if the railway which has received the benefit happens to have sold out to another railway, which then has the property and enjoys that benefit, there is no relief to be obtained through the board because the board has no jurisdiction in relation to the matter over the company that did not make the contract. This Bill places it in the power of the board to consider such questions either at the instance of the railway, the Crown, the corporation or an individual.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RACE TRACK GAMBLING.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Criminal Code respecting the matter of race track gambling. He said: The object of the Bill is to amend sections 226, 227 and 235 of the Code with a view to suppressing and preventing, as far as possible, not the betting but the business of betting and gambling upon race tracks.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 7) respecting the units of electrical measure—Mr. Templeman.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, which was as follows:

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable William Stevenson Fielding, Minister of Finance, the Honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Honourable Wm. Paterson, Minister of Customs, and the Honourable Wm. Pugsley, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the pur-

poses and under the provisions of the 11th Chap. of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled 'An Act respecting the House of Commons;'

Government House,
Ottawa, 15th November, 1909.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the notices of motion are taken, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals why it is that we cannot have the report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway in printed form at the commencement of the session. The report which was brought down last session was in typewritten form, and I think the printed form was only completed a few days or a few weeks ago. I have seen nothing in printed form until very recently. The one that has been brought down this session was in the same form, there is only one copy of it, and it is not available for the use of the members of the House generally who would like to examine it. I do not see any reason why it should not come down in printed form like the report of every other department of the government.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I think the observations of my hon. friend are quite reasonable. It never struck me in that light before. The commissioners have been practically doing their own work and submitting it to me, and I have submitted it to the House. I will try and see if we cannot make some arrangement by which the report will be printed in advance. It comes in regular form before me, and I present it to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the meantime will the minister be good enough to move that the rule be suspended, and that this be printed immediately?

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that the rule of the House on printing be suspended as regards the report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway, and that the said report be ordered to be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF CHIEF ENGINEER LUMSDEN, TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I made an inquiry of the Prime Minister a day or two ago with regard to the resignation of Mr. Lumsden, formerly chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway, and it was intimated by the Prime Minister at the time that the answer would be given by the Minister of Railways at an early date. Perhaps it might be convenient to give it now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an order on the paper to-day, and as soon as it is reached it will be granted at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to know whether the report of the resignation of the chief engineer is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is correct.

INLAND REVENUE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient that the Inland Revenue Act be amended as follows: That Section 76 be repealed and the following substituted therefore:

'76. The person in whose favour a license is granted for an excise bonding warehouse, not included in the description of the premises in respect of which a license has been issued to him under this Act, shall, upon receiving such license, pay to the collector the sum of fifty dollars.'

He said: I may say that His Excellency has been informed of the purport of the resolution.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What change does that make?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It will increase the amount paid for licenses for bonded warehouses from $20 to $50.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

COST OF NEWMARKET CANAL.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

How much was estimated for the Newmarket canal in 1909, and how much was expended each month since December, 1908?

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

1. No special vote was taken for the Newmarket branch. The chief engineer allotted for the Holland River Division of the Trent Canal in 1909-10 $50,000 out of $1,000,000. Amount expended each month since December, 1908, as follows:

1909.	Contractor's Estimates.	
March	$12,440 00	
May	2,050 00	
June	1,690 00	
July	2,960 00	
August	11,040 00	
September	8,000 00	
October	10,690 00	
		$48,870 00

1909	Engineering pay-lists.	
January	$731 95	
February	547 00	
March	574 01	
April	535 72	
May	536 74	
June	816 20	
July	683 37	
August	742 86	
September	903 00	
October	820 80	
		6,891 65
		$55,761 65

COST OF MARKHAM POST OFFICE.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

What was the cost of lot for the Markham post office building and furnishings?

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

Site	$1,004 79
Furnishings	1,744 59

COMMISSIONERS OF INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. What are the names of members of the Government Railways Managing Board, appointed to administer the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway?
2. What is the date of their appointment?
3. Where do they reside?
4. What are their salaries?

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

1. The members of the government railways managing board, are—Mr. M. J. Butler, C.M.G., Deputy Minister Railways and Canals, chairman, Mr. David Pottinger, I.S.O., Mr. E. Tiffin, traffic manager and Mr. F. P Brady, general superintendent.

2. April 20, 1909, by order in council, copy of which is attached hereto.

3. Mr. Butler, resides at Ottawa, the three other members at Moncton, N. B.

4. Mr. Butler without salary, Mr. Pottinger, Mr. Tiffin and Mr. Brady, $6,000 per annum, each.

The following is a certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 20th April, 1909:

On a memorandum, dated the 16th April, 1909, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that he has, for some time past, had under most careful consideration, the various complicated questions involved in the operation of the Government Railways, both from the financial and administrative points of view, and, as the result, has concluded that a change in the present method of management is desirable.

The Minister directs attention to the following facts:

The Intercolonial railway was built as a government road, in pursuance of the requirements of the British North America Act of 1867, Sec. 145; and without amendment of this Act, must retain that characteristic.

It was opened for traffic on the 1st day of July, 1876, between Halifax and Rivière du Loup; its length, including the Pictou and Windsor branches, and the line from St. John to Point du Chêne (Shediac) being 745 miles.

By various extensions, purchases, and leasing arrangements its length, in the year of 1907-8, reached a total of 1,448·62 miles—the cost of operating being $9,157,435.53. Its traffic comprised 4,134,046 tons of freight and 2,789,371 passengers.

The Prince Edward Island railway was taken over by the government on the 29th of December, 1873, under the express provisions of the Imperial Order in Council of the 26th of June, 1873, admitting Prince Edward Island into the Dominion.

At the time of the original opening of the Intercolonial railway for traffic, and the taking over of the Island railway an organization was adopted, which, with some modifications, has remained in force up to the present day, notwithstanding the changed conditions, and the expansion of the road and its operations. The official placed in immediate charge is a general manager, who is also in charge of the Prince Edward Island railway, under the title of 'General Manager, Government Railways.'

By section 49 of the Government Railways Act, R.S.C., 1906, chapter 36, it is provided as follows:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such regulations as he deems necessary,

(a) for the management, proper use and protection of all or any of the government railways, including station houses, yards and other property in connection therewith;

(b) for the ascertaining and collection of the tolls, dues and revenues thereon;

(c) to be observed by the conductors, engine drivers and other officers and servants of the minister, and by all companies and persons using such railways;

(d) relating to the construction of the carriages and other vehicles to be used in the trains on such railways.

The minister considers it expedient and recommends that, in pursuance of the above statutory provision, the following be fixed as the organization to be in force on and after the 1st of April, 1909, for the government railways—the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway—as at present constituted, and as the same may hereafter be extended or modified; such organization to be in supercession of the existing organization:

1. The position of general manager of government railways to be abolished.

2. A Board, to be constituted under the name, 'The Government Railways Managing Board.'

3. The said Board to consist of four persons, namely: Mr. M. J. Butler, Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, who shall be chairman of the Board; Mr. David Pottinger, I.S.O.; Mr. E. Tiffin, the present traffic manager, he

retaining that position; Mr. F. P. Brady, of Montreal.

4. The said Board to supervise and direct all departments of the railways owned by the Government of Canada.

5. The duties and powers of the said Board to be as hereunder defined, namely:

They shall have the powers usually vested in the executives of railway corporations.

They shall prepare, subject to the Government Railways Act, and the Provident Fund Act, and, with the approval thereto of the Governor in Council first obtained, carry out, rules and regulations as follows:

(a) For the organization of the staff and officials of the railways.

(b) For the conditions of employment in the railway service.

(c) For the purchasing of supplies and the sale of materials.

(d) For the ascertaining and collection of the railway tolls, dues and revenues.

(e) Those to be observed by the conductors, engine drivers and other officers and servants, and by all companies and persons using such railways.

(f) Those relating to the rolling stock to be used in the trains on such railways.

6. They shall meet for the transaction of business at least once a month and shall keep regular minutes of each meeting.

7. They shall report to the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, monthly, and shall also make a special and comprehensive report at the end of each fiscal year, on the expenditures and receipts of the government roads; and on all occurrences and transactions of importance; and shall, further furnish such reports as may be, from time to time, required of them by the Department of Railways and Canals.

The Minister further recommends that the salaries payable to the several members of the said Board above named, be fixed as follows: to Mr. Butler, no salary as a member of the Board, and to Mr. Mr. Pottinger. Mr. Tiffin and Mr. Brady, $6,000 a year each.

The Minister also recommends that, with the exception of Mr. Butler, whose departmental duties render such provisions inapplicable, the appointees be required to devote the whole of their time to the official duties attached to their positions.

The Committee submit the same for approval.

F. K. BENNETTS,
Assistant Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
The Minister of Railways and Canals.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN FRANCE.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. Who are our immigration agents in France, and what are their salaries?

2. Who are our immigration agents in Belgium, and what are their salaries?

3. Have we immigration agents in the other countries of Continental Europe? If so, what are their names and salaries?

4. Has the government appointed a successor to Mr. J. E. Cyr, immigration agent in France? If so, what is his name and salary?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Paul Wiallard, $3,000 ; Pierre Foursin, $1,000 ; Emile Belanger, $900.

2. D. Treau de Coeli, $1,500.

3. No.

4. No.

BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RAILWAY.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. Has the government yet found a remedy for the grievance which the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals on the 10th February, 1908, in this House, admitted did exist by reason of the failure of the Grand Trunk railway to operate the branch of the old Belleville and North Hastings railway from Madoc to Eldorado?

2. Is the government aware that on that date the hon. the Minister of Railways, speaking of that and similar grievances, stated to this House: 'We are anxious to find a remedy so that this will not occur again; the people have a grievance not only on account of the subsidies voted by this House, but on account of the votes by the municipalities throughout Ontario and its other provinces. There is a weakness in the law that ought to be remedied, and I assure the House that I am trying to find out the method to remedy this grievance. I will say further that I will not be satisfied until I do find some way. I do not believe that a railway company has a right to take money of the people of Canada and then not carry out its contract, any more than it would have the right to take my money and not carry out a contract entered into with me?'

3. Is the government aware that such remedy has not yet, after the lapse of nearly two years, been discovered by the Minister of Railways, or if discovered has not been applied, as the grievance still exists?

4. Has such remedy been discovered? If so, why has it not been applied? If not discovered, is the Minister of Railways still searching for it, or does he now believe that no remedy can be found?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals).

1. Since date mentioned, the statute 7 and 8, Edward VII, C. 61, has been passed and reference may be made to section 8 of that statute.

This was amended by statute 8 and 9, Edward VII, C. 32, section 1.

2. The words quoted in the question are to be found at different places on pages 2815 and 2816, 'Hansard,' 1907-8, but consist of three separate extracts not spoken in the order quoted, and from which intervening sentences are omitted.

Debate on the amendment, statute 8 and 9, chapter 32, section 1, is to be found on pages 6202-3-4-5-6-and 7, 'Hansard,' 1909.

3 and 4. It is hoped that the legislation above mentioned will provide an efficient remedy in preventing a recurrence of any such grievances as is stated.

ARMED VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Is the information as to the armament and crew of the United States training or war ships 'Yantic,' 'Hawk,' 'Fern,' 'Dorothea,' 'Don Juan,' 'Essex,' 'Sandoval' and 'Nashville,' which the Prime Minister stated to the House on the 30th April, 1908, was being obtained by the Department of Militia, yet available? If so, what is the extent and nature of the armaments, and the strength of the crews?

2. Does the government consider that the tonnage and armament of these vessels has any relation to the Rush-Bagot agreement of April, 1817?

3. Was the question of the admission of these vessels to the Great Lakes submitted to the Militia Council for the views of the military advisers of the Minister of Militia and Defence previous to the requests of the government of the United States being acceded to?

4. Was the imperial government requested to submit the question of the admission of these vessels to the Great Lakes for the views of the Imperial Defence Committee previous to the requests of the government of the United States being acceded to?

Rt. Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. The government does not think that the information in question and obtained by the Department of Militia should now be made public, pending diplomatic action on the same.

2. Yes.

3. All applications were considered by the Governor in Council.

4. No.

COST OF ROYAL MINT.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What is the total cost of the Royal Mint, to date?

2. What amount is estimated as necessary to complete it, including the refinery?

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works).

1. $544,052.78.

2. Estimated cost of refinery building.. .. ..$35,000
Estimated cost of equipment.... 32,000

$67,000

ADDITIONS TO BOARD OF ENGINEERS, QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has the government, since last session, added any new members to the Board of Commission of Engineers in connection with the reconstruction of the Quebec Bridge?

2. Why has the government so increased the said board?

3. Who are the new nominees, what are their functions, and what is the rate of their remuneration?

Mr. GRAHAM.

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

1 and 2. No new members have been added to the board, but under the provisions of the order in council, two engineers were called in consultation for the substructure and two engineers were called in consultation in connection with the designing of the superstructure.

3. For the substructure, Messrs. Noble, of New York, and Holgate, of Montreal. For the superstructure, Messrs. Johnson, of Montreal, and Wolfell, of New York. As to the consulting engineers of the substructure, the customory rate of $50 per day. The consulting engineers of the superstructure have not yet billed the government for their work.

BOARD OF ENGINEERS, QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. When were the members of the new Board of Engineers of the Quebec Bridge appointed?

2. When did they hold their first meeting?

3. Has the board or any of its members made any report upon the reconstruction of said bridge to date?

4. Have any plans been prepared and handed in to the government?

5. What is the remuneration of said original three members of said board?

6. What is the total amount paid to date by the government for the maintenance of said board or commission?

7. Have any actual works been executed in respect to reconstruction of said bridge? If so, what works?

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

1. No new members were added to the Board of Engineers.

2. First meeting of the board with Messrs. Holgate and Noble took place July 2, 1909. The first meeting of the board with Messrs. Johnston and Wolfell took place Sept. 7, 1909.

3. Yes, monthly reports.

4. Plans have not been completed, but are well advanced.

5. $1,000 per month.

6. Paid to October 31, 1909—$97,631.67.

7. No actual work has been executed other than plans, specifications, soundings and borings, etc.

DRY-DOCK AT PORT ARTHUR.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Was any application made for the subsidizing of a dry-dock and ship-building yard at Port Arthur? If so, on what date, and by whom was the application made?

2. What were the dimensions of the proposed dry-dock and ship-building yard?

3. Has the department any information as to what site, if any, has been chosen for such dry-dock and ship-building yard?

4. If so, has the department approved of such site for the purposes of granting subsidies under the Act?

5. For what distance and to what depth will dredging be required to be done to permit of easy approach to dry-dock for vessels desiring to use the dock?

6. Has the department ascertained, or has it been reported to the department, that it will be necessary for the proper maintenance of the dry-dock that a break-water be built in Thunder bay in front of the dock to protect it? If so, have any plans for dredging approaches to dry-dock, and for the erection of breakwater, been prepared or approved by the minister? If so, what is the estimated cost of each work?

7. What is the estimated cost of the dry-dock and ship-building plant to be erected in Port Arthur as represented by the applicants for subsidy, and at what amount has the capital been adjusted or fixed by the department for purposes of subsidy?

8. What subsidy has been granted to such dock, and upon what terms?

9. Has the department any information as to what persons are promoting the building plant at Port Arthur?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works): An application for a subsidy has has been received from the Western Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, Limited, for a dry-dock at Port Arthur; but the department is at present unable to furnish the information asked, as all papers, plans, etc., concerning the application have been forwarded to the resident engineer at Port Arthur to be reported upon.

DRY-DOCK AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. Was any application made for the subsidizing of a dry-dock and ship-building yard at Sault Ste. Marie? If so, on what date and and by whom was the application made?

2. What were the dimensions of the proposed dry-dock and ship-building yard?

3. Has the department any information as to what site, if any, has been chosen for such dry-dock and ship-building yard?

4. If so, has the department approved of such site for the purposes of granting a subsidy under the Act?

5. Will any dredging be required to be done for approaches to the dry-dock as proposed? If so, for what distance and what depth, and what is the estimated cost of it?

6. What is the estimated cost of the dry-dock and ship-building plant to be erected at Sault Ste. Marie as represented by the applicants for subsidy, and what amount has the capital been adjusted or fixed by the department for purposes of subsidy?

7. Has the department approved of the plans submitted by the applicants for subsidy? If so, when were such plans approved of?

8. If such plans have not been approved of as to site of dry-dock, or the dry-dock itself, what objections have been raised against the same, and have such objections been met by promoters?

9. Is it the intention of the department to subsidize a dry-dock and ship-building plant at Sault Ste. Marie?

10. Is the department aware that a substantial bonus for such dry-dock has been granted to the promoters of the said dry-dock by the council of the corporation of the town of Sault Ste. Marie after submission to, and approval of such by-laws by the ratepayers of said town, by an overwhelming majority on the 8th March last.

11. If the department has not already approved of the plans of the dry-dock and shipbuilding yard at Sault Ste. Marie, what is the cause of the delay in giving such approval?

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

1. (a) Yes. (b) 11th June, 1909. (c) The Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, Limited.

2. The dock is to be 620 feet long, 53 feet wide in the bottom and 85 feet wide at the top and to have at least 17 feet 6 inches of water on the mitre sill, at low water.

3. Yes.

4. 6 (a), 7, 8, 9, and 11. The whole matter is now being reported upon by the resident engineer.

5. No.

6. (b) The company is entitled to ask for an annual subsidy of 3 per cent on the total cost for 20 years, provided the plans are approved by the department and the work is carried out as designed.

10. Yes.

SEA GULL DOCK.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. Who was the superintendent in charge of the work of construction at Sea Gull dock on St. Joseph Island, in Lake Huron?

2. When was he employed, at what rate, and for what period of time was he paid?

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

1. T. A. Armstrong.

2. (a) and (c) October 9, 1908, to March 31, 1909. (b) $3 per working day.

CEMENT MERGER.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the cement merger that has taken place, by means of which the Canada Cement Company, Limited, has taken over ten of the largest cement companies of Canada with a capital of $30,000,000 and that on account of this merger the price of cement to the consumer has been very much increased?

2. Is it the intention of the government to take action to protect the public against this merger, which threatens to be a huge combine, thereby increasing the cost of cement, which is almost a necessity to-day in great works?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The government are aware from information in the public press, that a number of the cement manufactories of the Dominion have been consolidated under one large company. Whether this consolidation has unduly enhanced the price of cement is a disputed point.

The law provides two methods of dealing with combinations which unduly enhance prices. One of these, in the case of dutiable articles, is by abolition or reduction of customs duties, after the facts have been established by judicial inquiry. It is proposed to introduce, during the present session measures to make this portion of the law more effective. The other method is under the Criminal Code, the administration of which comes under the direction of the Attorneys General of the several provinces.

SOUTH AFRICAN WARRANTS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. What number of warrants have been issued to date for South African veterans' services?
2. What number of warrants have been filed for land personally by veterans?
3. What number of substitutes have been registered?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 6,645.
2. 420.
3. 2,498.

LIFE-SAVING STATION IN BAY OF FUNDY.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Crocket—asked:

1. Is there a life-saving station in the Bay of Fundy? If so, where, and what is its equipment?
2. Who has charge of the boat and equipment?
3. Is there a crew provided for the boat? If not, how is a crew obtained when the services of the boat are required?
4. Is it the intention of the government to provide a crew for this boat?
5. Was this life-boat used on the occasion of the recent wreck of the SS. 'Hestia'? If not, why not?

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

1. Yes. At Westport, Brier Island, there is a subsidized motor boat and crew. There is a Beebe-McLellan life boat at Seal Cove, Grand Manan, with coxswain in charge, but no established crew.
2. At Westport Mr. Bowers, the owner of the boat. At Seal Cove Mr. T. C. Benson, the coxswain.
3. Not at Seal Cove. Volunteers have to man the boat at present.
4. Yes, if not at present station, at some more suitable locality.

Mr. BRADBURY.

5. No. When the fishermen at Seal Cove, nine and a half miles distant, heard of the wreck, they set out in their sailing fishing boats, with which they rescued the survivors. It was not a case then for a life boat and beyond the beat of the Seal Cove Station.

PASSAGE OF TRAINING SHIPS THROUGH CANALS.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. Referring to the passage of United States warships or training vessels through the St. Lawrence canals to the Great Lakes, to what department was each application of the United States government referred?
2. Did the department to which the application was referred take steps in each case to consult other departments interested? If so, what departments were so consulted, and have records of such consultations been preserved?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister): Every application was dealt with by the Governor in Council on the report, either of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or of the Secretary of State.

OLD PROPRIETOR LIGHT.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Crocket—asked:

1. When was the government or any of its departments informed that the light in the buoy on the Old Proprietor rock in the Bay of Fundy was out, and that the whistle of said buoy was also defective?
2. Is the government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries aware that this light has not been operating during the whole or greater part of the past summer?
3. Why has this gas automatic whistle buoy been allowed to remain so long in this defective condition?

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

1 and 2. The St. John agency of the department was advised January 22, 1909, that light was out. The acting agent thereupon notified the shipping interests and advertised in local papers on January 25 that light was out. The department at Ottawa was not aware of the irregularity. Whistle was found defective November 7, 1909.

3. On account of adverse weather conditions, also press of work in connection with more important aids to navigation.

POWASSAN-NIPISSING MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. ARTHURS—by Mr. Kidd—asked:

1. Have requests by petition or otherwise been received for a change in the existing mail route between Powassan and Nipissing and Restoule? If so, from whom?
2. Has the Post Office Inspector made a report on the said proposed changes?
3. If a report has been made recommending a change, why has such change not been made?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

1, 2 and 3. The department having been advised that the arrangements for the mail service between Powassan, Nipissing and Restoule were not satisfactory, the matter was referred to the inspector for inquiry. He recommended a rearrangement of the services, which the department authorized, but a largely signed petition having been received from the district protesting against the change, the matter has been held in abeyance until further inquiry is made by the inspector.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A copy of the contract for the dredging of the Napanee river during the summer of 1909; name of the contractor who had the contract; names of the engineers in charge of the work and the inspector; the depth and width of the channel after dredging; the length of time taken to complete the work; the total amount of money expended on the work; whether the work was done by day work or by the yard; and the prices paid by day or by yard.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a copy of all reports, letters, communications and documents touching or relating to the resignation of Hugh D. Lumsden from his position as chief engineer of the National Transcontinental railway, including a copy of all letters, communications or reports of the said Hugh D. Lumsden to the Prime Minister, touching or relating to his resignation, or to the affairs of the National Transcontinental railway.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and papers of every description not already brought down touching the recent treaty with the French Republic, or any modification therein.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing in relation to each dog-fish reduction plant or establishment for the reduction of dog-fish erected by or for the government or maintained in whole or in part by the government, (a) the cost of construction, (b) the cost of maintenance for each year, (c) the location, (d) the quantity of dog-fish treated thereat in each year, and (e) the amount realized from the sale of or the disposal in each year.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council at present in force with reference to immigration; also a copy of all regulations in force at the present time in connection with immigration in Canada.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, documents and papers not already brought down touching the treaty with the United States of America known as the Waterways Treaty, or any modification thereof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you wish this to stand?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter is still under consideration and if my hon. friend will renew the motion at a later date I will be happy to bring down the papers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very good.

Motion allowed to stand.

WHARFS IN JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for:

A copy of all petitions addressed to the government or any member thereof, as well as of all letters, correspondence and reports in the possession of the government, and having reference to repairs required at two wharfs built by the government and situated at Ste. Geneviéve and Isle Bizard, in Jacques Cartier County, P.Q.

He said: These two wharfs were constructed by the Dominion government in the year 1888, on the river which runs north of the island of Montreal from the Lake of Two Mountains to the St. Lawrence at the lower end of the island. The two wharfs cost about $35,000; one was located on the Island of Montreal in the parish of St. Geneviève, and the other on an island in the lake of Two Mountains in the parish of Isle Bizard. The wharfs were built opposite each other and some years ago the provincial government, with the consent of the federal government, I have no doubt connected these wharfs by a steel bridge, the wharfs themselves forming the abutments of the bridge. These wharfs were originally built because they were useful, the river there is navigable at certain seasons of the years and there is considerable traffic in the district. No doubt the federal government acquiesced in the construction of this bridge and at all events on several occasions, since the bridge was erected the federal government has repaired the wharfs. So far as I have been able to discover the wharfs were not deeded over to the municipality or to the Quebec government when the bridge was built, and I believe they remain the absolute property of the federal government. In 1904 the wharfs were in a bad state and this parliament voted $2,800 for repairs. Mr. Hyman was then Minister of Public Works and I sent him an estimate prepared by contractors of repute showing that this vote was insufficient and that it would be necessary to expend four or five thousand dollars to place either wharf in proper condition. Mr. Hyman wrote me that the vote in question was the only amount available, that they would expend it, and that if further repairs became necessary they would no doubt be attended to by the government.

At the present time the condition of these two wharfs is deplorable. The wharf on the St. Geneviève side, owing to the spring freshets and the piling up of the ice has almost completely given way, and the other wharf is also in need of extensive repairs. If these wharfs, the property of the Dominion government, are to be preserved at all, they must be attended to at once. The bridge itself cost $40,000 and should the wharfs give way there will be a combined loss to the provincial and federal governments which it would take $100,000 to replace. The situation from the point of view of the provincial government is this: we have a law in the province of Quebec in regard to the steel bridges constructed under the Mercier administration.

Under that law, 56 Victoria, the supervision of these steel bridges is vested in the provincial government. Bridges joining two parishes in the same county are to be repaired by the county, bridges leading from one county to another are to be repaired by both counties, bridges in the same parish are to be repaired by the municipality of the parish, and the inspector of government public works is authorized by that statute, if he finds repairs necessary, to notify those who are responsible for those repairs, and, if they are not executed, to execute them himself at the expense of the parties responsible. The condition of this bridge has been investigated by the provincial government, and a notice has been served upon the interested parties to repair the bridge. Nothing has been done. I myself applied to the local government to avail themselves of the provision of the statute which says that if the repairs are not made, then the government makes them and recovers the cost thereof from the parties responsible. But, so far as I can see, the objection of the local government is this: We will not repair the bridge with the prospect that in the spring the piers belonging to the Dominion government will be carried away and the bridge will be lost, it is for the Dominion government to do its duty and repair these piers, when they will be in a fit and proper condition, we will attend to the bridge. Now, I have had some correspondence with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works in regard to this matter, and my hon. friend has always answered my letters with his proverbial courtesy and offered to have the matter looked into. In his last communication my hon. friend stated that there was no money available for these urgent repairs. I think I pointed out to my hon. friend that this was a case of urgency, and that the government had power to make the repairs, and should make them while the water in the river is low, which is the only time at which the repairs can be made. But nothing, so far as I know, has been done, and I ask for this correspondence with the view of bringing this question to the notice of the House. It seems a great pity that a valuable asset such as these piers are, should be allowed to be lost, because I can state, so far as my information goes, that next spring's freshets will carry off at least one of these piers. It is all the greater pity, as the government has allowed the provincial government to place a valuable bridge upon these piers without charging that government or any other authority with the maintenance of this public work. It is a Dominion public work, it is in danger, and I think it calls for the immediate attention of the government.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, in the interesting address which my hon. friend has delivered in support of this motion, he has, I think, forgotten one very important point, that is, to inform the House as to what quantity of shipping resorts to these wharfs and therefore to what extent they are useful for purposes of navigation. If he had done so, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who was Minister of Finance when these wharfs were built in 1888, might have felt it his duty to make some explanations to the House of the rather extraordinairy coincidence which led to the building of two wharfs on that river, the one being directly opposite the other, and why the government of that day saw fit to expend some $35,000, ostensibly for the building of wharfs, which apparently, from the remarks of my hon. friend, were intended to constitute the piers for a steel bridge which the provincial government of the day were induced to erect upon these piers. If my hon. friend who represents St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) were here, I have no doubt that on hearing the remarks of my hon. friend, he would feel it his duty to repair at once to the site of these wharfs with his camera and have them photographed to show what kind of wharfs were erected in 1888, when the hon. member for North Toronto was Minister of Finance. It is true, I had correspondence with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and I promised him, as I felt it my duty to do, to look carefully into his representations and see whether I could meet his views. There is a difficulty, because I have taken, and with the approval of my colleagues, somewhat strong ground against a continuance of the practice of allowing wharfs to be utilized as substructures for bridges. In some cases this has been done, and we have been attacked pretty strongly for it by some of our friends on the opposite side of the House. But the case which my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House is about the worst case that has come under my notice. It is quite true, I told my hon. friend that I had no appropriation available for the purpose,

I have not at present any appropriation available for the purpose, and I am not quite sure that the maintenance and repairs of what is in reality the substructure of this bridge ought not to be attended to by either the provincial or the local authorities. However, if my hon. friend will be content to have the motion amended by adding the words, ' and also all the correspondence concerning the construction of those wharfs and of their use as piers for a bridge,' I shall be very glad to have the correspondence brought down, and I will then give further careful consideration to the question of making expenditures for the repairs of these alleged wharfs, but what are in reality bridge piers.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman consent to amend his motion as suggested?

Mr. MONK. I do not mind, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is as pleasant and oily in his words as he is in his letters. From the correspondence which I had with my hon. friend, I understood that he had given some attention to this matter and looked at it in a serious way, and intended to examine whether, this being really government property, the government had a right to allow it to perish without repairing it. My hon. friend does not seem to have paid any attention whatever to that point. He is satisfied with a comment upon the circumstances which existed at that very distant period when these piers were built.. Would it not rather be proper for my hon. friend to declare whether the government intends keeping these wharfs as its own property or abandoning them to the provincial govenments or the parties to whom they are useful? Does he not think he might have given a few moments to that point, which is the only serious one in the matter. In 1904, either he or his predecessor took an entirely different view and repaired these wharfs. Why will not the present minister do that to-day? In 1904, no question was raised as to where or what was the origin of this public work. The local member for the county then happened to belong to the same political faith as my hon. friend and urged that the work be done. It was done. But because this year the local member does not belong to his political faith, my hon. friend takes an entirely different view, and has not even taken the trouble to make up his mind as to whether we would say to the people that the federal government does not think it ought to keep these works and is prepared to deed them to the provincial government, or that the provvincial government having repaired that bridge and having placed it upon these piers, should take over the whole business. He has not thought of that at all, but has indulged in a few pleasantries at the expense of my hon. friend from Toronto, because forsooth, some twenty years ago, other considerations entered into the construction of these piers which neither my hon. friend nor I know anything about. Certainly from the admirable letters my hon. friend wrote me, one would judge that they were written by some courtier of the court of Louis XIV., and I could not imagine from them that he would get up here and state that he would not repair the piers or allow any one else to repair them. That is indeed a very sad disappointment. As regards the amendment suggested by my hon. friend, I have no objection whatever. There is navigation there, and these wharfs were constructed because they were required for that locality, and they are in a locality which pays one fourth of the taxes in the Dominion. I refer to the Island of Montreal. But this government has built wharfs since where there is no navigation at all. They built a wharf at Disraeli, and we have evidence that the cows are now browsing around it. I am not blaming my hon. friend or the government, but I say that if sins have been committed in the past, they have been very admirable imitators.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RIVER DES PRAIRIES.

Mr. MONK moved:

For a copy of all petitions addressed to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, or to the government, or any department thereof; also, of all letters, correspondence of all kinds, and all reports had by the government in reference to the navigation, cleaning and deepening of the river known as River des Prairies, following along the northern boundary of the Island of Montreal.

He said: This is a motion for copies of petitions which have been sent in to the government during the past year in connection with some works required in the River des Prairies, which is the river where the wharfs mentioned a few moments ago were constructed. In this case, however, the works asked for interest not only the county of Jacques Cartier but the county of Laval, where a supporter of my hon. friend has been elected, which gives me great confidence that this motion will be given greater consideration than the one just disposed of. This river runs from the Lake of Two Mountains through these two counties down to the St. Lawrence at the lower end of the Island of Montreal. It has been very carefully examined and surveyed by the Georgian Bay Canal Survey Commission. The government therefore, is in possession of all the necessary information, not only for the execution of the Georgian Bay canal but also for the comparatively insignificant work referred to in this motion. The projected Georgian

Bay canal will either, according to the survey and report of the engineer, pass by way of Lachine, where the Lachine canal now runs, or else, coming down the Ottawa, go through the River des Prairies from end to end, and join the St. Lawrence a few miles below the city of Montreal but in the port of Montreal. This latter alternative, which is less costly than the other, presents many other advantages. At any rate the government are possessed of the necessary information to determine whether the work of cleaning up this river and opening it to a certain amount of navigation can be accomplished. I may say that the River des Prairies on the northern side of the Island of Montreal is the resort of a very large number of summer residents, who have large interests in the city of Montreal and pay heavy taxes. Moreover there are along that river thriving villages requiring a great deal of building material and other traffic which could be carried much more cheaply and conveniently by boat than by any other way. The work of deepening this river to the extent of three or four feet, removing the boulders, and making it navigable for vessels of small draught, would entail in reality very little expenditure and prove extremely beneficial and advantageous to the whole locality. I sent these petitions to the Minister of Public Works and always got very gracious and courteous acknowledgments of the resolutions passed by the different municipalities. There was a resolution unanimously adopted by the municipality of Cartierville, an important and flourishing village in the county of Jacques Cartier, and also one from the municipality of Ahuntsic, a little below Cartierville, which called on the government to do what is required in order to facilitate navigation by small vessels from Sault aux Recollets or from the Lake of Two Mountains to Montreal or Ottawa. The municipality of Ste. Geneviève also passed a resolution calling on the government to have this work executed, and I will read a letter which I received from the boating club of Cartierville—a very important sporting association, and very much interested in this matter. The club expresses the desire that parliament should be made acquainted with the contents of this letter. I may say that the government has executed works of dredging in the county of Vaudreuil presumably for public purposes but in reality to accommodate private interests. There was dredging in the county of Vaudreuil, asked for by the member for that county, to facilitate the approach to an icehouse belonging to a private individual.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has been misinformed.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. MONK. No, these facts are well known. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) will come with me to the place I will show him that it is quite evident that the work was done for private purposes. The hon. gentleman must remember also that dredging was done around some of the islands in Vaudreuil to benefit men politically important, friends of the hon. minister, who owned islands in that locality. They wanted their islands enlarged by dredging the lake and placing the dredged material on the island. In fact the domain of these owners has been extended by my hon. friend's dredging. And I think dredging of the same kind was done in Nicolet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Long ago.

Mr. MONK. No, not long ago. In fact, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that it is going on now. Thev are dredging across the river St. Lawrence opposite the county of Nicolet, in quicksand or clay, at a point where the current of the St. Lawrence is so rapid that, as everybody in that section knows, the trench dug by the dredge is filled up in forty-eight hours. But the dredge returns every year and continues digging in this trench which is filling up as it is made. This, no doubt, has emboldened my young friends of the Cartierville Boating Club to think that, if dredging is done in the way I have indicated, it might be done for the purpose of affording facilities of navigation for their club and the residents of the locality. This is the letter of the club:

Cartierville Boating Club,
Montreal, Sept. 23, 1909.

Mr. F. D. Monk, K.C., M.P,

Dear Mr. Monk, as you are doubtless aware, the Rivière des Prairies is shallow and rocky in many places between Cartierville and Lake of Two Mountains and has practically no navigable channel for anything larger than a canoe in many places and at low water not even a canoe can be paddled up the worst of the shallows.

Your two hundred and fifteen fellow-members of the Cartierville Boating Club, many of them owning motor boats as well as canoes and skiffs are thus restricted from using the upper portion of this beautiful river and the Lake of Two Mountains except at highwater, and I have been asked to write to you saying that they earnestly request that you will bring to bear all the influence possible.

Very little influence, I am afraid, with my hon. friend or his government.

In order to have our government take the necessary steps to have the river made navigable under low water conditions for boats of say four to five feet draft.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. member (Mr. Monk) say that a canoe cannot float on these shallows now, and that he wants five feet of cutting done in solid rock?

Mr. MONK. There is no solid rock, and to deepen the river to five feet would not be very costly, while it would enable motor boats and small craft to go up that river to the Lake of Two Mountains which affords access to great stretches of navigation. Certainly there is more water there than in the Newmarket canal.

Our club may now be considered a body of some importance in aquatic matters about the Island of Montreal. Its members consist for the most part of rising young business and professional men of Montreal and Westmount, and the summer residents of Cartierville, together with some of the well-known men of affairs in the vicinity, such as:—Hugh Paton, president, Shedden Forwarding Co., J. C. King, of Warden, King, Limited, E. W. Barlow, of Barlow, Mongenais & Co., J. A. Bremner, of Alex. Bremner, Bleury St., C. E. Hanna, secretary of the Dominion Textile Co., Limited, S. C. Jones, of S. C. Jones & Co., Importers, H. F. Stearns of the Dominion Wadding Co., and many others.

The Club stands for clean sport in its best sense, and is doing everything in its power to further the interests of boating particularly, and, in its small way, the welfare of Canada generally.

We would ask you then, as one of its members, as well as the county's official representative, to put the club's request before parliament at your first opportunity and to do your utmost to have this matter put through.

Will you please be good enough to write to me saying what we may expect you to do for us.

Awaiting your reply, I am, sir,
Yours very truely,
F. B. Brown,
Honorary Sec.-Treasurer.

Now, I will send my reply as soon as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) states that, as this work is not very costly, as he has all the information necessary in his department, and as the interests are worthy of consideration, he will have that work executed next summer and give satisfaction to this large number of interested parties.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I do not think I can properly allow the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to pass without some observations from me, especially in view of the fact that he has made the statement that this work will be one of very trifling cost and suggests that therefore I ought to do it as a matter of course. I am quite sure that my hon. friend has been misinformed with regard to the cost. The river, at the point at which the department is asked to dredge it, is very rocky and is full of boulders. As the petition states—and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) stated also—at present at times, there is scarcely water enough to float a canoe. The department is asked to dredge so that there shall be a navigable channel with four or five feet depth of water. I may say, I am having the matter inquired into. I have been very strongly pressed to do this work, not only by my hon. friend, but by the hon. gentleman representing the constituency of Laval (Mr. Wilson). But I may say to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that, if the doing of this work had to depend entirely upon the fact that it would be of some advantage to the boating club to which my hon. friend refers, and whose members have appealed to him so strongly as a fellow-member, I am afraid I should not be able to look upon it favourably. I do not think that the money of this country should be expended, in very large amounts at all events, for the purpose of improving navigation in order simply to accommodate those who are members of boating clubs and desire to use small motor boats, rowboats and the like. But the hon. member for Laval has put the case upon a very much stronger ground. He stated that in the locality and along this river for a number of miles there is a community of very prosperous farmers who would find it of very great advantage in getting their produce to market if there was navigation upon this river.

Mr. MONK. I think I stated that also.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an argument that has impressed me, and by reason of that argument having been presented, I have directed the resident engineer to make a report; and, if it is found reasonably possible, at a moderate expense, to give navigation which will enable the farmers better to take their produce to market and thus cheapen the cost of transportation, I shall be very happy indeed if I can meet their request. Of course, I can make no promise until we have the report of the engineer and a very complete estimate of the cost of the proposed dredging work.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Are we not going to proceed with the business? This is government day, there are matters that we could advance to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is very impatient, it seems to me. There is no business on the paper that could come before the House at the present moment. There was a motion to be introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue, which will come up to-morrow.

Mr. MONK. This is government day, and for my own part I am ready for business, and anxious to advance it. It is only half past four o'clock. There is not a single

piece of government business ready for us to attend to; I think that fact ought to be insisted upon. For my own part I am not satisfied, and I would like to proceed with the business for which we have been summoned to parliament.

INDIAN LANDS IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA.

Mr. J. HERRON (Macleod). Before the House adjourns, I wish to bring before the House a matter which I consider urgent, and of considerable public importance. It affects more particularly the Department of the Interior, and I am sorry the Minister of the Interior is not in his place; he is probably not far away. He is aware of the fact that I was going to bring this matter up. It refers to the disposal of some Indian lands in the province of Alberta.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not quite regular for the hon. member to introduce a discussion on this question. We have laid down the rule that it is only in cases of urgency that a matter can be brought before the House on a motion to adjourn. If we allow a discussion to a motion to adjourn, another rule requires a formal motion for the purpose of bringing up the question. I would like the opinion of the House on this point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the amendment you refer to was one restricting the rule that a motion to adjourn is always in order. That rule was found to be somewhat subject to abuse, and it was therefore restricted. Thus, the right to move a question for the discussion of a particular subject on a motion to adjourn the House, is qualified; it exists only on certain conditions. I do not think that that particular restriction has any bearing on a debate which may take place when the Prime Minister or member of the government who is leading the House, actually moves that the House shall adjourn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With all deference to your position, it seems to me that the interpretation of the rule given by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is correct. The object of the rule is not to interrupt the business of the House by a motion to adjourn.

Mr. HERRON. I shall take up the time of the House but for a few moments. I desire to refer to a sale of land occupied by Indians, that was advertised to take place on the 24th of this month. The reserve is situated between Macleod and Pincher Creek, where I live. The quantity of land is something less than a township. A majority of the Indians on the reserve that own the land are required to give their consent to a disposal of any portion of the land. Be that as it may, I am not thoroughly posted. It is claimed that when the first vote was taken half of the Indians on this reserve did not know the vote was to be taken to dispose of their land. It seems the majority was not sufficiently large to authorize a disposal of the land. It is alleged that the Indians were induced in some way to leave the reserve and be absent when the second vote was taken, and the second vote did not carry by a sufficient majority. A third vote was therefore necessary, and it is also alleged that some inducements were offered to some of the Indians who opposed the selling of the land to be absent, and on the third vote the proposition was carried. Now the sale is advertised to take place on the 24th of this month, and the Indians are apparently making a pretty vigorous protest, that is those who were opposed to the selling of this land. For my own part I am not prepared to say whether it would be a good thing for the Indians to dispose of a portion of their land or not at the present time. I think it would be rather to their advantage to sell the land. But that is not for me to say here to-day. I desire to draw this matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior in order that he may be acquainted with the facts. Perhaps they may be serious.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior). I am sorry the hon. member has not seen fit to ask for the production of the papers in this matter, because had the papers been before the House, there would have been an opportunity for all members on both sides to acquaint themselves with the actual facts of the case. However, as the question has been brought forward by my hon. friend; and as it happens I am personally familiar with the facts to a considerable extent, I may take the opportunity of placing them before the House, with the hope, however, that later on my hon. friend will move for the papers, and that they will be placed before the House.

Mr. HERRON. I have moved for the papers.

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. gentleman has said, the Indian reserve in question is situated between the two towns of Macleod and Pincher Creek, in Southern Alberta. The reserve is a very large one, and it is occupied by about 500 Indians. It is much larger than that number of Indians are entitled to under the treaty. But the reserve having been set apart for that band, they exercise proprietary rights in regard to the whole area. This band as well as several others in Southern Alberta, have made considerable progress towards self support. They have emerged from the condition of absolute dependence on the government, and to a great extent they now earn their own living, either by working for wages amongst the farmers and others

outside of the reserve, or by rearing stock and cultivating land within the reserve. Recently the development of agriculture in Southern Alberta has been such that it has borne in upon the minds of these people the possibilities that there are in the raising of crops upon their reservation, and they have from time to time approached officials of the department with the request that they be outfitted with the necessary implements and seed which would enable them to cultivate on a larger scale than at present.

Although the conditions of farming are perhaps not as arduous in the west as they are in the east, still farming requires capital; there must be motive power and machinery to break up the land, sow the crop and harvest it. The Indians could not be placed in a position to carry on farming operations without an expenditure of money. Their land has become very valuable by reason of the increase of settlement in the vicinity and it did not seem to the department reasonable that parliament should be asked to vote large sums of money to supply the Indians with a farming equipment when these Indians in their own property had ample means to supply their requirements. The matter has been under discussion for some time and naturally there are differences of opinion among the band on the subject. A member of the band who had a good farming outfit, with stock and a house, would naturally not be in favour of disposing of any of the land, whereas a member who had no equipment or cultivation would naturally be inclined to view the proposition with favour. The question was brought before the band as provided by the Indian Act, the proposition being to sell for the benefit of the band, a certain portion of the reserve on the side towards the town of Macleod. That proposition was not received with favour by the band. It was then proposed to surrender another portion of the reserve and this too was not received with favour. A third proposition was made for the surrender of a portion of land on the northwest portion of the reserve, which lay across the Old Man river from the portion of the reserve that was principally occupied by the Indians and this proposition was received with favour by the band. On a vote being taken, a majority of 12 of those present voted in favour of the sale of that portion of the reserve. This vote having been taken and it being considered by the department to be in the interests of the band that this land, which was of practically no value to the Indians, should be utilized to outfit them so as to enable them not only to earn their own living but to actually become profitable producers in the country, the surrender was accepted and means were taken to dispose of the property to the best advantage. Some 35 sections of land are involved. I visited the land myself. It is to a large extent very desirable land and no doubt will produce at the sale which is advertised to take place on the 24th of this month, a very substantial amount, which will certainly be sufficient to so equip the Indians as to enable them to support themselves on the portion of the reserve which they retain. That is our belief and in that belief we have been prepared to go on with the sale. When the papers are laid before the House they will show that there is no foundation for any suggestion of impropriety on the part of the department in the matter.

There is, as I have said, a difference of opinion between the Indians who have an equipment and the Indians who have not, but apparently the Indians who have not are in the majority, and as the law says that the majority shall rule, I see nothing else but to go on with the sale as has been intended. I held council with the Indians myself for some five hours and heard arguments on both sides very thoroughly threshed out, and I certainly was of the opinion that, the surrender having been made, the sale should be carried out.

ST. JOHN RIVER VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, New Brunswick). Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I would ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if the government have yet considered the proposal which was made to a sub-committee of the cabinet consisting of himself, the Minister of Railways (Hon. G. P. Graham), and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Wm. Pugsley), in April last by a delegation from New Brunswick for the construction of a railroad from Grand Falls to the city of St. John by the valley of the St. John river and, if so, what decision has been arrived at? The right hon gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that there was a very large delegation representing all the river counties of the province and that they represented to the sub-committee of the cabinet that they had the assurance of the government of New Brunswick that the Governor in Council of that province would undertake to guarantee bonds of any company undertaking the construction of that railway to the extent of $25,000 a mile, provided this government would agree to take over the line on completion and operate it as part of the Intercolonial system on the basis of a rental of forty per cent of the gross revenue. The delegation asked for an early reply in order that the necessary legislation might be put through the New Brunswick legislature at the last session, which was then expected to prorogue in the course of a few days. I remember the Prime Min-

ister stating that he considered the proposal a very definite one and intimating that a reply would be given in a very short time. Notwithstanding that assurance, I understand that there has since been no official communication to the government of New Brunswick, or to any other authority, in reference to the action of the government, and I would like to know now if the matter has been considered, and if so, what decision has been arrived at.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has desired that, as this is a matter affecting more particularly the province of New Brunswick, and as I am very familiar with what has taken place, I should reply to the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) for information. I may say to him that no proposal was made to this government by the government of New Brunswick, but a proposal was made on behalf of a company which, we were informed, was incorporated by the legislature of New Brunswick. The members of the company were present, and I think also some officials of the province, particularly the Provincial Secretary, the Hon. Mr. Fleming. It was stated at that time that the company had the assurance of the provincial government that they would ask from the legislature of the province authority to guarantee the bonds of the railway company to the extent of $25,000 a mile, provided the Dominion government would agree that the Intercolonial railway should operate the line as a part of the government railway system and would pay over to the province forty per cent of the gross earnings. The government took the matter into consideration and a short time afterwards the government were informed that the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) had received a telegram from the company stating that they were desirous of having a reply to the proposals which had been submitted. The member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) interviewed the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways, and myself, and possibly other members of the government, and as a result of that interview he wired, as he was authorized to wire, to the company, that before giving—I am now stating the effect of the telegram, I do not profess to give the exact words.

Mr. CARVELL. I have the telegram here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the telegram which the hon. member for Carleton sent to the secretary of the company:

Ottawa, April 28, '09.

J. J. Winslow, Fredericton, N.B.

Before the Dominion government can give positive answer they require information as to details of proposition. They suggest that the local government pass legislation authorizing guarantee subject to conditions that the Dominion government make satisfactory agreement to operate.

F. B. CARVELL.

Mr. CROCKET. By whom was the member for Carleton authorized to convey that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have stated that that was sent after consultation by the member for Carleton with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways, and myself, and the member for Carleton was authorized to send that telegram in answer to a telegram from the secretary of the company, addressed not to the government but to the member for Carleton.

Mr. CARVELL. I have the telegram sent to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the telegram dated April 27, 1909; from the secretary of the company to the member for Carleton:

'Fredericton, N.B., April 27, 1909.

F. B. Carvell, M.P., Ottawa.

We are credibly informed that local government will not introduce legislation guaranteeing bonds Valley railway unless prior assurance is received that Dominion government will operate road on completion. Would it be possible for you to obtain this assurance and wire us at once, as House rises Thursday or Friday.

J. J. F. WINSLOW, Secretary.'

The member for Carleton upon receiving that telegram saw the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways, and myself, and he was authorized to send to Mr. Winslow the telegram of April the 28th, which I have read to the House. I may say that subsequently I received communications from the mayor of Fredericton, who is the president of the company, and I submitted the correspondence to the Prime Minister and also to the Minister of Railways, and as a result of the interviews I had with my colleagues I made it very plain and clear to the company that before this government could give a definite answer it would be necessary that a definite proposition should be submitted on behalf either of the company or of the provincial government. I called the attention of the company to the fact that an ofler to merely construct a road without specifying what was to be the standard of construction, what the grades, what the weight of rails, what the kind of bridges and culverts, what the equipment of the road, and without specifying these, to ask this government to agree that the road should be operated upon the basis of paying over to the provincial government 40 per cent of the gross earnings, was too indefinite a proposition for this government to consider.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the minister allow me a question right there? Does the

minister remember the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways, or himself, making any intimation to the delegation that such details as these would be required before this government would consider the proposal? Not a question indicating any such suggestion was asked by one of them. On the contrary the Prime Minister as already pointed out, described the proposal as a definite one which would have to be considered by the cabinet and intimated that an answer would be given in the course of a few days.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not stated it was asked at the conference referred to, but I have stated that it was asked in a telegram which the member for Carleton sent, and I have also stated that it was asked distinctly and clearly in the letters which I wrote to the secretary and president of the company. These letters I wrote not only upon my responsibility as the minister representing the province, but also after a conference and also a full understanding with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that no legislation was introduced into the New Brunswick legislature by the provincial government, and no proposition has yet been made by the provincial government in response to the suggestions made by the member for Carleton and which were afterwards made by myself in the letters to which I have referred.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the minister if the government took the proposition that they would not consider the proposal until it was put in the form of a statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. I hope I made myself clear to the hon. gentleman. What I stated was that before this government would consider the proposal as to whether or not the Intercolonial would operate this railway upon the basis of paying over to the province 40 per cent of the gross earnings, they must know the character of the road which it was proposed to build, what would be the grades, what the description of bridges, what the weight of the rails, and what the equipment, in order that they might determine intelligently whether or not the road could be operated upon the percentage basis proposed.

Mr. CROCKET. One other question: Has not the government of New Brunswick asked for a conference with a sub-committee of the Council to discuss these matters to which the minister has referred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the government of New Brunswick has not directly asked for a conference, but the railway company has written to me asking that I would arrange for a conference. I have written back to the president of the company to say that I was authorized by my colleagues to state that when a definite proposition along the lines which I have indicated was submitted to the government, I would be most happy to arrange the earliest date possible for a conference, but that until a definite proposition was submitted, I was unable to see what would be the advantage of a conference.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 17, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. H MILLER (South Grey) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Interest Act. He said: The effect of this Bill will be to compel mortgagees to accept payment of overdue principal on mortgages on real estate upon receipt of one month's notice or one month's interest in lieu of notice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER ON DEBATE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). By your leave Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an incident which took place yesterday. On motion to adjourn, a debate was started by my hon. friend from York, N. B., (Mr Crocket) and you, Sir, expressed the opinion that such a debate was irrelevant on a motion to adjourn. This opinion of yours was questioned by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and I agreed with the hon. gentleman in the opinion he expresed. On looking into the matter I find that your opinion was the correct one, and that so far as I am concerned, I was in the wrong. The point has been decided several times, I find, in this parliament. In 1899, Mr. Speaker Edgar ruled as follows, as reported in 'Hansard' of May 29 of that year :

If the hon. member wishes my ruling, I may say, that I have stated to the House several times my view of the motion to adjourn. There are three kinds of motion to adjourn the House ; I mean to say that they have three different effects. One is a motion to adjourn the House made while a debate is going

on. That is in order to give a member who has already spoken in that debate, or any other member, an opportunity to speak again on the subject under discussion. Another kind of motion to adjourn the House is the motion that is made by the government to close the sitting of the House. That is really not a debatable motion. The other kind of motion is such a one as has just been made by the hon. member for York, N.B., that is a substantive motion to adjourn the House in the interval of the proceedings, which motion may be moved by an hon. member in order to bring up a particular important or unimportant public question.

I may say that we have a new rule with regard to private motions, which was adopted eight years ago. In 1901, on February 18, Mr. Speaker Brodeur also decided the point, and his opinion is recorded in these words:

I may tell the hon. member that on the motion for the adjournment of the House, the only question to be discussed is whether the House should adjourn now or not. When the orders of the day are called, if a formal motion for adjournment is made, not by a member of the Cabinet, but by some other hon. member, in order to bring up a question for discussion, he has a right to discuss that special question; but on the motion for the adjournment of the House, which is the one made now, I do not think there can be any debate except on the question whether the House should now adjourn or not.

I understand that this opinion has been expressed twice by Speakers of the House, so it was come to after careful consideration with the Clerk of the House, at that time Sir John Bourinot, who, as we know, was quite an authority on the subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I questioned your ruling, and I confess that you were in the right and I was in the wrong.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, I am not at all convinced by the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not surprised at that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not surprised that my right hon. friend is not surprised, because he has never been able to convince me. My idea, which I submit with all deference, is that any hon. member can argue that the House should not be adjourned until he has obtained some information upon a public question which he presents. That seems to me to be a very reasonable view. The proposal is that the House shall adjourn. The hon. member who desires to discuss an important subject says: 'It is not desirable to adjourn the House at present, but it is time for the government to give information upon a particular point as to which I desire information, and I do not consent that the House shall adjourn until I have obtained that information.' In that way he is arguing strictly and definitely upon the point of immediate adjournment; and with all deference to the views which have been expressed by Mr. Speaker Edgar and Mr. Speaker Brodeur, and with all deference to the opinion which has been vouchsafed by the Prime Minister and by Mr. Speaker, I would like to look a little into the English authorities to ascertain whether that point cannot be made good.

QUESTIONS.

DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. How many employees of the Intercolonial have been dismissed since the appointment of the commissioners charged with the administration of the affairs of this railway?

2. How many employees of the Intercolonial have been dismissed at Montreal and Campbellton since the establishment of the commission?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I want to ask the hon. gentleman to be patient in regard to answers to questions of this character. It will take days to get this information. It has to come from Moncton, and sometimes from various other stations along the line. But I have asked for the information by wire.

NATIONALITIES OF IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

What is the total number of persons from the five largest national contributors who have settled in Canada for each year from 1890 to 1909, inclusive?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The total number of persons from the largest five national contributors who have settled in Canada for each year from 1897 to 1909, inclusive:

—	British Isles.	United States.	Galicia.	Italy.	Russia.
1897....	11,383	2,412	3,917	†	†
1898....	11,608	9,119	5,509	†	†
1899....	10,660	11,945	6,700	398	8,085
1900*...	5,141	8,543	4,992	957	1,287
1900-01.	11,810	18,055	4,702	4,710	1,726
1901-02.	17,259	26,461	6,550	3,828	3,771
1902-03.	41,792	49,473	8,382	3,371	7,239
1903-04.	50,374	45,229	7,729	4,445	2,800
1904-05.	65,359	43,652	6,926	3,473	3,234
1905-06.	86,796	57,919	5,656	7,959	4,459
1906-07.	55,791	34,659	1,652	5,114	2,976
1907-08.	120,182	58,312	14,268	11,212	7,493
1908-09.	52,901	59,832	6,644	4,228	4,216
	541,056	425,611	83,627	49,695	47,286

* Six months. † Not recorded.

Note.—The particulars asked for are not of record prior to 1897.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—COST OF SECTIONS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What is the cost per mile to date of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Edmonton?
2. What amount per mile is estimated to complete this section?
3. What is the same information as respects the section from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction?
4. What is the exact mileage of each section?
5. What has been expended to date on the Moncton-Quebec section?
6. What is estimated as necessary to complete this section, and what is the exact mileage?
7. What has been expended to date on the section from Edmonton to Prince Rupert, and what is now estimated as necessary to finish it?
8. What is the exact mileage of this section?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This question is divided into three parts. I could give reply to a portion of it now, but I would prefer if the member for North Toronto could wait until to-morrow, when I will answer it altogether.

WATER LOTS ON ST. CHARLES RIVER.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Are the two water lots on the St. Charles river situate in front cadastral lots Nos. 582A and 583B, of the parish of St. Roch, in the county of Quebec, the property of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, under the statutes governing that body?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). We have written to Quebec to get the information, and it has not yet reached us.

INDIANS OF ST. PETER'S BAND.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to any dissatisfaction on the part of the Indians of St. Peter's band regarding the manner in which it is alleged they claim to have been improperly treated by speculators or others in the matter of the land allotted to them by the government in connection with the surrender of their reserve at St. Peter's? If so, is it the intention of the government to take such action in the premises as may prevent any injustice to the said Indians?
2. Has the government been made aware of any claim on the part of the said Indians that they have been deceived into signing away their lands for less than one-third of their real value?
3. If so, is it the intention of the administration to take proceedings to punish any parties that may be proved guilty of such deception of the Indians?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The attention of the government has been called to dissatisfaction on the part of several Indians of the St. Peter's band in regard to non-payment of the purchase price of their lands, but inasmuch as the Indians refused to allow a clause to be inserted in the surrender preventing alienation without the consent of the department, and thereby assumed to deal with their allotments as ordinary citizens, the enforcement of any agreement for the sale rests with the courts and not with the Indian Department. Section 103 of the Indian Act provides that Indians may sue for debts due them or in respect of any tort or wrong inflicted upon them, or to compel the performance of obligations contracted with them.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.

WRECK OF STEAMER 'HESTIA'—CONDITION OF LIGHTS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is the Proprietor Ledge buoy in the Bay of Fundy listed officially as having both a light and a fog signal?
2. For how long before the wreck of the steamer 'Hestia' was the buoy marking these dangerous ledges without a working light or fog signal?
3. Had the defective condition of this buoy been reported to the department? If so, on what date, and by whom?
4. What officer of the department had charge of said buoy, light or automatic whistle?
5. What period of time elapsed between the report received at the department on the condition of said buoy and the giving of the orders to repair?
6. Why was not the buoy in working condition at the time of the wreck of the steamer 'Hestia'?

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

1. Yes.

2 and 3. St. John agency of the department was advised January 22, 1909, by the lightkeeper at Gull Cove that the light was out. The acting agent thereupon notified shipping interests and advertised in local papers on 25th January that light was out. The department at Ottawa was not aware of the irregularity. Whistle was found defective 7th November, 1909.

4. The buoy in question is part of the equipment under the care of the St. John agency of the department.

5 and 6. Light was reported out January 22, 1909. On January 23 and subsequent dates, orders were given by the acting agent, to relight, which orders were not carried into effect on account of adverse weather conditions also press of work in connection with more important aids to navigation.

WATER SUPPLY FOR DOMINION GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. Does the supply of water for the Dominion government buildings come from the Ot-

tawa city supply? If so, how many gallons daily are consumed?

2. How many persons use or are privileged to use the water?

3. Is the government aware that an analysis of Ottawa city water pronounce it contaminated?

4. Have the government experts yet investigated the system of purifying water by ozonization in use in Lindsay, Ontario? If not, will the government have an inspection made?

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

1. (a). Yes.

(b). As there are no meters on the supply, this question cannot be answered.

2. About 3,500 persons are privileged to use the water.

3. No. The department has received no notification from the Ottawa city health officer.

4. No information in the department.

VACANCY ON BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

Is it the intention of the government to fill the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners, caused by the death of the late Mr. Greenway? If so, when will the appointment be made?

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

The matter is still under consideration.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

Is it the intention of the government to introduce a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba during the present session of parliament?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). By a resolution adopted in this House on the 13th of July, 1908, this House authorized the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, out of the Northwest Territories, to an extent therein specified. On the 26th of February last the Prime Minister sent to the government of Manitoba for their consideration a Bill to increase the boundaries of Manitoba as defined in said resolution. Until the government of Manitoba has signified its acceptance of these boundaries, and until the Dominion government and the provincial government have come to an understanding as to the financial conditions consequent thereon, the government has no authority to introduce any legislation to give effect to the above resolution.

MAIL CARRIAGE—GRENVILLE STATION TO GRENVILLE VILLAGE.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. How many times and on what dates during the last fifteen years has the Post Office Department called for public tenders for carrying the mails between Grenville station and Grenville village, in Quebec?

2. When does the present contract expire?

3. Is it the intention of the department to advertise for fresh tenders for the renewal of the service? If not, why not?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Twice—12th November, 1897, and 27th October, 1905.

2 On the 31st December, 1909.

3. No. The present courier was offered and has accepted a renewal for a further term of four years.

VETERINARY SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Have there been since the 1st January, 1909, any vacancies in the Dominion Veterinary service for British Columbia?

2. If so, what persons, if any, have been appointed to fill such vacancies; and what have been the dates of their respective appointments and the dates upon which they have entered upon the duties of their office?

3. Is the staff complete at present?

4. Is there an official list of men eligible for appointment, by reason of having passed the required examination or otherwise? If so, is it the intention that preference shall be given to those whose names appear on said list?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes, there was one vacancy caused by the resignation on April 30, 1909, of T. Bowhill, F.R.C.V.S., who was engaged in a pathological investigation of the disease known as Red Water in cattle, and who occasionally also acted as a veterinary inspector.

2. Inspector Tamblyn, who has been in the service for nearly five years, was transferred from Midway to perform the inspection duties above referred to. Dr. Seymour Hadwen, of the Pathological staff of the Health of Animals Branch, who at the time of Mr. Bowhill's resignation was on leave for the purpose of taking a special course of instruction in Europe, was, in October last, sent to Vancouver to carry out the investigation of Red Water.

3. Yes.

4. (a) Yes (b) Yes, except in the case of persons who, to the knowledge of the department, are unsuitable for the proper performance of the official duties required.

ARMED VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What war vessels or training ships has the United States government upon the Great Lakes?

2. What war vessels or training ships have State governments upon the Great Lakes?

3. What are the armament, tonnage and men of each?

4. Which of these ships passed the Canadian canals?

5. Did any pass without permission of the Canadian government?

6. Where are these vessels located?

7. Has the province of Ontario any training ships on the Great lakes.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I informed my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) yesterday that, pending diplomatic action, it was not desirable to bring the information to the House at this moment.

SOUTH AFRICAN SCRIP.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has the government under contemplation the amendment of the law relating to the issue of South African scrip during this session, so as to recognize a considerable number not technically entitled under the present law to scrip?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No.

CANADIAN FLAG.

Mr. JAMESON asked:

1. Is there an officially authorized Canadian flag? If so, what is the design thereof, and when did same receive official saction?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to take necessary measures to provide a distinctive ensign?

3. Will the proposed Canadian navy fly the British or Canadian flag?

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

1. The red ensign of His Majesty's fleet, defaced with the Canadian coat of arms in the fly. Authorized by Admiralty warrant of the 2nd February, 1892, to be used on board vessels registered in the Dominion, and, the blue ensign of His Majesty's fleet, defaced as above, for use on board vessels belonging to or permanently in the service of the Dominion. This flag is authorized by the King's Regulations, no special warrent being required.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The matter is under consideration by the Admiralty.

VISIT OF GENERAL SIR JOHN FRENCH.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government any data regarding a visit to be paid to Canada during 1910 by General Sir John French?

2. If so, is it intended to have as many militia camps as possible inspected by General French during his visit?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). There is no official information on this subject yet.

DISCOVERY OF PETROLEUM IN THE WEST.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government any reliable data that petroleum has been found in commercial quantities in the Canadian Northwest? If so, what are the details?

2. Does the government charge a royalty on each gallon of oil produced in the Northwest?

3. Is a pipe line now under construction from near Fort MacMurray to Edmonton?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. While evidence, which would appear to be reliable, has been obtained to show that petroleum in considerable quantities has been discovered in the Canadian Northwest, it would appear that further development will be necessary to establish the discovery of this product in large quantities.

2. The regulations provide that a royalty, at such rate as may from time to time be specified by order in council, will be levied and collected upon the sales of the petroleum. No royalty, however, has yet been fixed or collected.

3. The department has no information.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Was a special issue of rifles made to the last Bisley team from Canada or to any of the members thereof? If so, of what manufacture, the mark thereof, was such issue a free issue, or was it made on repayment; how many rifles of that mark were manufactured, and on issue to Canadian corps, or rifle associations, on the date of sailing of the Canadian Bisley team from Canada, giving names of corps or associations and number on issue to each?

2. How many have been since manufactured, and to whom issued?

3. Was any certificate given to this Bisley team or any member thereof that the issue of rifles with which they were supplied was the service weapon of Canada, and was on issue to certain corps of the active militia? If so, by whom was such certificate given and what was the nature thereof?

4. Are all parts of the Ross rifle now manufactured in Canada or British possessions? If not, what parts are now manufactured outside of Canada; where manufactured, in what stage of manufacture when imported and are customs duty paid thereon?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes. Ross Rifle Mark II**. Issue made in regular way, in accordance with the regulations, the rifles remaining government property.

8th Royal Rifles—10; Bisley Team—25, being the first rifles delivered of the order for 500 of the same mark.

2. 465 issued as follows:—23 to permanent units, 87 to non-permanent units, 2 to rifle associations, 10 to school of musketry, 3 to Dominion Rifle Association, 12 to individuals, 328 in ordnance charge, being distributed to best shooting regiments in each district at the discretion of the D.O.C.

3. No.

4. The manufacture of these rifles is proceeding on the same lines as during the past few years, all the work being perform-

ed and the material procured in Canada so far as possible.

CHARGES AGAINST MAJOR AND CAPT. DELARONDE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Have any charges of malfeasance of office been laid against any officers of No. 5 Company, Canadian Army Service Corps? If so, against whom?
2. Was any court of inquiry convened in the matter of any such charges? If so, by whose order was such court convened, and what instructions were issued for its guidance?
3. Do any such charges constitute indictable offences under the Criminal Code or under the Militia Act?
4. Was it established before any such court that public moneys have been paid out by the Militia Department upon fraudulent claims, vouchers, or pay-lists?
5. If so, what steps have been taken by the government to recover moneys so paid out upon fraudulent claims?
6. What steps have been taken to send persons charged with such offences for trial as provided by statute?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes, against Major Stuart E. de la Ronde, sr., and Captain Stuart E. de la Ronde, jr.
2. Yes, a Court of Inquiry was convened by the District Officer Commanding Military District No. 4. The only instructions issued to the court for its guidance were, that it was assembled for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting upon certain charges made against Major Stuart E. de la Ronde, Sr., and Captain Stuart E. de la Ronde, Jr., No. 5 Company, C.A.S.C., by Lieut. A. A. Pinard and Lieut. C. D. Spittal, No. 5 Company, C.A.S.C.; that the evidence was to be taken on oath, and that witnesses would be warned to attend.

3, 4, 5, 6. The whole case is under the consideration of the Department of Justice.

ARMED VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. EDWARDS moved:

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, documents, correspondence and papers from January 1, 1897, to January 1, 1907, relating to the passage of United States warships or training ships through the St. Lawrence canals and the Great Lakes; also, for a copy of all orders in council, reports, documents, correspondence and papers on the subject from March 30, 1908, to the present time.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no objection at all to the first part of the motion which reads as follows:

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, documents, correspondence and papers from January 1, 1897, to January 1, 1907, relating to the passage of United States warships or training ships through the St. Lawrence canals and the Great Lakes.

There is no objection to that being granted. I would ask my hon. friend not to press the other portion of his motion which reads as follows:

Also, for a copy of all orders in council, reports, documents, correspondence and papers on the same subject from March 30, 1908, to the present time.

The reason is that this matter is now the subject of diplomatic action. I, therefore, move to strike out the last part and I suggest that the motion as amended be adopted.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no objection in view of the explanation of the right hon. gentlemen. Perhaps later on, after the information has been brought down, the latter part of the motion may be adopted.

Motion as amended agreed to.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier)—moved:

That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to investigate the different systems of proportional representation adopted or suggested elsewhere, as an improvement upon our present method of election, with power to extend said inquiry to all the various forms of the proportional representation, laws proposed or in force; and with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time.

He said: This is a motion which was presented to the House last year and was adopted in the form in which it was now renewed. There was something in the beginning of the motion presented last year which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) desired to be changed. There was a modification made in the motion and I present it now in the form in which it was finally carried by the House last year. The motion last year was adopted, I think, at a late date in the month of March and very soon after the motion had been adopted before the committee was named, or the motion could be acted upon, it became evident that the session was going to be considerably abridged for various reasons. In consequence of that, after having conferred with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) it was determined to take no action upon the motion of last session, it being considered that there would be no time for the committee to sit and take evidence before prorogation. There were at that time additional reasons for deferring the inquiry. There had been a movement in England for the constitution of a commission of inquiry into the question of electoral reform generally and particularly into this ques-

tion of proportional representation and pending the report of that commission, it was thought advisable that we should not proceed with our inquiry. Since that date a royal commission of eight members has been named in England with Lord Richard Cavendish as chairman. That commission has concluded the taking of evidence and I have no doubt that within a month the final report of that commission will be in the hands of the public in England. Through the courtesy of the members of the commission I have been furnished with advance sheets of the evidence so that that evidence will be available for our own committee. At the same time an investigation was in progress in France having for its object specifically proportional representation. That commission has since made its report and if I am not mistaken it is being considered at this moment by the legislature of France. Recent papers publish reports of the debates upon the report of the commission which is very full and there is a very remarkable speech by Mr. Paul Deschennels, one of the members of the commission. Thus, our committee will now have the advantage of having before them the results of these two very important investigations.

After the explanations which I gave towards the close of the last session, it will not be necessary for me to again set out the merits of this question. Several members of the House at that time took some interest in the question and I shall not take up the time of the House by traversing the same ground again. Since the adoption of this motion at the last session there have been a great many discussions on this subject which has become a very burning question in England, France and other countries, particularly in the United States, and all that has been written upon the subject will be available for this committee. I have also ascertained that there are witnesses in this country who are experts in the matter of proportional representation and would be able to give evidence of local interest and of a local character showing how the system might advantageously be applied in this country. There are men who have studied the question in all the provinces and who will be easily available to give evidence before that committee as to the utility of proportional representation in our own country. The subject has great actual interest and invites attention, and I feel that we should take it up so as to gather all necessary information on it.

Proportional representation, as the House knows, has been adopted in New Zealand, Tasmania and Australia, and it is embodied as a principle in the new constitution of the South African confederation, and will probably have in practice a greater expansion than it is designed to have by the constitutional enactment recently adopted in the imperial parliament.

It is very necessary for us to be equipped with that information and to have before us all the evidence which would enable the House to take up the question as a practical question. We are all aware of the abuses that exist in connection with the present electoral system, the 'one man, one constituency' system, with the plural majority only. We have adopted many laws since I have been in parliament to correct these abuses, but, so far as I am aware, the legislation designed for that purpose has not been at all productive of the results that we anticipated. I submit to the House that the real remedy lies in a radical change of our electoral system which would root out the cause of the evils, which as long as the cause remains will continue to exist in this country. I therefore submit this proposal with confidence to the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, if I understand aright, the action of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) this session is more diligent than his action of last year. I understand that the reason for not proceeding with this committee last session, although it had been granted, was partly because he wanted to have the benefit of the information which was being collected in Great Britain. That information has not yet been collected, the report of the commission to which the subject has been entrusted has not yet been made or received.

Mr. MONK. Only the evidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Only the evidence. And although we have not yet received the report of the English commission my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) now suggests that we should adopt the motion. I have no objection to that, although we may have to wait for some time if we are to have the benefit of British experience before the committee. As to this I have nothing to say; we assented to the motion last year and we are prepared to assent to it this year also. It so happened last year that when my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) brought his motion I could not be in the House. I had looked into the question for my own information and had come to the conclusion in my own mind that there was some merit in the system of proportional representation which he suggests. I have not the figures which I had collected last year, but if I remember them aright, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, if at the last election we had had the system of proportional representation there would be more Grits in this House than there are to-day. Of the total vote cast in Ontario outside of the city of Toronto in

1908, there was a majority of Liberal electors and yet the result was to give a majority of representation in the province outside of the city of Toronto to the Conservative party of some five members. The Conservative majority from Ontario in this House is now about ten. Five are elected by Toronto, the other five being from different parts of the province and yet, if I remember aright, there was a large majority of Liberal votes over Conservative votes in the province outside of Toronto. Thus the result was to give to my friends on the other side of the House—on the wrong side of the House—a majority of five. In Toronto we could not carry one single seat, Toronto is a very fine city—I have the greatest admiration for the city itself and for the people of Toronto. The people of Toronto are a fine people, they are educated and progressive in a great many ways, but I regret to say that in political matters they seem to be hopelessly blind. It is perhaps more their misfortune than their fault and I sympathize with them. And, although the majority of the people of Toronto are on the wrong side of politics I am glad to say there is quite a proportion of Grits in that city, but they cannot succeed in electing a single member to this House. Probably it is in view of this that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) takes such a warm interest in the question, and I would be inclined to agree with him that such a condition of affairs as exists in Toronto should cease. Now, the question of proportional representation is not new in this country and it is not new in Ontario. Some twenty years ago the government of Sir Oliver Mowat passed a Bill which embodied this principle and as a consequence Mr. Joseph Tait, a gentleman well known to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, was elected as a Liberal member for the Ontario legislature, but although one would think such laudable legislation would have the support of gentlemen opposite, that law was repealed and there is no longer a Liberal member from Toronto in the Ontario legislature any more than there is in this parliament. From what little attention I have been able to give to the subject of proportional representation I think that while it may be satisfactory in countries with the governmental systems of Switzerland and the United States, it may not altogether be adapted to nations under the British system of parliamentary and responsible government. However, I am not prepared to discuss that question now ; I like to approach it with an open mind, and we have no objection to the committee being granted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have given a little attention to the subject and while no doubt the result of proportional representation is fairer in one way, yet, it may possibly lead to a difficulty in carrying on government by party where the popular vote is pretty nearly equally divided. For example, if the system had prevailed in Canada previous to the last general election the Prime Minister would to-day find himself sustained by a majority in this House of about three members instead of 47 or 48. No doubt the same consideration would apply to the conditions before 1896, when the Conservative government was in power with a substantial majority, although the popular vote was pretty equally divided. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has considered that difficulty. The government of the country must be carried on by one party or the other, and where the popular vote is nearly equally divided the system of proportional representation might lead to difficulty. Now, I wondered a little why the Prime Minister did not tell us of some of the results in the province of Quebec under our present system of representation. We have eleven members on this side from that province. Their quality is so excellent that I am bound to say that in that respect the Conservative vote of 130,000 in Quebec is very ably represented. But, if these 130,000 Conservative voters in Quebec had proportional representation, instead of having eleven Conservatives in this House we would have 28 or 30. Of course, if that illustration had occurred to my right hon. friend he would have mentioned it. I sympathize with the right hon. gentleman with regard to Toronto; I think he himself has told us that while the people of that city are on all occasions prepared to cheer for him, they are not prepared to vote for him, and I am inclined to think that condition will continue in the future notwithstanding that he did lay out the electoral divisions in Toronto in the firm hope that he would elect three supporters; an aspiration of his which has not been satisfied and as to which I tender him my sincere sympathy. However, the subject of proportional representation is well worthy of consideration by this House and I do not doubt that in its consideration we will receive a great deal of assistance from the report and evidence on the subject which are shortly to be presented to the Imperial House.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). I would direct the attention of the House to the fact,—and especially I would direct the attention of the Prime Minister to it—that one of the Conservative members from Toronto in the Ontario legislature had a majority greater than the combined majorities of all the Reformers who were elected to that legislature at the last election.

Mr. F. D. MONK. When I spoke in the House on this subject last year I presented a statement compiled by an expert mathematician—a statement which was endorsed by other experts—showing how many members, under a system of proportional representation should be assigned to each province on each side of the House. I will be frank enough to say that although I sent my right hon. friend a copy of my speech on that subject, I doubt if he did me the honour of reading it. As regards the situation in Toronto; there is no doubt that proportional representation would remedy the very unfortunate state of affairs there from the point of view of the Prime Minister. I believe there are in Toronto a few Grits, but since I have been in parliament I have never seen them represented here. Whereas under a system of proportional representation some relief would be given, and might possibly have the advantage of having one representative in this House. The chief advantage of proportional representation is that it provides representation for a minority who, under the single member constituency system, are never represented in this House. Some have never been since confederation and have naturally lost all interest in public affairs. The question raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is one of great importance and which has been considered by all those who have carefully studied it. Under the system, which is being promoted by the English proportional representation league, there might be some danger of the contingency referred to by my hon. friend. That league promotes the idea that every man should have one vote. In a constituency where there are several members to be elected, he has but one vote and gives that to one candidate, but he indicates on the ballot what are his second, third and fourth preferences. There is no party under that system. You have a certain number of candidates and the elector has but one vote with the preference I have indicated. On the continent, however, they have the list system. In Finland, where they have proportional representation, they have the list system, also in Belgium, New Zealand and Tasmania, and where you have the list system, you also have the party system, and there is no danger of that happening which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition apprehended a moment ago. The moment you introduce election lists, you have parties, and when you have parties, you have almost the certainty that there will be a sufficient majority for one party to enable it to govern. As a matter of fact, proportional representation has existed in Belgium, Finland and other countries for several years, and its results have been most satisfactory. These countries would never dream of reverting to the old system which they consider obsolete and manifestly unjust. The difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend has not so far been felt in any of these countries. In each there has always been a sufficiently strong majority to enable government to be carried on without difficulty.

My right hon. friend Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said that the system has been tried in this country. In that he is wrong. There was a time when they had in Toronto a system different from the present, but which was not at all proportional representation. In fact, it was a denial of it. There were three members for Toronto and each elector had two votes. That what was called a limited vote which, like the cumulative vote—another system of that kind—was absolutely in contravention of what is known as proportional representation. The name is unfortunately very long, but in France and Belgium they have a much shorter name. The main object of proportional representation is to provide that the people shall be faithfully represented in parliament, but under the present system such faithful representation is not obtained. Under the present system, parliament is not at all a mirror of the wishes of the people. I am extremely gratified that my right hon. friend has seen fit to accept this motion, but when he says that there is some merit in this great movement, characteristic of modern times, to reform the electoral system all over the world, he greatly depreciates its value. This is not merely a movement in which there is some merit. All writers everywhere are agreed that the present system has fallen short of what was expected. When a deputation in England waited on Mr. Asquith and asked for this commission, the prime minister replied that a point on which everybody was agreed was that the present system is unjust and arbitrary and a remedy must absolutely be found. Under those circumstances, we ought to try and take our place among the advancing nations which seek improvement.

Motion agreed to.

SEGREGATION OF PENITENTIARY CONVICTS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

Whereas it appears from our published criminal statistics, that crime is increasing alarmingly among the young, and

Whereas it has been proved by experience and testimony that the placing together of all classes of convicts in our penal institutions is highly detrimental to the improvement and reclamation of the younger offenders; and

Whereas it is now strongly asserted and believed that classification and segregation of convicts undergoing punishment according to their ages, aptitudes, degree of criminality and prospects of moral improvement have been productive of most beneficial results:—

Resolved, that it is desirable to ascertain by the appointment of a special commission or by reports obtained upon the subject from wardens and inspectors, what means could be adopted in Canada to insure a judicious classification and segregation of the convicts in our penal institutions and reformatories.

He said: Last year, towards the close of the session, I drew the attention of the House and the government to this matter on the second reading of the Bill to amend the criminal law. The object of that Bill was to create a new offence, and I thought the opportunity a favourable one to call the attention of the government to the fact that for a number of years we have been increasing the number of offences under the criminal law, but have neglected to pay sufficient attention to the convicts themselves. The object of this motion is to point out the necessity of improving our penal system in accordance with modern ideas. The House is no doubt aware that all criminal statistics to-day establish the fact that crime is increasing all over the country. In spite of what we call our advancing civilization, in spite of the millions that have been spent for some years past in the improvement of education, primary education particularly, and in spite of the apparently great results that we have attained in that line, crime is increasing in an alarming degree. And another point of importance is that it is increasing particularly among the young. In speaking on this subject last year, I pointed out that, of a convict population in our country of about 1,400, there were over 800 under the age of thirty, and of these a very large proportion are under the age of twenty-two. And this ratio of the young to the whole criminal population is increasing rather than decreasing. What can be the cause it is difficult to say. The reports of the parole officer of this government are very carefully prepared, and the House will find that that officer seems to attribute the increase of crime, and especially among the young, to the temptations that are met with in our large cities. For crime in the rural districts is not on the increase, whereas the majority of the convicts come from our larger cities, and the larger the city the more crime seems to increase there. Montreal, for instance, seems to furnish almost the entire convict population of our great penitentiary, but in the rural districts there does not seem the same temptation or provocation to crime. I have not yet had opportunity to examine carefully this year's report on penitentiaries, but in the brief examination I have given it, I have been unable to find the exact statistics of the ages of the convicts. Still, I venture to assert that the proportion of the young will be about the same as last year. The convict population in our country has increased to over 1,600 this year from 1,400 last year.

Mr. MONK.

Our present system of penitentiaries is obsolete—it has been universally condemned. If one reads the modern authors on penology, or follows the reports of the great prison congresses that have taken place—seven or eight have been held already, and one is to take place next year in Washington—he must know that the system of herding together all criminals, young and old, hardened and accidental, as in our penitentiaries, is absolutely condemned. In speaking on this subject last year, I quoted several authorities. I shall not take up the time of the House in quoting them again or even in giving others, for upon this question all authorities are agreed. Tallack, who is the standard author in England on penal systems, was among those I quoted last year, as well as a number of leading authorities in the United States. I referred to a very able article in 'The Month,' the review on penitentiaries, going to prove that the system which we now follow in this country is absolutely condemned, and that throughout all the countries of the world they are endeavouring to change it, and in France, England, Belgium and the United States these changes are being successfully made. In these countries there is classification. When a man arrives at the penitentiary, his antecedents are looked into, his own idiosnycrasies are studied, everything is taken into consideration, and he is not herded with other criminals indiscriminately, but men of experience decide where he is to be put. It is a fact well known to every person who has had experience in penitentiaries that the hardened malefactors in these institutions contaminate those who come amongst them. It is also a fact, a very sad one, that this contamination spreads very rapidly amongst the young, those who, but for its influence, might easily be saved. All authors on these subjects tell us that the old system of penitentiaries is a hotbed of vice in which those who might be saved are made criminal for life. The question is whether we ought not to follow the example of other nations and try to adopt the system of segregation and classification. This system does not exist in our penitentiaries at present. When I brought this matter to the attention of the House last year, the Minister of Justice pointed out that some steps had been taken by the government to remedy this deplorable state of affairs. A year or two ago parliament passed the Juvenile Delinquents Act, to which reference is made in this year's report of the parole officer. That Act is a step in the right direction, there is no doubt. But, in the first place, it applies only to delinquents under the age of sixteen. There is a vast number of convicts who are outside the influence of this Act. In the second place, this Act, to be called into effect, re-

quires the co-operation of the province. And, although the provinces of the Dominion are slowly moving in the right direction, Manitoba alone, up to the present time, has conformed to the conditions of the Act and established a Juvenile Delinquents' Court. And, as I have suggested, the criminally inclined who are over the age of sixteen and who, up to the age of thirty, you may say, in many cases might be reclaimed and prevented from becoming hardened criminals, cannot be reached by this Act—I speak of the class who in England are called juvenile-adult criminals, a class that is increasing every day. So, the idea which prevailed up to the middle of last century that the prison should be a dungeon where all who were guilty of offences against society should be herded together and treated without judgment or discrimination and almost without charity, is now entirely exploded. And, with an increase of crime which is mysterious and abnormal, and which goes on especially among the young, I think we should make a great effort in this country to adopt the improved methods suggested. I pointed out last year that the next great prison congress was to take place in 1910, and, under special invitation of the American government, it is to be held in the city of Washington. Probably more than forty nations will be represented at that congress. I suggested that it would be very important for us to be represented at that convention and to try to benefit by the information which the convention will bring out and the admirable lessons it is certain to teach.

The idea that I have tried to bring out is not new in Canada. I am informed that Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, had in mind a project under which classification and segregation should take place. The idea of Sir John Thompson at that time was to have a penitentiary for extremely young and easily reclaimable convicts at Alexandria, I believe, and at the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul the government would put the more difficult cases, and finally, those for whom there is no improvement possible would have been placed together in the penitentiary at Kingston. But that idea was never carried out so far as I know. When I spoke of segregation, I would like to remind the House that it is not solitary by any means. Solitary confinement is one of the harshest punishments that can be inflicted upon any convict, and certainly leads to no improvement whatever. But by the word 'segregation' is meant the placing of a convict who may be reclaimed under special conditions and in special circumstances, where every possible effort will be made to restore him to a proper moral condition, and then send him back to society a cured man, if I may use that expression.

Now in the United States that system has been largely experimented upon, and adopted with the most beneficial results. Everybody has heard of the great penitentiary at Elmira, in the state of New York. The results obtained there by careful scientific application of modern principles have been marvellous. As much as eighty per cent of the convicts there have been liberated, and have actually turned out to be excellent citizens. That is an established fact to be found in the statistics referring to that penitentiary. In the Massachusetts female reformatory—and female convicts, as the House knows, are very likely to become recidivists—the results have also been extraordinary. So it seems to me that the government ought to take steps in that direction here. During last summer I visited the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul, I have visited several establishments of that kind, both in Europe and on this continent, and I wish to say that the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul appeared to be one of the cleanest and the best equipped penal institutions I have ever seen. But as I say, I was informed that there is no provision there for segregation. In fact, getting information from the leading officials there, I was told that they could themselves see every day the unfortunate results of the herding together of criminals, and that a change might be effected without much expense. Classification and segregation according to modern teachings could be carried out at that penitentiary, with some cost at first, of course, but no very great cost. It is right to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that statistics in the United States establish that once the change is made, the cost of maintenance is not greater than under the old system, and in some cases indeed it is less. So that the objection of expense does not exist.

Now, Sir, as to the remedy. I suggest in this motion that the government should obtain a special report from its inspector, from the parole officer, and from the wardens, on this particular point. They are all experienced and competent officers, and if their attention was drawn particularly to this matter in their report they could give ample information to the government and to the House. I submit that the question is important enough, the change contemplated is great enough, to warrant the government in instituting a Royal Commission, naming one commissioner at least who is an expert in these matters, and there are some in this country, who would fully investigate the whole subject, visiting the penal establishments in the United States that are the most advanced in the world, some of them, upon this particular subject. Then it seems to me it would be in order for us to improve our present

system, and endeavour to diminish in some degree the dreadful increase of crime which is referred to in every report.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I am sure that every one will agree thoroughly with my hon. friend in his view of the importance of the subject he has brought to the attention of the House to-day. As I am quite willing that the resolution he has proposed should be adopted, I might content myself with a silent acquiesence in his proposition. But the nature of the subject he has discussed, and the circumstance that the penitentiaries of the Dominion are under the charge of the department of which I am the head, make it seem necessary, at all events not improper, that I should say a word or two on this motion.

Every one who has thought about it at all, I think, will recognize that the whole question of dealing with prisoners in our penal institutions is one of very great practical difficulty, and such thought as I have been able during the last few years to give to the subject, has led me about to this position, that the only men who are able to deal with such a subject at all satisfactorily, are the practical men who are in charge of our prisoners; and that there is not very much use in attempting to theorize upon present conditions or to deal practically with questions that one is not thoroughly acquainted with. I have no doubt whatever that very great advantage would result from obtaining the fullest possible information on this subject, and the resolution which is in your hands being one directed to the obtaining of such information, I think it well it should be passed, as it is only a question, if it is a question at all, of the means by which we should get before us the information that is desired. When that information is before us, we should all be in a much better position, I think, to discuss the question of what changes, if any, ought to be made in the management of those institutions, than by any possibility we could be at the present time.

But let me point out one or two considerations that occur to me in dealing with what is here proposed. I will assume, every one must agree, that the reformation of the offender ought to be, and is, one of the objects, perhaps some may think a principal object, in imposing upon him the sentence of the court. I suppose every one would agree also in the view that, ordinarily speaking, it is the beginner in crime who will be the most likely to receive benefit of a reforming character from recognition of the fact that crime it attended with consequences that are unpleasant when punishment is inflicted. There is certainly less hope of reforming the conduct or the character of the hardened offender.

If one remembers the division of our penal institutions between the jurisdiction of the provinces and of the Dominion, it will be seen that, taken in the large, the hardened offenders are those that we in the control of the Dominion penitentiaries have to deal with. Every criminal who is sentenced to two years or more of imprisonment, is liable to be sentenced to the penitentiary —is ordinarily, if not always, sent to the penitentiary. The young and the new offenders are, in almost each instance, unless the offence is very unusual in its character, sent to jails, to reformatories, to provincial prisons which are entirely under the control of the provincial authorities and there, more certainly than in the penitentiaries, would be room for the application of the principles which are indicated in this resolution and which my hon. friend has been advocating.

Of course, I do not mean to say that you can draw any hard and fast line and put all the criminals upon one side or the other of that line. The man who was seeking to classify would have to do it according to his best judgment of the character of the offender coupled, I suppose, with some consideration, at any rate, of the nature of the offence for which he was under sentence and there certainly are to be found many hardened old offenders who have behind them a long career of crime in the provincial institutions, happening to be convicted of some trivial or smaller offence and so punished by a sentence of less than two years' imprisonment. One can readily see, if there is communication between prisoners, the danger that my hon. friend adverts to from the younger and less experienced man coming under the influence of some one, who, perhaps, from entirely false ideas of things, he rather looks up to as a model or hero in crime. In our penitentiaries there is certainly less room for that. There are plenty of first offenders in the penitentiary, men who, perhaps, commit but one crime in their lives. The crime may be very serious in its consequences—forgery, manslaughter, or arson —some offence which does not arise from the fact that the man has become a hardened criminal, but is the one slip or the one instance in the whole life of the man where he has gone wrong. That man serves his time and very possibly returns to society and becomes a reputable citizen. That particular kind of man certainly does no harm to the others in the penitentiary and very likely is not much harmed, if at all, by those who are there along with him. He very likely feels himself above those who are there as men who have entered upon lives of crime, who are habitual criminals and there is the less danger of his being injured by association with these or the more hardened class. But, it must not be forgotten, in thinking about this

subject, that there is not supposed to be any communication at all between convicts, one with another, in our penitentiaries. Each convict has a separate cell, each man goes about his work during the day under the continual supervision of a guard who has charge of a gang of convicts and whose duty it is to see that there is no communication between them. According to the regulations of these institutions and according to the efforts of those in charge there is not intended to be, and there is not supposed to be, any room for the pollution of the morals of one by the degradation of another. There is absolute segregation, individualization and no communication supposed to go on of any character whatever. The practical work of classifying would be, as I have tried to indicate, a matter, certainly, of very considerable difficulty. It might be a very desirable thing. It would certainly be a desirable thing if there was going to be the injury that I have adverted to by communication between different sets of prisoners or by individuals meeting in any sort of social intercourse. That, however, is something that is prohibited. While we have in our six penitentiaries under Dominion control some 1,500 to 1,600 men the great majority of these convicts are not in for a first offence, and a very large percentage of them are men who have made up their minds to live by criminal courses and are entitled by their behaviour to be regarded as habitual criminals. These are men who are not likely to be reformed, even if benefited at all, by anything in the way of classification or segregation that possibly could be applied to them. The wider field for the operation of the principles of penology to which my hon. friend has adverted is with the more juvenile offenders, with those who are in the provincial jails, in the various reformatories and in institutions of that character which are under the control of the provincial legislatures altogether. In speaking of this subject under similar circumstances last session, or the session before, I reminded the House of the fact that we had taken one step, perhaps not a very great step, but yet an important one, in the direction which my hon. friend desires in the passing of our Juvenile Offenders Bill. But, it seems rather a comment upon the usefulness of that measure and upon the pressure which was exerted by many benevolent and right minded people to procure its passage when I say that only in one community in this whole Dominion has advantage been taken of the provisions of the Bill and that the city of Winnipeg is the only place in Canada where that Act, though it was passed two years ago, has been put into force and where they are enjoying the benefit of it, if it be a benefit. With regard to the practical course to be taken in this matter, in order to secure the information, I would suggest to my hon. friend that probably the best way to obtain it would be by the experience of the wardens and the inspectors. We have our six penitentiaries each with its warden and deputy warden. If there were a meeting between the six wardens, the two inspectors, and possibly the six deputy wardens, with an interchange of ideas on this subject, I think that probably all the information and suggestions towards any practical course which could be advanced would be obtained equally well as, and possibly better than, by the appointment of a commission. I would suggest to my hon. friend that the words providing for the appointment of a special commission might be eliminated from the resolution which would be left as an expression of the opinion of this House that it is desirable to ascertain by means of reports on the subject from the wardens and inspectors whether or not some such practical course as my hon. friend desires might, with advantage be taken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). I would suggest that as both the warden and the deputy warden are executive officers, who naturally view matters from the standpoint of discipline it might be well to take officers of the institution who look on the other side of life. Why should not the chaplain be in a better position than the deputy wardens or even the wardens for this reason that the executive officers are often inclined to look on the harsher side of the prisoner.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think it would be better to have the chaplain than the deputy warden, because it might be difficult to spare the warden and the deputy warden at the same time.

Mr. MONK. The point mentioned by the Minister of Justice that in the penitentiaries convicts are not allowed to have intercourse with one another is true. The rule is there, They are not supposed to speak to each other and certainly at St. Vincent de Paul the discipline is as carefully preserved as it possibly can be. But the answer to that is that they do communicate, that 500 men guarded, I suppose, by about 20, communicate unceasingly, and the wicked contaminate those who might be preserved. That is a fact in every penitentiary in the world. How it is done it is very difficult to know, but they find means to communicate and the evil work goes on. It is true, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) says, that a large part of the work devolves upon the provinces. Some provinces I think have advanced upon others in the care of their

criminals, particularly the young, but we have the penitentiary population under our care and I pointed out last year that out of 1,400 convicts 800 were under 30 years of age, and probably 500 or 600 were admittedly being contaminated. We have the care and the responsibility for these prisoners and I do not think that the fact that the treatment of criminals is divided between the two jurisdictions exempts us from our share of improvement. When I was at St. Vincent de Paul the high officials there told me that in spite of every precaution communication took place without the knowledge of the officials and the Catholic chaplain who has been there for thirty years, an old college mate of mine, told me that that is the grave, the serious point, the contamination of those who are not particularly wicked. I see my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is not here at the moment. Our views on religious matters apparently coincide because I was going to suggest that possibly the chaplains in the penitentiaries might be added to those who might be called on to report because everything that has been said in the penitentiary reports in favour of improvement has come from the chaplains. Last year two Anglican chaplains pointed out the desirability of this improvement, and as a matter of fact the danger of evading the task in the case of the wardens, inspectors and others, experienced although they may be, is that they are naturally inclined to be conservative in the sense that they do not desire any change. Mr. Beauchamp, prefect or warden of the penitentiary of St Vincent de Paul told me his own views had tended towards reform. But they the officials might be disposed to desire the maintenance of the status quo, otherwise I would be quite prepared to adopt the minister's suggestion, and I hope that before next year, or at any rate next year when parliament meets we can have a full report from all these gentlemen upon this subject and that we will endeavour to make some progress.

Motion as amended agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient that the Inland Revenue Act be amended as follows:—That section 76 be repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

76. The person in whose favour a license is granted for an excise bonding warehouse, not included in the description of the premises in respect of which a license has been issued to him under this Act, shall, upon receiving such license, pay to the collector the sum of fifty dollars.—Mr. Templeman.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The object of this resolution is to increase the fee paid for bonding warehouse licenses from $20 to $50. We find in the department that there are many demands for the establishment of bonding warehouse licenses all over the Dominion. We have granted them in every case. In many of the small towns throughout the west and in the east as well where liquor is sold, for the advantage altogether of the liquor dealer, a bonding warehouse is required and is granted. The result is that we have an official in the Inland Revenue Department to supervise that bonded warehouse—his salary is small it is true but in some cases it reaches $400 or $500—and the revenue received from that particular place is so small as not to warrant the department in granting a license. The object of the department in increasing the license from $20 to $50 is not so much to increase the revenue as to be a deterrent on those who ask for bonded warehouses. These bonded warehouses are essentially for the convenience of the dealers and we think the convenience is of sufficient importance to justify us in asking him to pay a slightly larger fee.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What is the total number of bonded warehouses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Two hundred and seventy or 280 in the Inland Revenue Department, and many of these are in very small places. The utility of these bonded houses is not as great as it was prior to the change in the tax on tobacco. The revenue on tobacco is now paid upon the raw material almost entirely and as the excise duty is small, very little is transferred from one bonded warehouse to the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This only affects the inland revenue?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I would suggest to the minister that instead of making a flat rate of $50 per license he should have a graded rate depending upon the importance of the bonded warehouse. Why should the poor fellow in a small village who wants a bonded warehouse be compelled to pay as high a fee as the man in the large city who does a business of probably more than $100,000 a year? The system in the smaller places is that the customs officer looks after the Inland Revenue business and gets a small increase in his salary for so doing.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the case of distillers the fee for their bonded warehouse is included in their license fee which is $250.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I still think that the rate should be graded and that the poor man should not have to pay the same fee as the big dealer.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The graded system is in eflect in the Customs Department, but the smallest fee for a bonded warehouse in that case is $60 a year while the highest is $480, and in the Customs Department the grading is according to the number of hours per day that the officers have to work. I am advised that such a system would not be practical in the Inland Revenue Department. We have licenses issued in some of the very small places where the revenue has gone down to less than we pay the officer in charge, and I do not think it is in the public interest that we should encourage the establishment of such licenses. If a person really wants a bonded warehouse I do not think that $50 a year is too much to pay for the convenience.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is to be regarded from the standpoint of the man who receives the license rather than from the standpoint of the department, then there is a great deal to be said in favour of the system of grading the fee which has been advocated by my hon. friend from Leeds. A man doing business of half a million dollars per year could better afford a fee of $500 than a man doing a business of $5,000 per annum could afford a fee of $50.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is just about the same work in passing $100,000 worth of liquor in a bonded warehouse in Montreal, as there is in passing $1,000 worth in a smaller place. I do not think it would be advisable to grade the fee according to the value of the alcohol ex-warehoused or according to the amount of revenue collected. I would point out that the minimum charge is $50 and that if you are going to charge relatively a higher rate of license for the large places, you will have to increase the fee to $200 or $300 for a bonded warehouse in the larger cities. The Customs Department fixes a fee according to the time devoted by the officers to the duties of that particular work. The amount is not arbitrary but varies according to the number of hours per day required in each bonded warehouse. We could not learn until the end of the year how much time the officers devoted to the work, and I am advised it would be difficult to work out any scheme differing from the flat rate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand why it would be more difficult in the Department of Inland Revenue than that of Customs. I do not see why what is suitable to the Customs Department should not also be suitable to the Department of Inland Revenue. However, the minister will perhaps give us more information when he brings down his Bill.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the descriptive nomenclature and mark of the different manufactures or issues of the Ross rifle; the dates of issue thereof; description of changes from preceding manufactures or issues; the Corps, Rifle Associations or Rifle Teams to which issues of Ross rifles have been made, showing number issued, date of issue, and designation or mark thereof; and the detailed disposition of the Mark I pattern of this rifle.—Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all accounts, vouchers, correspondence, reports and other papers, not already brought down in connection with the survey of the St. John river channel between Fredericton and Woodstock, N.B. — Mr. Crocket.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If opportunity offers we will take up government business if the Bills are printed.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 4 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 18, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—ESTIMATES FOR 1910-11.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st March, 1911, and, in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North American Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 18th Nov., 1909.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, His Excellency's message, together with the estimates, was referred to the Committee of Supply.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER presented to the House the report of the special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, as follows:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Barker,
Barnard,
Borden, (Halifax),
Bristol,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Haggart (Lanark),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lancaster,
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonald,
McColl,
Maddin,
Major,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Monk,
Northrup,
Porter,
Pugsley,
Rhodes,
Rivet,
Roy (Montmagny),
Sifton,
Stratton, and
Warburton.—45.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Allen,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barr,
Beattie,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Broder,
Brown,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, S.),
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCall,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Maddin,
Magrath,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meighen,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Chisholm (Huron),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clare,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crosby,
Crothers,
Currie,
(Prince Edward),
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Edwards,
Elson,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fowke,
Fraser,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Kent),
Gordon (Nipissing),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Haggart (Lanark),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Harris,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lanctôt (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctôt (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Lavergne,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Lortie,
Lovell,
Low,
Miller,
Molloy,
Monk,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Neely,
Nesbitt,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Owen,
Papineau,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Parent,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Price,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Richards,
Rivet,
Roche,
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Russell,
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Stratton,
Talbot,
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Tobin,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Wallace,
Warburton,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval),
Worthington, and
Wright.—199.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Ames,
Arthurs,
Aylesworth,
Béland,
Black,
Blondin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clarke (Essex),
Conmee,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crosby,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Daniel,
Devlin,
Donnelly,
Elson,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Fowke,
Fraser,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gladu,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Kent),
Guthrie,
Harris,
Harty,
Hunt,
Jameson,
King,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Lortie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, S.),
McCoig,
McGiverin,
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Magrath,
Martin (Wellington),
Meighen,
Meigs,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Owen,
Papineau,
Parent,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Robb,
Schaffner,
Sealey,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smith (Stormont),
Stewart,
Stratton,
Talbot,
Tobin
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alberta), and
Worthington.—85.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Barr,
Black,
Brown,
Burrell,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Fortier,
Goodeve,
Henderson,
Jameson,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lavergne,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Meigs,
Miller,
Molloy,
Papineau,
Price,
Reid (Restigouche),
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Montmagny),
Russell,
Rutan,
Seguin,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Smyth,
Staples,
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Low.
MacNutt,
MacCarthy,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
Maddin,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall (Wellington),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington), and
Wright.—53.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven Members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Allen,
Bickerdike,
Bristol,
Douglas,
Fowke,
Gervais,
Gordon (Nipissing),
Henderson,
Hughes,
King,
Lavergne,
Maclean (York, S.),
McColl,
McIntyre,
McLean (Huron),
Magrath,
Martin (Montreal,St.Mary's),
Nantel,
Pardee,
Rhodes,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alberta), and
Wilson (Lennox and Addington).—25.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Allen,
Ames,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boyce,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crosby,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Demers,
Doherty,
Ecrément,
Fielding,
Foster,
Fowke,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Goodeve,
Hughes,
Haggart (Lanark),
Kyte,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lanctôt (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Law,
Lennox,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McKenzie,
Maddin,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Neely,
Nesbitt,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Porter,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Richards,
Roche,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Stanfield,
Taylor (Leeds),
Tobin,
Wallace,
Warburton, and
Worthington.—82.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Allen,
Ames,
Arthurs,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chew,
Clark (Red Deer),
Conmee,
Cowan,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Delisle,
Demers,
Doherty,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Kent),
Gordon (Nipissing),
Guthrie,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Harris,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctôt, (Richelieu),
Lavergne,
Law,
Lovell,
Low,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, S.),
McCall,
McCarthy,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Magrath,
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Mayrand,
Meighen,
Michaud,
Miller,
Monk,
Nesbitt,
Osler,
Owen,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Papineau,
Paterson,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Price,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Dorchester),
Russell,
Savoie,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stratton,
Talbot,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Wallace,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alberta),
Wilson (Laval),
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lortie,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington), and
Worthington.—133.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Allen,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Black,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boyer,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Brown,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clare,
Clark (Red Deer),
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Currie (Simcoe),
Delisle,
Devlin,
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Ecrément,
Edwards,
Elson,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Fraser,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon (Kent),
Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Jameson,
Kidd,
King,
Lafortune,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctôt (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Lortie,
Lovell,
Low,
McCall,
McCarthy,
McCoig,
McColl,
McIntyre,
McLean (Huron),
McMillan,
Maddin,
Magrath,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Maynard,
Meighen,
Meigs,
Middlebro,
Miller,
Molloy,
Monk,
Nantel,
Neely,
Oliver,
Owen,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Rankin,
Richards,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross (Rimouski),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar)
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Talbot,
Thornton,
Tobin,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Laval),

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington), and
Wright.—131.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

Bickerdike,
Bradbury,
Brodeur,
Chisholm (Inverness).
Clarke (Essex),
Crosby,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Fraser,
Gervais,
Jameson,
Kyte,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McKenzie,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Nantel,
Pardee,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Todd,
Turgeon, and
Warburton.—25.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Blondin,
Burrell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Nipissing),
Herron,
Lanctôt (Richelieu).
Loggie,
Lortie,
Macdonald,
McCarthy,
McCoig,
McMillan,
Maddin,
Prowse,
Rhodes,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smyth,
Stratton,
Templeman, and
Tariff.—25.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Arthurs,
Béland,
Boyce,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Chew,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Edwards,
Fisher,
Fowke,
Haggart (Lanark),
MacNutt,
McLean (Sunbury),
Magrath,
Molloy,
Monk,
Perley,
Pickup,
Price,
Richards,
Savoie,
Sifton,
Tobin,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alberta), and
Wilson (Laval).—26.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Black,
Blondin,
Hughes,
Knowles,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Ethier,
Gervais,
Guthrie,
Hodgins,
McCarthy,
McLean (Huron),
Schaffner,
Taylor (Leeds), and
Taylor (New Westminster).—15.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Béland,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (Sir Fred'k),
Bristol,
Brodeur,
Daniel,
Doherty,
Foster,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Monk,
Pardee,
Pugsley, and
Smith (Nanaimo).—16.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the report was adopted.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely, Messrs. Allen, Bickerdike, Bristol, Douglas, Fowke, Gervais, Gordon (Nipissing), Henderson, Hughes, King, Lavergne, Maclean (South York), McColl, McIntyre, McLean (Huron), Magrath, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Nantel, Pardee, Rhodes, Taylor (Leeds), Taylor (New Westminster), Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson (Lennox and Addington), will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Aylesworth, Beland, Borden (Halifax), Sir Frederick Borden, Bristol, Brodeur, Daniel, Doherty, Foster, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Lemieux, Lewis, Monk, Pardee, Pugsley, and Smith (Nanaimo), a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

LOAD LINES ON SHIPS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) respecting load lines on ships.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. The Bill which I now wish to present to the House has for its purpose the cessation of those regrettable, fatal and avoidable accidents which happen to ships on the coastal waters of Canada and on the Great Lakes. During the past few years there have occurred many such. I instance the wrecks of the Asia, Jones, Bannockburn and others on the Great Lakes which have occasioned great loss of life and property, caused principally by overloading. This Bill is founded on the English Plimsoll Act and also upon a clause with respect to the loading of ships engaged in the maritime coasting trade of Canada, with which I am not so familiar as with the conditions on the Great Lakes, but this feature of the Bill is founded on a Bill presented to the House some sessions ago by Mr. Lawrence, of Nova Scotia. There was some exception taken to a clause in a similar Bill by the large transportation companies, which provided that lists of passengers and crews should be placed in the hands of customs officer, harbour master or wharfinger, before a vessel left port after the 15th day of September and before the 15th day of April in each year, the period to which this Bill only applies. I have changed that clause by expunging from it the provision with reference to ferry steamers, river steamers and excursion steamers. Otherwise it follows upon the lines of the English Plimsoll Act. Clause eight seeks to prevent too much loading on deck in the fall and winter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY ON VESSELS.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) respecting wireless telegraphy on ships.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. This Bill is simply following out legislation brought down in the mother of parliaments and also in the parliament of the large country to the south of us in reference to wireless telegraphy on ships. There is no hon. gentleman in this House who, after having read of that accident to the steamship 'Britannia' last year, and of the great loss of life which was prevented by the use of wireless telegraphy, will not be disposed to vote for this Bill. Since last year wireless telegraphy has been introduced on many lake vessels by the Lake Trust and other vessel owners.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LEWIS.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many employees of the Intercolonial have been dismissed since the appointment of the commissioners charged with the administration of the affairs of this railway?
2. How many employees of the Intercolonial have been dismissed at Montreal and Campbellton since the establishment of the commission?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. There have been 503 employees of the Intercolonial railway dropped since the appointment of the Managing Board.

There have been three employees dismissed at Montreal and thirteen at Campbellton since the establishment of the Managing Board.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. How many employees of the Intercolonial railway have been superannuated since the appointment of the Government Railways Managing Board at each of the following places: Truro, Halifax and Stellarton?
2. How many employees of the Intercolonial railway heve been dismissed since the appointment of the Government Railways Managing Board at each of the following places: Truro, Halifax and Stellarton?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Since the appointment of the Government Railways Managing Board there have been six (6) employees of the Intercolonial railway placed on the Provident Fund at Truro, nineteen (19) at Halifax, and three (3) at Stellarton.
2. Since the appointment of the Government Railways Managing Board, there have been thirty-eight (38) employees of the Intercolonial railway dismissed at Truro; one hundred and forty-seven (147) at Halifax; and fifteen (15) at Stellarton.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How much money has been expended to date by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, exclusive of sums paid to contractors having construction of road bed under contract?
2. How many employees of the commission are there at present?
3. What do their salaries aggregate?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $18,118,133.58.
2. $1,434.
3. $108,133.74 per month.

Mr. MONK:

1. At what date was the contract entered into or signed for the construction of the section of the National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Superior Junction?
2. What was the amount of the said contract?

3. Who was the contractor, what was the time fixed for the completion of the works?

4. Is the construction finished, and is the line ready for operation? If not, when will the said section be ready for use?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. May 15, 1906.

2. The estimated amount was $13,010,-398.92.

3. John D. McArthur, of Winnipeg. Time for completion Sept. 1, 1907.

4. All work is not finished so as to discharge contractor; but track is laid and trains are being run. Contractor expects to have the road completed and hand it over by next spring.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. Has the western section of the National Transcontinental railway, extending from Winnipeg to Superior Junction, been opened for traffic?

2. If so, when was said western section so opened for traffic?

3. How many bushels of wheat have there been carried over said section up to the 10th November, 1909?

4. How many car loads of cattle have been carried over said section during said time?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. All work is not finished so as to discharge contractor, but track is laid and trains are being run.

2. Trains went over said line about 6th day of November, instant.

3. Ten carloads.

4. No information.

Mr. MONK:

1. What are the dates of the different contracts for construction of the National Transcontinental railway from Superior Junction to Quebec?

2. What is the time fixed in said contracts for the termination of the works, and what is the price or consideration to be paid the contractor in each case?

3. What is the mileage covered by each contract and is the contractor in each case within his time limit for the execution of the part contracted for?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1 and 2.

Contract No.	Date of Contract.	Date of Completion.
10	May 15, 1906.	Sept. 1, 1907.
11	March 15, 1907.	Sept. 1, 1908.
12	Sept. 19, 1908.	Dec. 31, 1910.
13	Sept. 19, 1908.	Dec. 31, 1910.
14	March 14, 1907.	Sept. 1, 1909.
15	March 28, 1908.	Sept. 1, 1910.
16	Oct. 29, 1908.	Dec. 31, 1910.
17	Oct. 29, 1908.	Dec. 31, 1910.
18	March 28, 1908.	Sept. 1, 1910.
19	Sept. 19, 1908.	Sept. 1, 1910.
20	Sept. 19, 1908.	Sept. 1, 1910.

3.

Contract No.	Mileage.	Whether within Time Limit.
10	About 159 miles	No.
11	" 45 "	No.
12	" 107 "	Time not up.
13	" 114·97 "	"
14	" 150 "	No.
15	" 100 "	Time not up.
16	" 104·24 "	"
17	" 100 "	"
18	" 75 "	"
19	" 126 "	"
20	" 24·13 "	No.

None of these are lump sum contracts. The contractor is paid according to schedule of prices embodied in the contract.

OWEN SOUND PUBLIC BUILDING

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the total cost of the Owen Sound public building site, furniture, fixtures, and all other cost to date?

2. What amount will still be required to complete same?

3. What amount thereof is for extras, and what are the particulars of such extras?

4. What amount has been expended and will yet be required to be expended in respect of fittings and furniture?

5. From whom were such fittings and furniture purchased, were tenders asked therefor, and was the lowest tender accepted in each case?

6. Have any appointments of mail carriers for street delivery in Owen Sound or other persons been made in consequence of proposed street delivery in Owen Sound? If not, why not? If so, what are the names of such and salary?

7. When will the post office be removed to said public building, and when will street delivery commence?

8. What is the age limit for entry to service as mail carriers on street delivery?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. $93,255.78.
2. About $9,000.
3. Additional story.. .. .. $8,950
   Electric wiring.. 275
   Addition to fittings.. 458
   Sink.. 38
   Total.. .. .. $9,721
4. Fittings, paid $2,702
   Furniture, paid.. .. ..
   Total.. .. .. $2,702
   Fittings, unpaid $2,855
   Furniture, unpaid.. 876
   Total $3,731

5. The fittings were advertised for, and the lowest tender, that of J. T. Schell, accepted. The furniture ordered from R. Breckenridge-Horton, departmental store, at a fixed price for each article ; shades from Goldblatt; boxes, sorting cases and bag rack, from Office Specialty Company; brass grills and plates from Rubenstein Brothers at prices agreed upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster general):

6. Free delivery of letters can only be established in places where the houses have been properly numbered and the streets labelled at intersecting points, and as these requirements have not yet been completed at Owen Sound, the department has not been in a position to put the service in operation. The municipal authorities have been asked to notify the department as soon as the necessary arrangements in connection with the numbering of the houses and labelling of the streets are completed.

7. As soon as the building is ready for occupation and taken over from the contractors by the Public Works Department.

8. Thirty years.

EXPORT LICENSES.

Mr. LANCASTER :

1. Have any licenses been issued by this government for export of any power, or fluid, or gas, under the statute, chapter 16 of the statutes of 1906-7, since those mentioned by the Minister of Inland Revenue in answer to question on page 360 of the House of Commons Debates on 9th December, 1907?

2. If so, what are the respective dates, amounts or quantities, and terms of such licenses, and the kinds of power or fluid for export, and from what places, and the names of the licensees?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN :

1. Yes. Old licenses have been renewed. No new licenses have been issued since answer above referred to.

2. On the 1st of April, 1909, a license was granted to ' The Maine and New Brunswick Electrical Power Co., Ltd.,' Aroostook Falls, N.B., to export during current fiscal year, electrical energy not to exceed one thousand (1,000) kilowatt years.

On the 1st of April, 1909, a license was granted to ' The Ontario Power Company of Niagara, Falls, Ont., ' to export, during the current fiscal year, electrical energy not to exceed forty-five thousand (45,000) kilowatt years.

On the 1st of April, 1909, a license was granted to ' The Canadian Niagara Power Company,' Niagara Falls, Ont., to export during the current fiscal year, electrical energy not to exceed thirty-nine thousand one hundred and sixty-five (39,165) kilowatt years.

On the 13th April, 1909, a license was granted to ' The Electrical Development Co. of Ontario, Ltd.' Niagara Falls, Ont., to export, during current fiscal year, electrical energy not to exceed thirty-four thousand three hundred and sixteen (34,316) kilowatt years.

All these licenses are for a period ending on the 31st March, 1910. The quantities given in the licenses do not amount to one-third of the total possible output of the licensees respectively.

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. VERVILLE :

1. What has been the increase in wages for mechanics, year by year, from May, 1900, to May, 1909, in different industries?

2. What was the percentage year by year for the same period?

3. What has been the average number of days worked yearly in different industries for the same period?

4. What has been the increase in production in percentage for the same period?

5. What has been the difference in the cost of living year by year, for the same period?

6. What has been the increase in number of mechanics in Canada yearly for the same period?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING :

1. The Department of Labour has in course of preparation a special report on wages changes and the cost of living in Canada during the past decade. Until this report and the statistical tables and diagrams which will accompany it, are completed, it will not be possible to give the information in the detail requested.

2. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

3. The Dominion census having been taken periodically and not annually, it is not possible to give returns showing annual averages or percentages for the period mentioned.

4. Answered by the answer to No. 3.

5. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

6. Answered by the answer to No. 3.

NEW BRUNSWICK COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY ACCOUNTS.

Mr. FOSTER:

What has been done up to date to forward the process in the Court of Equity of the province of New Brunswick begun by the Minister of Public Works, as declared in his speech of May 5, 1909, in the House of Commons, as follows: ' I yesterday instructed my solicitors, the legislature being prorogued only a few day ago, to issue a summons in the Supreme Court in Equity of the province of New Brunswick, making the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, and the other parties defendants, so as to bring all parties before the court for the purpose of having an accounting as to the receipts and expenditures made by that company and for the purpose of having a decree made as to the state of its accounts? '

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I regret that I am unable to see that this inquiry has any relation to the public affairs of the Dominion. The lawsuits of members of parliament can hardly be considered proper subjects for question in this House.

TEMPORARY LOANS SINCE JUNE 1, 1909.

Mr. FOSTER:

What temporary loans have been made since June 1, 1909, from what banks and at what rate of interest?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. None.

IMPORTATIONS OF INCUBATORS.

Mr. WHITE:

What was the total number of incubators and brooders, respectively, imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, and what was the total cost of each?

Hon. WM. PATERSON: This information is not immediately available, but if the question is allowed to stand as a notice of motion I shall expedite it as far as possible.

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

LETTER RATE, BARRIE AND ALLANDALE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the Postmaster General received a resolution of the municipal council of the town of Barrie, urging upon the Department of Justice of providing that letters posted in Allandale, the 6th ward of the town of Barrie, and delivered at the principal post office in the town, and vice versa, will be transported for one cent?

2. What conclusion has the minister come to, or is the matter under consideration?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. The drop letter rate of postage, one cent per ounce, is limited by statute to letters which are not transmitted through the mails, but simply posted at and delivered through the same post office, and as Allandale and Barrie are two separate post offices the rate in question does not apply to letters passing between them. The municipal authorities at Barrie have been advised of the statutory requirements in regard to the application of the drop letter rate.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL SURVEY.

Mr. LENNOX:

In connection with the Trent Valley Waterways system has the report of the survey between Kempenfeldt bay and the Georgian bay been completed and filed in the department?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, a report has been received on the estimated cost of canalizing one of the proposed western outlets of the Trent canal,—that is from Kempenfeldt bay, Lake Simcoe, to and via the Nottawasaga river to (Nottawasaga bay) Georgian Bay, and has been filed in the department.

DEVIL'S ELBOW—BRADFORD CHANNEL.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government decided to construct a channel from Devil's Elbow, on the Holland river, to a point in the neighbourhood of Bradford Railway station, as petitioned for, or not to construct it?

2. Has the government taken this matter into its serious consideration? If so, with what result?

3. Has the government obtained a report on this proposed work, or any estimate of its cost? If so, what is the estimated cost?

4. Will the minister lay the papers upon the table of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No decision has yet been reached by the department.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

TEMPORARY POST OFFICES FOR TOURISTS.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

1. How many temporary post offices for the benefit of tourists were established in Canada during season of 1909?

2. What was the cost of each office in respect to salary of postmaster and carrying of the mails, respectively?

3. What was the revenue from each office?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General):

1, 2 and 3.—

Name of Office.	Service.	Revenue.	Salary.
Cedar Croft.....	Daily, no cost.	$30.50.	$25.00.
Kawartha Park...	Daily, cost $30.00.	$58.00.	$29 00.
Midlothian Wharf	Tri-weekly, no cost.	$19.25.	$25.00.
Ojibway Island...	Tri-weekly, no cost.	$61.00.	$31.00.
Rigaud Sur le Lac.	Daily, $20 for two months.	$5.00 for two mos.	$12.00.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS FOREST RESERVE.

On the orders of the day being called.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to the report of the Select Standing Committee on Forests, Waterways and Water-powers. One of the recommendations of that committee is as follows:

In view of these facts, therefore, your committee begs to recommend that immediate action be taken to enlarge the boundaries of the National Parks or Forest reserves and that a single continuous forest reserve be created from the International boundary line to the northern watershed of the Peace river, embracing so far as possible the land upon the east slope of the mountains as shown in the accompanying tracing which has been prepared by the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior.

I find that no tracing has been included in the report and consequently we seem not to have the plan which was in the minds of the committee.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The tracing in question is a production of the Department of the Interior which was submitted to this committee last session. I shall inquire from the clerk of the committee. Perhaps it was not kept on file but I will see that it is placed within reach of the members of the House.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all applications, petitions, letters, telegrams, documents, plans, specifications and correspondence with reference to, and in any way concerning the application for subsidy for the building of a dry-dock and ship-building yard by certain persons, or company, at or in the vicinity of the town of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all correspondence and papers respecting the application by the United States Immigration Service to the Minister of the Interior, for the deportation of one Mrs. Goby, an alleged immigrant to the United States of America from Canada, entering at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, together with a copy of all orders, decisions, reports and returns regarding any action taken thereupon by the Department of the Interior. —Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all applications, petitions, letters, telegrams, documents, plans, specifications and correspondence with reference to and in any way concerning the application for subsidy for the building of a dry-dock and ship-building yard by certain persons, or company, at or in the vicinity of the town of Port Arthur, Ontario.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return giving the names and addresses of all immigration agents at the present time employed by the government in Great Britain, the Continent of Europe, and the United States on salary, the amount of salary paid to each, the amount of other perquisites paid to each, if any; the names and addresses of all immigration agents at the present time employed by the government in the above countries on commission, the amount of such commission, the rate of commission per immigrant, the amount of other perquisites paid to each: the names and addresses of all special immigration agents in the above countries appointed during the fiscal years 1908-9 and up to 1st November, 1909, the date of the appointment of each, the address of each at the time of his appointment, the amount of salary, commission, or other perquisites paid to each, and the length of time served by each in respect of such appointment.—Mr. U. Wilson.

For a return showing the number of fatal accidents resulting from the use of explosives in the construction of railways and other public works in Canada, reported to either the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Public Works, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, within the past three years; the nature of investigation, if held, after each accident; and what precautions have been taken to prevent or minimize the number of accidents from the use of explosives on construction work in Canada under control of government officials.—Mr. Robb.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, documents and papers of every description relating to the proposed sale or disposal of any part of the Peigan Indian reserve in the province of Alberta, including any advertisement of such sale and record of the proceedings, whether by vote or otherwise, under which any of the Indians on said reserve purported to give their consent thereto. Also a return showing the actual number of Indians on said reserve entitled to vote or elect in respect of such proposed sale, and all other information in the possession of the department or its officials relating to or in any way referring to the proceedings in connection with such proposed sale.—Mr. Herron.

THE FRENCH TREATY .

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to approve of the Supplementary Convention respecting the commercial relations between Canada and France, entered into at Paris on the 23rd day of January, 1909, by plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by the President of the French Republic, a copy of which was on the eighth day of March, 1909, transmitted to the House of Commons by His Excellency the Governor General.

He said: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it would probably be more convenient for the House to discuss this subject, should discussion be found necessary, when the Bill is printed. We might pass the resolution through committee as the foundation for the Bill that is to be introduced, but not proceed further with the matter until the Bill has been distributed; in the meantime any information on the subject that is to be given will be brought down.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I wish to go on record as not being bound by the resolution even if it is passed, because I am against the resolution.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). May I ask if the government has any communication—

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that it would be better to go into committee, and I can better answer questions there.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. MONK. In view of what has been said regarding the effect of this treaty on our relations with the United States in connection with the new tariff, I would ask whether the government has endeavoured to ascertain in any way what interpretation the American authorities will put upon this treaty as affecting our position under that tariff. Has any communication taken place between this government and that of the United States on that point?

Mr. FIELDING. There has been no such communication. Our view, as stated the other day, is that our proper course is to await the determination of events. I hardly think it seemly that we should approach the government of the United States in the matter. I have reason to believe, however—this comes to me unofficially—that the United States government would not be in a position to give us information on the point at present. I have reason to believe that the American tariff commission which will advise the president has not yet come to a determination on the subject. However, as I said, we have not had any official communication with them on the matter.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) aware whether any decision come to by the president of the United States under the powers conferred upon him in this matter is subject to revision by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. My impression is that it is not, but I would not answer definitely. It is not a point to which I have given particular attention.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to retard the report of the committee, but I think the point of my question still remains. I do not see anything particularly 'unseemly' in our inquiring of a friendly nation in what way they would interpret the favour we are giving to the French government under this treaty. Surely international relations admit of such a course between peoples at peace. We are granting a special favour to the French nation on certain specified articles, and a great many people express a doubt whether the result of that very moderate favour to the French nation will not be to affect very considerably our commercial relations with the United States through our being in consequence placed under the highest United States tariff. That is the difficulty, as I understand it. Surely, before we ratify a treaty some tentative effort might be made to find out how that would be interpreted.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is hardly correct to say that we are granting a favour to the French nation. If it be a favour, it is for a favour in return. I think our American neighbours, on principle, do not interpret that as discrimination. Of course, I have no right to speak on their behalf. I think the statement I have made that, even if we had sought information of that kind from the United States government, they are not in a position to give it, is correct, and I base my statement on information gained through the press and elsewhere. The United States authorities have not yet determined their action. I do not think we should assume that that action will be adverse to us; on the contrary, we should assume that it is the right of Canada to regulate its own commercial affairs. We have no reason to suppose that the American government will approach the matter in an unfriendly spirit; quite the contrary; I think we have every reason to believe that it will be the desire of that government to interpret the tariff favourably toward Canada. However, the matter may be more fully discussed at a later stage and, in the meantime, I think the House might well reserve its judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the resolution passing, on the understanding that it does not bind the House, certainly this side of the House, as to the action to be taken when the Bill comes before us. But I would like to know whether the Finance Minister proposes to press his Bill, to be based on this resolution, to a conclusion before any information is got as to what will be the course of the United States tariff with reference to Canada in this matter. I quite agree with the Minister of Finance that he cannot get that information now. If he were to appeal for it a dozen times, I do not think he could get it. That comes in a certain course, as I explained the other day. A commission of experts has been appointed, and that commission will take up the tariff legislation of different countries, inquiring into the facts, and into the facts alone. It will report the facts to the President, who cannot act until that report is before him. This report of the commission, as I understand it, will not be political in any way, it will not take into account the matter of policy but simply the facts of the case. If the commission report, with reference to a given country, that it gives advantages discriminating against the United States, it will be for the President to decide as to his course in the matter. As I pointed out the other day, I think it is abundantly clear that the decision of the President will not be a personal decision

in any way; it will not be a decision by the President that, looking at it from his own standpoint, and as far as he is concerned he will apply or will not apply the surtax to the country in question. It seems to me that his is the duty of making a decision according to the facts presented, just as a judge or jury would give decision on whatever question came before them. Therefore, if the Minister of Finance determines to press this to a conclusion before we know what will be the attitude of the tariff commission or the President in this case, I think he will be taking a very grave step, and that he ought to wait more definite information before we are asked to take that final step. The present treaty with France is a very contracted one. It gives concessions upon a very small number of articles, but the treaty which has been arranged by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine is much more extended and has an area and scope much wider, as applied to the United States in this matter, than the old treaty. While the President of the United States or the tariff commission might not think that the old treaty had any particular discrimination against the United States, they might come to a very different opinion with reference to the present treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no disposition on the part of the government to press this matter unduly, and we shall be willing to grant a delay in the procedure at the request of any hon. gentleman on either side who may desire better opportunity of studying the question. But if I understand my hon. friend rightly he wants us to wait until next April in order to find out what the United States will do. I do not think we ought to wait on the action of the United States. I think we have clearly made it understood in this parliament that Canada, while paying great deference to her great neighbour, is no longer willing to be dependent on the action of the United States in tariff matters. The sentiment of our people is that we shall quietly and deliberately work out our own commercial policy. If that policy be acceptable to our powerful neighbour, we are all the more pleased; but if it should not, much as we might regret the fact, I do not see why that would justify our taking a different policy. I do not see why we should depart from any line of action which we deemed advantageous in our own interests because that might not be agreeable to the great republic. We must play our own part fairly, open and above board, and after having entered into negotiations with the French government, after having persuaded them to accept this treaty, after having become in honour bound to the French government to present it to the House, we do not think it would be proper to wait until the 1st of April next in order to find out whether it will be acceptable to our neighbours to the south.

Mr. LENNOX. The sentiment which the Minister of Finance has just expressed has evoked very hearty applause from his followers, but this is not a matter for sentiment or hysterics. It is one of cool business. The proposition may or may not be good, so far as the French treaty is concerned, but that is no reason why we should go it blind on this occasion. When the French treaty was before this House for consideration previously, we had not the information as to the action of the United States which we now have. We have now, in their statutes a clear cut expression of the policy of the United States. It is not impossible for this government, long before April next, to ascertain what must be the action of the United States regarding the tariff now under consideration. The language of the American statute is pretty clear. Unless the President of the United States, after taking into consideration the fiscal measures of any other country, comes to the conclusion that the United States is receiving in every respect reciprocal fair treatment, the 25 per cent additional duty is automatically imposed. If it be rather unfortunate, if, by reason of the fact that, as the Minister of Finance has suggested, this government urged upon France the adoption of this treaty although it entails great sacrifices upon this country, we are to press this matter through without looking to the results. Putting sentiment aside and looking at this as a matter of business, whatever our representatives may have done twelve months ago, it is our duty now, before finally concluding this treaty with France, to ascertain what will be the effect of its going into operation. I am not saying that I am opposed to it, but I say that we must look at it as a business proposition and ascertain whether, as regards trade with other countries, it will be to our commercial benefit. If this House is of the opinion notwithstanding the efforts of the two gentlemen who went to France, notwithstanding what assurances they gave or what persuasion they used, that the adoption of the treaty would not be commercially beneficial to us, we should not ratify it. I think that the government should, in the first place, submit to the Minister of Justice the question as to the reasonable construction of the American statute, whether that might involve the addition of 25 per cent duty on imports from Canada to the United States, should this French treaty go through. In such an event the exports from Canada to the United States would be exceedingly limited.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has become

unduly excited. Commercial treaty making is a business affair, not a question of knuckling under to any other nation or giving up our independence. We leave that kind of business to our hon. friends opposite, but we have blundered enough in this French treaty so far that we do not want any further mistakes. Everybody I am sure wants the treaty, but we would like to know how we stand. My hon. friend went to France, he dealt with business men, who soon ascertained that he had forgotten we had a treaty with Switzerland and that was the cause of the whole delay. What happened? When the Americans made a treaty with Japan they inserted four or five words in their treaty which preserved them against Japanese immigration. We made a treaty and it was suggested to us by the Foreign Office in England that we should guard ourselves in a similar way. We did not do it, and the error we committed in that instance must have cost us over £50,000, and led to the invasion of British Columbia by the Japanese. That was another mistake. Now here—and I think it is just as well that these things should be stated before the Bill come up, because it will shorten discussion on the Bill—my hon. friend lays this matter before parliament. He has no legal opinion to lay before the House as to the effect of the ratification of this treaty upon our relations with our neighbours in the United States. There is no legal opinion. I asked my hon. friend if he had taken the trouble to inquire from the official representative in Washington what would happen if we ratified the treaty. Will we suffer this immense inconvenience or not? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance does not seem to me to have any information on that point. He mentioned that the matter would have to go before the commission. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, that the commission having examined the matter, will report to the President, whose action thereupon will be in the nature of ministerial action, not political action. But surely it is fair that we should know what our position will be before we finally ratify that treaty. I am very desirous that we should multiply our commercial relations with France. But we must not forget that our commercial relations with the United States are far more vast, far more considerable; and we must not jeopardize the one in order blindly to carry out the other which is less important. I think that when the matter comes up upon the Bill, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance should have the legal question elucidated before us by the legal advisers of the Crown; and I still believe, in spite of what has been said, that inquiries should be made from our representative at Washington as to what would probably happen in that case.

Mr. FIELDING. It is quite true that there has been some blundering in connection with the French treaty, but the blunder, I regret to say, has been very largely on the part of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman led up an attack upon the treaty, alleging that it was something which gave France an undue advantage. He discovered his blunder.

Mr. MONK. I did not say that to-day. I said we granted favours.

Mr. FIELDING. But I am talking of the discussion of this French treaty some time ago when it was brought before parliament. The hon. gentleman, in a variety of ways, has endeavoured to make this House believe that the treaty was one in which the interest of Canada was sacrificed, and undue favour shown to France.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, he is quite mistaken.

Mr. FIELDING. That was the ground of his repeated hostility to the treaty. If he did not mean that, what did he mean?

Mr. MONK. I never was hostile to the treaty. I will not allow my hon. friend to make mistakes of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says he is not hostile. One is reminded of the old lines:

> It is all very well to dissemble your love,
> But why did you kick me down stairs?

If the hon. gentleman was in favour of the French treaty he took a queer way of showing it to this House. Again and again my hon. friend, by question, by suggestion, gave the House to understand that it was a treaty in which the interests of Canada were sacrificed. Does he not virtually say that to-day?

Mr. MONK. I deny that absolutely.

Mr. FIELDING. Then the hon. gentleman discovered that this treaty, which was so favourable to France and so unfair to Canada, after it had been ratified by the Canadian parliament, was held up for months and was not ratified and approved by the French legislative bodies because they thought is was too favourable to Canada; and then my hon. friend discovered his blunder. He regarded this treaty as too favourable to France, and we thought it was a fair treaty. And again and again, in the legislative chambers—

Mr. MONK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not think my hon. friend has a right to make that statement when I deny it.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to-morrow to read what he did say in the 'Hansard,' perhaps he

will find that he went further than he imagined. For the present I may say, and repeat, that the hon. gentleman again and again, in this House, by question, by suggestion, by a variety of ways, impeded—

Mr. MONK. Order.

Mr. FIELDING. What is the matter? Does the hon. gentleman say that he did not oppose the treaty?

Mr. MONK. Never.

Mr. FIELDING. Never questioned it?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend should take my denial.

Mr. FIELDING. I accept my hon. friend's statement. I advise him to read the 'Hansard,' that is the best advice I can give him.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman will not read the 'Hansard' to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not bring it here to-day because I did not imagine that my hon. friend would for a moment doubt the accuracy of what I have said. However, let that pass. Then my hon. friend discovered his blunder a little later. After the course he had pursued in relation to this treaty, when it came to be ratified, if I am not mistaken, he did not vote against it.

Mr. MONK. Voted for it, and supported it also.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, that is a kind of support in regard to which I would say: save us from our friends. Then there is another point. My hon. friend said trouble arose in connection with this treaty because it was discovered that Switzerland was a favoured-treaty-country, and that that fact had not been ascertained. My hon. friend said that it was a blunder. Well, if it was a blunder it was a blunder that he had better lay at the door of the hon. member for North Toronto; because when the first French treaty was brought down in this parliament the question as to the countries that were entitled to the favoured-nation treatment was brought up, and a list of countries under the favoured-nation-treaty was given, and Switzerland was not one of them. So my hon. friend will see that there was doubt as to what was the application of this treaty to Switzerland. That doubt was entertained not only by the Liberal government but entertained by the government of the Conservative party. Now I am glad to be able to say that there is no party interest in this matter. My hon. friend suggests that there is in some way, he suggests some party feeling, some excitement. I am glad to be able to tell him that on behalf of the Conservative party the true note in this matter has been spoken by a distinguished member of that party in another place, a gentleman whose name it is not necessary to mention, and speaking in a place which I must not mention. He said :

He called attention to the reports that the Franco-Canadian treaty was likely to result in the United States maximum tariff being imposed against this country. The evident spirit behind the American tariff was one which could not be admired. It was designed among other things to prevent an improvement of the trade relations between Canada and the mother country, or any other country. He observed that Canada had developed her trade in the face of hostile American legislation, and he hoped that the Canadian government would not humiliate the Dominion by approaching the United States to ask the benefit of the minimum tariff.

I think that is a truer national note than has come from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think that the members of this House on both sides are under a deep debt of gratitude to the Minister of Finance for the clear, explicit and unmistakably frank expression he gave this House as to the ground on which the government intend to proceed with regard to this French treaty. We have had many other measures brought down by the government on which the members on this side of the House were perfectly satisfied that the principle on which the government was determined to proceed was that unhappy principle which the Minister of Finance so frankly avowed a few moments ago to-day. For the first time in the history of this House, a minister of the Crown has stood before parliament, speaking of a matter of tremendous importance to this country, a matter that means an immense deal for the weal or for the woe of thousands and thousands of business men of this country, and the Minister of Finance has frankly said that the government did not propose to be influenced in the slightest by such considerations as the weal or woe of the people of Canada, but that they proposed to do exactly as they saw fit, regardless of all considerations of Canadian interests. It was rather singular, too, that the Minister spoke, not hastily, not without a complete understanding, not without a precedent to guide him in the right path, for within a moment or two after he had so spoken, speaking of this and the other French treaty, referring to the manner in which another, and perhaps I may say, a wiser government have acted, he frankly admitted that the treaty had been held up for many a long day. Why? Because, at the other end of the line, the other contracting party suspected that the treaty was too favourable to Canada and therefore was not sufficiently favourable to France. One would have thought, particularly when the hon. gentleman knew that the nation with which

he was dealing had held up the treaty to calmly consider it and would not assent thereto until the authorities were perfectly satisfied that the treaty was in the interest of France, that the Canadian Finance Minister might have had sufficient interest in the people of this country, sufficient regard for the wishes of the people and sufficient regard for the opinion of this House to at least say: We will get all the information we can and when we have obtained all the information we can we will ratify or refuse to ratify as may be in the interest of Canada. Supposing it should be the case that the effect of ratifying this treaty is to expose us to the maximum tariff of the United States. Let us assume, for a moment, this, because, surely, the Prime Minister will not claim that there is sufficient advantage to be gained by Canada, not even the little trade we do, but the increased trade that we may do with France under this treaty to justify the tremendous loss which would be inflicted on Canada by virtue of the imposition of the maximum tariff of the United States. Although the Finance Minister would not dream of saying that if the American maximum tariff were to be applied it would not be a far greater injury than the French treaty would be a benefit to us, he calmly tells us: I do not know whether it will be applied or not and I do not propose to wait to find out. I think the business men of Canada might well ponder that utterance of the Minister of Finance and perhaps some of them will come to the conclusion that if times do happen to improve a little in one year as compared with another it is not owing to any extraordinary astuteness or financial ability on the part of the government who are managing the affairs of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is adopted I would like to make a few more remarks. I do not think there is anything in the discussion of this question except a mere discussion of business matters. I do not know why the Minister of Finance should go off at a tangent and indulge in something which is not far removed from high-faluting as to the tremendously martial and vigorous stand that he is going to take against the United States. He was not going to be coerced—not much. He would stand by his guns as long as the guns had ammunition and he could keep on firing them! It was not necesary to the discussion of this question to go into that part of it. One is tempted to ask whether the Finance Minister was always as patriotic and decided over these matters in connection with the United States as he is to-day.

Mr. FIELDING. Always.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, what disappointment has he received that has so soured him upon his former friends and confederates. At one time he was hand in glove with prominent persons in the United States declaring, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister declared, that they would nail to the masthead a certain flag written upon which was that Europe might go hang, Great Britain might go hang, and all the other colonies of Great Britain might go hang, but that they would hang together until they had brought about the adoption of their policy of continental union, or unrestricted reciprocity, coupled with discrimination against Great Britain and every colony of Great Britain. Those were the guns that he was ready to stand by at that time. Now they are very different guns and he is behind them. But this, after all, is a mere pop gun. The Minister of Finance knows exactly what it means, if he has thought of it at all. On one side you have a possible treaty with France, involving a trade altogether of only about $10,000,000 a year. On the other hand, you have a decided juncture of circumstances in connection with our trade in the United States which trade amounts to $270,000.000 per year. There is hardly a trader from Vancouver to Sydney who has not more or less intimate trade relations with the United States of America on which he makes profits, from which he gets gains and in the prosecution of which he has his capital employed. If the minister puts through any treaty so small as this, or even though it were larger, and the decision of the United States, through their commission and the president, is that in the end it discriminates against the United States he knows that the exact statement in the clause of the United States tariff is that thereupon 25 per cent is added to the duty on every article which goes from this country to the United States. That is a very serious thing. What happens as the next step? This country would certainly be acting outside of and recreant to its duty, should the United States put on that surtax of 25 per cent, if it did not follow suit with the surtax which is allowable and which is possible under the law which we have in Canada. What would that mean? It would mean a tremendous disturbance and dislocation of business amounting to $270,000,000 per year as between us and the United States. I am just as strong as the Minister of Finance in this statement, and on this ground that if, after all the facts of the case were understood this parliament of Canada comes to the conclusion that it is in the interest of this country to legislate in a certain way, then it should legislate in that way whether the United States puts 25 per cent or 50 per cent upon our imports.

But, I hold it to be the height of absurdity and childishness for the Minister of Finance of Canada to refuse a fair delay in the adjudication of this House upon this treaty until we can find out all the facts of the case so that this House will know whether or not, if it does carry out the French treaty, it will be face to face with the condition to which I have referred in connection with the trade of the United States. If after we have all the information we believe that it is best for us to do so, we have the right to do so, notwithstanding anything that may be contained in the tariff of the United States. All we ask is that until we get that information, until a reasonable time at least is allowed for the getting of that information, this House shall not be pressed to come to a conclusion with reference to this treaty. This treaty has been held up now for about two years and nothing very harmful has happened. It would not hurt things materially if it were hung up for two, three or four months more. In two, three or four months more we certainly would know the attitude of the United States and then we could legislate with our eyes open upon the wide basis of all the facts. I am told —it goes through the papers at least—that the commission which has now been organized and which is at work in the United States, has instructions to take up the case of Canada first of all the countries and it is within the range of possibility that they will conclude their investigation into the facts in reference to Canada in a short period, and then the decision of the President may be found out. That is all. There is no need of going into heroics about it, there is no use of being ultra-patriotic as the Minister of Finance has tried to be, getting up and shooting off his ammunition and artillery all at once in our faces. By and by if we are pressed to the worst of it I will even stand behind him and furnish the ammunition for him to shoot off as far as my vigour goes, if we find, after the facts have been ascertained, that it is right and politic for us to take a certain course.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I sincerely hope that the Finance Minister will not attempt to force this House to take definite action at the present time on the French treaty, as in 1897 he forced this House to denounce the German treaty, which has resulted in twelve years of practical commercial war with Germany. That country last year imported two billion dollars worth of goods, one billion dollars worth of food products, three hundred million dollars worth of just such products as we are producing on the farms of Canada. We are practically driven out of the German market, whereas last year the Argentine Republic sold to Germany $116,000,000 worth of goods, Australia $48,000,000 worth, and the United States $214,000,000 worth, against a paltry million dollars worth from Canada. Canada has been practically driven out of Germany, the second best market in the world, because of the action of this government in regard to the German treaty. On that occasion, Sir Charles Tupper urged the hon. gentleman to stay his hand, but in vain. The hon. gentleman is taking a similar position today with regard to the French treaty, which may result in the United States placing on goods from Canada a surtax similar to the one placed on goods from Canada going into Germany. I sincerely hope that the Finance Minister will wait until we learn definitely what position the United States is going to take in the matter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. May I ask the Finance Minister one question? If he were today absolutely sure that the ratification of this treaty would entail an extra duty of 25 per cent on all Canadian products going to the United States, would he proceed with the ratification of this treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. I wish to answer all questions frankly; but on a great international question it is the part of wisdom not to answer too broadly. If the question of my hon. friend implies that we are bound to be governed in our commercial policy by the action of the United States government or the United States congress, or that we must wait to learn what the United States government or the United States congress will do on any tariff matter before we mould our own policy, I cannot subscribe to any such doctrine.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The Finance Minister has not answered my question. The reason I put it is this. Unless he can answer it in the affirmative, and say that he would still ratify this treaty even if he discovered subsequently that the effect of ratifying would be to entail an extra 25 per cent duty on Canadian products going to the United States, he has no right to ask us to ratify the treaty. I am fair to say that I believe that if he absolutely knew to-day that the ratification of the French treaty would bring this result, recognizing the vast injury that would be done to this country as compared with the trifling benefit we would receive by the ratification of the French treaty, I think he would hold his hand.

Mr. FIELDING. If the United States government were to take the course my hon. friend suggests, they would have more to lose by it than Canada.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I do not think we should deal with this question at all from a party standpoint. The members of this

House, on both sides, are sent here to work for the best interest of their constituents, and of the country as a whole. We are practical business men sent here to attend to the business of the country. Now, with regard to this question, we sent two of our ministers to France, a country that is doing a small trade with Canada, to see if we could not enlarge that trade. They made a treaty which is subject to the ratification of the representaives of the people of this country. When making that treaty, they believed that they were acting in the best interest of the country. But since that time things have changed. The congress of the United States has passed certain legislation which applies to all countries, but most directly to Canada, in which they say to us, if you give any other country better terms than you give us, we will increase the tariff against you 25 per cent. How will that affect us? The Canadian farmer will have to pay an increase of $1 on every ton of hay, $10 on every horse, from $1 to $2 on every sheep or lamb he sends to that country. How can the farmers support a government that makes a bargain for getting a little trade with France by which it loses a great trade with the United States? I say it is the duty of the government to stay their hand until we see what our neighbours are going to do. It is the duty of every member of this House, on either side, to say to the government, we will not ratify that treaty until we see what action the United States government will take.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think every allowance should be made for the Minister of Finance, for this is one of those unfortunate questions which touch that autonomy which has of late become such a red rag to hon. gentlemen opposite. The moment any question touches that autonomy, these hon. gentlemen seem to lose all sense of perspective. It might do for somebody in a small township council to talk as the Minister of Finance has been talking this afternoon, but it hardly accords with the dignity of this House. The hon. gentleman talks about our being governed by the United States. Let us use the English language in something of the sense in which it is understood by everybody except the hon. gentleman. Nobody has suggested that this House should be governed by the United States. The proposition is that this House should legislate exactly as it thinks in the best interests of Canada. That is not being governed by the United States. The hon. gentleman is being governed by the United States through a fear he seems to have that somebody wants to interfere with his prerogative; but as there are six or seven million people in this country, and only two of those went as delegates to France, and are personally interested in having this treaty go through, right or wrong, it would be well to balance the interest of the rest of the six or seven million people against the exclusive interests of these two. If the Finance Minister can show that we are in any sense being governed by the United States in the proposition laid down, namely that this House should know what it is doing, that it should get all the information possible before it decides, then the more we have of such government by the United States the better.

Mr. TURRIFF. If this House followed the suggestion made by hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be simply extending an invitation to the Congress of the United States to put on that extra 25 per cent duty. I believe that if we want to prevent the United States from taking the action suggested by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that we ought to go on right now and conduct our business exactly as we would if the American tariff were not now under revision.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman not believe that the United States will put that extra duty on if they think it is to their interest to do so.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think there is one chance in ten thousand of their putting it on because for every dollar they hurt us, they will hurt themselves four.

Mr. LANCASTER. If you give that information to the Finance Minister it will help us on.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Will the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) say if it is still provided by the French treaty that absinthe and imitation brandies should be brought into this country at a reduced rate?

Mr. FIELDING. If those articles were expressed in the treaty, of course nothing has occurred to change them; but my hon. friend is mistaken; the treaty does not provide for a reduction of duty on the articles he has referred to. Except for one small paragraph in regard to cattle the treaty is precisely as it was when it was last discussed, and I think my hon. friend will find he is mistaken on this point.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Those articles were mentioned in the last treaty, they are in the list yet.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend will find he is mistaken.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I have it and I shall show it to the hon. minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I will be glad if my hon. friend will show it to me.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am of the opinion, and I know that a great many other busi-

ness men in this country are of the opinion that this trade treaty policy which has been adopted by the government is entirely wrong and that we should have one tariff for every country. Then if there is any change to be made or any particular article to be imported from any country the tariff on that article could be lowered. By making treaties with everybody we will some day find ourselves in the position of a certain old gentleman who had an animal and every one told him what to do with it; we will be making treaties for every one else and have nothing left for ourselves. I would strongly counsel delay in the matter of this or any other treaty at present for a more cogent reason than any that has been advanced to-day. An election will be held in Great Britain at an early date, and one of the great questions before the people there is whether Great Britain shall change her free trade policy and adopt a protective policy, and if she adopts a protective policy, whether a preference will be granted to the colonies. It is useless to talk hypocritically, the fact remains that the people of this country, especially the farming community, would like to see a mutual preference between Great Britain and Canada. Such a preference would benefit the farming community and every one else in the country. But if we adopt a great many treaties with various countries, and continue that policy, the day will come when we cannot take advantage of a preference offered us by Great Britain unless we denounce treaties with France, Japan and other countries. The House will remember that when we offered a preference to Great Britain it could not be put into effect until certain trade treaties which Great Britain had with foreign countries had been denounced. Within the next two or three months we will know exactly the position of the British parliament for the next four years and think that this parliament should hesitate and should delay taking action on any of its trade relations with any other country and tieing ourselves up for a period of years with any country until we know what our position is going to be in reference to a preference with England. I think that is a strong argument for delay, and one which should appeal to every member of this House who would like to see us obtain some slight advantage in the markets of the mother country. Any small trade advantage that would be offered to us, would certainly not be offered by Great Britain to France or any other foreign country, and for that reason the clearer we keep our hands from treaties with other countries, by simply adopting one single tariff for every country, the safer will be the ground on which we stand. We will then be on the safe ground on which this country stood for many years and on which the foundations of its greatness were laid. We are now departing from that policy, adopting the principle of trade treaties with every country so that articles from one country are admitted at a lower rate of duty than from another country. The effect of that is that articles are being sent from countries against which we have a high tariff through countries enjoying a reduced tariff, so that the Customs Department has constant trouble in reference to this question of the country of origin. The Customs Department claims that articles are sent to Great Britain from Germany and other countries, given a coat of lacquer or varnish, and passed through the Canadian customs as British. Such cases of fraud will occur and no one can prevent them; it is human nature to try and get the best of the customs.

In view of the serious aspect of the question in relation to Great Britain and the probability that we will have to consider a preference from the mother country possibly before the end of this session, I believe it would be advisable for us to delay any consideration of any trade treaty with any foreign country until we know just where we stand in relation to Great Britain.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the object of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in presenting this resolution at this particular time? I understood him to intimate that there would be no objection to allowing the Bill when it is brought down to stand for any length of time at the request of any member. Personally I look on this resolution as committing the House to the statement that it is expedient to approve of this treaty, and my own view is that I would not care to support the ratification of this treaty if I thought it would bring into effect the provision of the United States tariff subjecting Canadian goods to the extra 25 per cent duty. I have no hesitation in saying that if that is likely to be the effect of the ratification of this treaty I would vote against it, and when the Finance Minister is not able to give the House any more definite statement than he has given upon this point I do not think we should be called on to commit ourselves by the adoption of this resolution at this time. Has the Finance Minister consulted the Justice Department on this question? As I understand it, it is a matter almost entirely of legal interpretation and it seems to me that before he calls upon the members of this House to approve of the resolution he ought to be able to make some more definite statement as to its probable effect in reference to the application of the United States tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid the Justice Department would hardly undertake to in-

terpret the American law. The debate has taken a broader form than I anticipated. I suggested that it would be a convenience for the House to adopt the resolution pro forma in order that the Bill might be introduced and be available for discussion, so that the whole matter could be gone into at a later stage. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) nodded his assent and I presumed there was no objection to that suggestion. I did not expect there would be any debate at all. What I intended was that the resolution should be adopted, as is usually done, and then, when a Bill founded on it is introduced, we can discuss the matter on its merits. I have no objection to any reasonable delay being given to enable any hon. gentleman on either side to become better informed, but I am not prepared to wait until the first of April next in order to ascertain what might be the American view.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Passing over for a moment, the important observations of my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), may I observe that this discussion has proceeded under a misconception. If I understand the point raised, it is that this treaty, if adopted, might possibly be interpreted by the United States as discriminatory against it under article 2 of their tariff and cause the American government to impose an extra ad valorem duty, of 25 per cent on Canadian goods. The point taken is that any favour given under the proposed French treaty could be considered by the Americans as discrimination against them. I do not see how they can take that position; but if that point be well taken, it applies equally to our present relations with France, because we have in force now a treaty with France which admits certain goods at a preferential rate. If there be discrimination in the new treaty, there also is in the existing treaty, so that even if we should not ratify the treaty now submitted, we shall still be in the same position as regards our American neighbours in April next as we will be if we adopt the proposed treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No one desires that this country should take any undignified position with regard to its right to control its own tariff, but it must be borne in mind, notwithstanding what my hon. friend the Prime Minister says, that the ratification of this treaty may possibly have some bearing upon more than half our total foreign trade. That is a very important consideration. Possibly there might be a distinction between a treaty already in existence and one which we might enter into after the tariff with the United States has been framed and we have had notice of it. I do not think it would be advisable to take the position stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, that we should not have any regard whatever to the attitude of other countries in fiscal matters. The best evidence that such a position is not a good one is the fact that when the French Senate refused to ratify this treaty in its original form, this government modified it in order that it might receive the sanction of the Senate. This government took into consideration the attitude of the French Republic, when they signed a second treaty modifying very materially the position of affairs as compared with the first. I do not think we should be in any undue haste. In the old days, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, the Minister of Customs and their colleagues, were rather inclined to censure the Conservative administration for having taken what they deemed to be a very harsh and forbidding attitude in connection with our trade relations with the United States and were wont to inform the people that if a more conciliatory and courteous attitude had been adopted, our trade relations with our neighbours might have assumed a very much better condition. I believe that the men at the head of affairs in the United States to-day are of a friendly disposition to this country. I do not believe for one moment that they would be inclined to adopt any harsh attitude or take any unfriendly measures towards this country in any respect. I venture to think it might be worth while to have some reasonable delay. This treaty can be ratified at any time up to the close of the present session. There is no reason for undue haste. I do not think that either members of the government or private members are prepared to say that there may not come to us later on, before the close of the session, some information that might be of use to us in reaching a conclusion as to what the best interests of the country demand.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). What are the circumstances? A year ago a treaty was negotiated, through the British commissioner and the Canadian ministers, with France. This treaty was signed by the British commissioner as well as the Canadian ministers. It came to this parliament and this parliament ratified it. Every member in the House voted for it.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe a few did vote against it. It was however ratified by a very large majority on both sides. Since then some little change has taken place which involves this treaty coming back to this parliament for sanction. Have we changed our views since last session? If that were the case, it might be something to consider. But that is not the ground taken by the hon. member for North Toron-

to (Mr. Foster). Is it that the bargain is not a good one? There is no pretense of anything of the kind. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says it is a good treaty.

What is the true course in order to conserve the dignity of this parliament, even looking at the matter from the point of view of the leader of the opposition? France having agreed to this treaty and signed, this parliament having agreed to it and ratified it last session, a slight amendment that no one, I venture to say, considers of the least importance, must be ratified, thus making it necessary that the treaty should come back here. It is true, the whole question of acceptance or rejection of the treaty is before us now. Have our views been changed in any degree as to the beneficial effect of the treaty? If so, that is a point worthy of consideration. But, because there has been legislation by a foreign nation, acting within its rights and acting in its own interest, is it a very dignified position for this parliament to take to say that, though we entered in good faith into this treaty with the republic of France, we will, on the question of the ratification of this slight amendment, change our whole course? Should we maintain our dignity by saying that, because there are suspicions or doubts that the legislation of a foreign country may receive a certain interpretation, we will be swerved from what we have agreed is our duty in the matter? Also, I would ask hon. members who have spoken on this subject if they think that speaking of action on the part of a foreign government and crying it from the house tops is likely to make that government yield you any better terms? That, I think, is worthy of consideration. Will you strengthen the position of this parliament by such a course? Will you add to its dignity?

Mr. LANCASTER. Your position will be stronger if you do not tie your hands by passing the treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. Our position with whom?

Mr. LANCASTER. With the people you are speaking of. You will prevent them from accomplishing that object.

Mr. PATERSON. We prevent them from accomplishing that object if we do not ratify the treaty?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, if there is anything in your argument.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) then, is in favour of our throwing aside this treaty for fear the United States may take the course of action which is in his mind at this time. If that is the hon. gentleman's position and the position of his friends, the matter is one for them to consider. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) referred to action taken by this House in relation to the German treaty. He seemed to think that we had done a wrong thing in that matter. I believe that, to this day, the hon. gentleman is the only member of this House who has found fault with the action then taken. I have not heard another member on either side venture to say that Canada did not take a dignified stand at that time or that the action taken was not in the interest of the people of this country. It is true, there was a dislocation of trade for the time being. And I quite agree that you cannot wholly ignore the legislation of other countries. But, when you come to frame your tariff you take these matters into consideration and decide upon your action in the interest of the Canadian people under the circumstances. But, when the hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) speaks of our action in relation to the German treaty as though it had been a disaster, I cannot so view it. It is true that trade was interrupted and forced into new channels, and that is inconvenient, to say the least of it. If the United States, legislating in their own interest, enact laws by which trade is disturbed and turned into new channels, we must meet the changed conditions, there is no doubt about that. We would have to legislate in that matter, as we are bound to do in every matter, in the interests of the Canadian people. And so we are brought right back to the point from which we started. If the hon. member takes the position that, if the Americans were to tell us that we would come under their highest tariff if we dared to put this treaty through he would throw the treaty over, not because he objects to the treaty but because pressure has been brought to bear upon him, I can only say that that does not seem to me a maintenance of the dignity of this parliament upon which the leader of the opposition dwelt so strongly. It would be a matter much to be regretted if we were put under the maximum tariff of the United States. It certainly would dislocate trade temporarily, and the trade is a very large one indeed. Our trade with the United States is greater than with any other country, not even excepting Great Britain itself. And, looking at it from the point of view of the United States, our trade with them is by no means insignificant. I believe that Canada is the third nation in the importance of its trade with the United States. You cannot disturb such a volume of trade, import and export, without inconvenience and difficulties resulting. Nations have to consider that: no doubt they will; and no doubt they will act as they may seem in their best interest under the circumstances as they exist. I confess that I am rather amused by what some hon. members opposite have said with regard to our export trade. They say that if we have to pay so much more for our sheep and cattle exported to the United

States, it will be injurious to us. That is true, but I may say for the comfort of these gentlemen that I do not think our great agricultural exports will go to the United States, or that they go there now, It is true the market for some of these exports is found there, but the market is very limited indeed. And, speaking in round numbers, the imports from the United States are about double the exports to that country. And some of these hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of delay have often lamented that there are so many manufactured goods from the United States imported into Canada. They say that $40,000,000 of manufactured goods are imported from the United States into Canada, all of which goods should be manufactured in this country. They ask, why do not you put up your tariff and shut them out? But to-day they are wonderfully concerned about the matter because there is a prospect of higher duties being put on. That is wholly within our own domain; we determine what duty should be put upon certain imports into our country, just as the Americans determine what shall be paid on imports into their country from Canada and elsewhere.

When you come to the exports of Canada, we do a trade with them as well as an import trade; there is no doubt about that. And that would be a matter, as I said before, of consequence in a trade so large between two friendly nations such as they are. But shall we on that account submit to have our legislative hands tied, and not carry out in good faith an agreement that was made, and a treaty that was made between this country and the republic of France? Are we prepared to do that? That is the way we must look at it now. If you are prepared to carry it out, no matter what may be the action of any other nation, why may you not as well carry it out now as at any other time? What will be gained by waiting? No one can tell. It has been said that the President of the United States has experts who will inform him on the conditions of trade between all the countries and the United States, and that he will be the judge, and he will judge, as the hon. member for North Toronto says, on the facts that will be laid before him. Well, what are the facts that will be laid before him? What, if you do not pass this treaty at all, will be the fact that will be laid before him with reference to our treaty with France? They will have to report that Canada has a treaty with France in existence. She has not denounced it. True, she is repealing it in another Bill that is before parliament; but in the meantime it is in force. They report that fact, they cannot report any more than that. If we pass this treaty they will have to report the same. What will be the action of the United States in reference to that? The United States is a great nation, a dignified nation. The United States, as I understand it, have always held that it is not to be considered a violation of the favoured-nation doctrine, if they considered themselves under it, when they chose to give to another nation certain favours for certain favours received. They have always taken that ground. In my judgment they will have to change their whole past procedure if they decide to penalize us because we have made a treaty with France in which we get advantage for advantage. They have their treaties. Would they ask from other nations, would they take away from other nations the liberty that they claim for themselves? They have a treaty with Cuba at the present time, I believe; they have had treaties that we did not participate in, a limited number, a treaty with Germany, and with France also. That has been their course all through. They have always taken that stand, and I see no reason why they should depart from that policy at the present time. If that be so, why should there be any hesitancy on our part? Again, I say, even if there were in our minds a thought that they would reverse their mode of dealing, and the ground which they have taken in dealing with other foreign nations, even if they were to reverse their policy entirely in that respect, what should Canada do? Should we not go on and carry out a treaty solemnly ratified in large part, as it was a year ago, before this question ever arose in the United States? I am not blind to what the effect would be on Canada's trade under certain conditions. But it seems to me that the dignity of this parliament, alluded to by the leader of the opposition, would call upon us to go on. We are acting within our rights, we are doing what we consider to be for the benefit of the people of this country. And should another country take the view that we should be penalized because we have exercised our own rights, not encroaching on the rights of any one else, what is the course we should pursue even then? Is it not to maintain a dignified course, and go on with our legislation, while having due regard to the rights of our neighbours, making Canadian interests our paramount motive, as they are bound to be.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It occurs to me in this discussion that we cannot find out what the attitude of the United States government will be unless we pass the treaty. The public men who are charged with a certain duty in connection with this matter in the United States do not deal with hypothetical cases; and it strikes me that unless we pass the treaty, we cannot ascertain what the action of the United States will be. I must also add, in view of what has been said here this afternoon, that if we are to have our freedom of action interfered

with by some kind of legislation in the United States, this country will be paralysed in anything we may wish to do. We will be told that if we go in for preferential trade within the empire there is a clause in the tariff of the United States that will interfere with our freedom of action in that regard; and if we admit that contention, why, we can do nothing. In order to preserve our freedom of action, I say we must fix the Canadian policy from the point of view of Canadian interests, and it would not be wise for us to show by our action that Canadians are to be intimidated in their policy. As one who believes in a national policy for this country, I say we ought to be prepared at all times to take our own part, and fight it out. Now, if we are to incur discrimination by this United States tariff, I do not think it will be on account of the French treaty, but rather on account of the patriotic action of this country in proposing, if we do so, to put export duties on our raw materials going into the United States, in order to secure that they may be worked up in this country. It is our action in regard to saw-logs in Ontario, and our action in regard to pulpwood in Quebec and elsewhere, which may bring upon us this threatened action of the United States. I, for one, am not prepared to abandon that patriotic stand the provinces have taken in regard to pulp-wood and saw-logs, even if the United States were to threaten us with a surtax that they are able to impose by their tariff law. So, while I acknowledge that we should not embark thoughtlessly in a course that will injure us, still I contend that we cannot ascertain what the United States will do until we pass the treaty. If we say that we will do nothing in this country for fear of incurring some tariff punishment from the United States, then we have parted with our freedom of action. Let me say again that if we are to incur the surtax, it will be not so much because of our action in regard to the French treaty as because it is proposed in this country to adopt the patriotic policy of trying to have our raw products worked up as much as possible in our own country, instead of letting them be worked up in the United States.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One word with regard to an observation that fell from the Minister of Customs. He has argued that the dignity of this parliament makes it necessary for us to ratify the French treaty as amended. I would not be inclined, however, to concur in that. Parliament did not make the treaty, the Crown made the treaty and the treaty, as far as Canada was concerned, was made subject to the ratification of this parliament. The government of the French republic made that treaty on the part of France subject to the ratification of the French parliament. The French parliament saw fit, in its wisdom, to declare it would not ratify that treaty without a certain amendment. It was entirely within the right and dignity of the French parliament to take that course. It is equally within the right and dignity of this House of parliament to say that it will not ratify the treaty with that amendment.

Mr. PATERSON. With this distinction, that we had ratified it once and they had not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We never ratified the treaty in its amended form as far as I am aware.

Mr. PATERSON. It is a very slight amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs says that it is a very slight amendment. It was not regarded as a slight amendment by the French parliament because they declared that they would not ratify the treaty without it. If it were sufficient to justify that refusal of action on their part it might be sufficient to justify a refusal of action on our part. In neither case would we be departing from our right; in neither case would we be infringing the dignity of parliament.

Mr. PATERSON. If it was for that reason that they rejected it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly; and I suppose it might be added that we would have the right to take into consideration the conditions as they are to-day.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I rise to give a little information to the minister who framed this treaty. I am surprised that he does not know what is in it. This is a 'Convention respecting the commercial relations between Canada and France.' It is an official document issued by the King's Printer. I find at page 37, 'French products enjoying the benefit of the intermediate tariff.' If the products that are enumerated under this head are not going to get any benefit, why does it say 'enjoying the benefit'? If they are not to be brought in at a lower rate why is it put in that shape? I turn over to see page 38 and I find there a reference to absinthe. Absinthe is dope. It represents knock-out drops. There is not a man in this House that does not know what that means. Absinthe is one of the greatest curses in France. Medical men say in France that it is sending more men to the asylums than all the other causes put together. I spoke and voted against this treaty simply because of that one article being included in the treaty and I thought the government would have taken steps to have had it eliminated. Are the people in France unable to find a market for that product at the present time? They have prohibited it in the

French army and the medical men of France met in convention and asked that the use of this poisonous drug be prohibited in France. I suppose they have no market for it without sending it to us poor Canadians? I see that 'imitations of brandy' are included in item 156. I had better read that item and the committee will see the kind of products that are being brought into this country at a reduced rate, or rather enjoying the benefit of the minimum tariff.

Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine, n.o.p., gin of all kinds, n.o.p., rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p., amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxilic spirit or any substance known as wood spirits or methylated spirits, absinthe—

Will the minister take notice there?

—arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy, n.o.p., cordials and liqueurs, all kinds, n.o.p., mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura, and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages; and wines, n.o.p., containing more than 40 p.c. of proof spirit.

Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients.

That is what is being brought into Canada. I object to the treaty on the ground of bringing these things into Canada and giving them any benefit at all and that is the reason why I voted against the treaty. I did so also for other reasons. I saw that the maximum and minimum tariff were the same and that while a number of things were enumerated as coming into this country and getting the benefit of the minimum tariff there was really no benefit, the maximum and minimum tariff in France being exactly the same on horses, cattle, peas, oats and other grains. The House was misled. It did not understand it. I am sure that hon. members did not know that these knock-out drops were being brought in at a reduced rate or they would not have supported the measure.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) must have been misled by somebody when this matter was before parliament at an earlier stage, because he certainly has an erroneous conception. He did not get it from this side of the House, and if he was led into error he must blame some one else. Let us understand what is the point of difference between my hon. friend and myself. We must connect his present observations with those that occurred a few minutes ago. He stated that by this treaty we were introducing brandy and absinthe at reduced rates. That is the point of difference between my hon. friend and myself, that is the basis of his whole speech. He is wrong. This treaty does not provide for the introduction of brandy or absinthe or any one of these things at a reduced rate. When I tell my hon. friend that, the whole foundation of his case is gone.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. At page 37 we have in schedule 'B,' 'French products enjoying the benefit of the intermediate tariff.' What does that mean? If they are enjoying the benefit of the intermediate tariff are they not coming into this country at a reduced rate? I think the fair inference is that they are to come in at a reduced rate.

Mr. FIELDING. I would have supposed that instead of being in doubt or being led astray for a couple of years on this subject my hon. friend would have taken the trouble to have turned to the Canadian tariff and found out what the benefits were under the intermediate tariff; because, if, instead of being in this doubt and of voting wrongly, my hon. friend had turned to the Canadian tariff, item 156, I think it is, he would have found that the intermediate tariff and the general tariff are the same and that there is no reduction at all.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. That is so, and that is where the deception comes in in this whole treaty. I ask that absinthe be totally prohibited.

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Why this deception? Why should it state that articles are receiving the benefit of the treaty when they are receiving no benefit whatever? Why do you say that cattle are to be allowed in under the intermediate tariff, when the maximum and minimum tariff are the same? If my hon. friend will read the speeches I made a few years ago he will see what I said on the subject then.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has confessed that he voted against the treaty because he was persuaded that we were bringing in brandy and absinthe at reduced rates. That is the important ground upon which he voted against the treaty. My hon. friend ought now to vote for the treaty and put himself right, because I have shown that he is entirely mistaken. The intermediate tariff and the general tariff on brandy and absinthe are the same and when our French brethren get the benefits of the intermediate tariff on brandy and absinthe they get nothing they were not enjoying now, because there is no reduction in the intermediate tariff on these articles.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. If there is no benefit why do you put it in at all?

Mr. FIELDING. When I was young I used to think that there were lots of things that needeed explanation, but now that I am getting old I have come to the conclusion that for pretty nearly everything in life there is a reason if you will only look for it. The reason here is very simple. There is a number of articles on which we in Canada are to receive the benefit of the minimum tariff in France. But if he looks carefully into it, he will discover that in several cases there is no benefit at all, because the general and the minimum are the same. These are not fixed rates of duty. At any moment France might adopt a minimum tariff which would fix reduced duties on grains or other articles; and if it gave any country in the world the benefit of those reduced duties, Canada could claim them and get them, Then the French government turn around and say to us: If at any time you reduce the duty on brandy to any country, we want the benefit of that reduction, and we agree to give it to them.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Why not prohibit the importation of absinthe entirely?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not a question that arises under the French treaty at all.

Mr. BRODER. Would you be at liberty to prohibit it while this treaty is in existence?

Mr. FIELDING. Most certainly we would. All we would not be permitted to do would be to admit absinthe or brandy from any other country on more favoured terms than from France. If we wished to prohibit its importation altogether, not from France alone, but from all countries, we would have a perfect right to do so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not this treaty make a reduction in the duties on wines coming from France to Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Is there any provision, either in the treaty or in the proposed Bill, for the termination of the treaty after notice from the government?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, there is the same provision as in the present treaty, that we can determine the treaty on giving reasonable notice.

Mr. SPROULE. I would have thought, with regard to absinthe, that we would have done as we did with regard to oleomargarine coming from the United States—prohibit the importation entirely while the treaty was being made.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) may have a misconception, which the House also may have received from him, that there is some special enactment in this treaty with regard to absinthe. That is not so. Absinthe is one of many articles which are grouped together under one number in our customs tariff, and the French treaty simply provides that, with regard to that whole group of items, whatever benefit may accrue to any country from Canada shall accrue to France.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the Minister of Finance say that there is no provision in this treaty to prevent the coming into this country of wines that may be doctored with absinthe and other noxious substances, to come into competition with Canadian wines?

Mr. FIELDING. The treaty makes no change with respect to wines, except as to the rates of duty. The effect of the importation of wines on the public health is another question. Under our tariff we admit wines at certain rates of duty. We provide in the treaty that certain wines of low spirit, commonly called light wines, may be imported at lower rate. As to whether or not they may be doctored, the same question can be asked with regard to the importation of wines from any other country.

Mr. LANCASTER. For that and other reasons, I was of the opinion a couple of years ago that this treaty was not in the interest of Canada. I am still of the same opinion, because I have heard nothing from the Finance Minister to-day to convince me to the contrary. Therefore, I want to protest against this resolution passing or being reported.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PREVENTION OF PESTS TO VEGETATION.

Mr. FISHER. moved that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent the introduction or spreading of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation; providing for the granting of compensation for matter destroyed for this purpose, the appointment of inspectors for the enforcement of the Act, and penalties for its contravention.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir WILFRID LAURIER, House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 19, 1909

DEATH OF MR. BARR.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed within the last few minutes that we have lost one of our colleagues in the person of Dr. Barr, member for Dufferin. This news, I am sure, will come as a shock to all the members of this house. It is another example of how slight is the thread by which we hold our tenure of life. Yesterday Dr. Barr, to all apearances, was in perfect health. It so happened that I met him in one of the corridors of the House, we had a friendly chat together and nothing at that time could have indicated that he had not before him a long tenure of life. Now, he is no more. Dr. Barr was always a very much respected member of this House and we on this side join heartily with his friends on the other side in tendering to his family a sincere expression of our condolence in their bereavement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax.) Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for the very kind words he has used in regard to the very sudden death of one of our colleagues. Dr. Barr was apparently in the best of health yesterday and last night. He spent the evening in the society of some members on this side of the House apparently in the best of health and spirits. During the forenoon it was found that he had passed away. I desire to add my word of appreciation with respect to his services as a public man. He had had a very long career in public life. He was conscientious, earnest and indefatigable in the performance of his public duties, and feel sure that every member of the House will join most sincerely and earnestly in the expression of sympathy which has just fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, this Bill has reference to damage done on the highway by a vehicle which was not known at the time the Criminal Code was instituted. This is a vehicle which is under the complete control of the man who is managing it—the chauffeur—and in this respect differs from a vehicle drawn by horses. I refer to motor vehicles. There is a precedent for the Bill I am now asking leave to introduce. I have a report here in which it is stated that the British parliament is alarmed at the destruction of life and at the damage to roads occasioned by motor vehicles. As part of the explanation of this Bill I would mention that while there was not one passenger killed on the railways of the United Kingdom in the years 1907 or 1908, there were 101 killed in New York alone by motor vehicles, and there were 5,616 motor accidents in the United Kingdom 248 of which were fatal. I have some expressions of opinions here from the newspapers with regard to this Bill and I shall hand them into 'Hansard' without taking up the time of the House in reading them.

Montreal Daily 'Witness,' Wednesday, May 5, 1909.

Highway Assault.

We have decisions by courts of competent jurisdiction that the person on foot has the right of way, at least upon recognized crossings. This is common law and common sense. As things stand the motor car is on the same level as the horse and vehicle before the law, but there is an essential difference; when a horse runs away there is some excuse for the frightened animal. The machine is guided in all its motions by human hands. The driver of it is, therefore, with few exceptions—for machines have been known to 'run amuck'—responsible for its conduct.

Toronto 'Saturday Night,' May 15, 1909.

Take warning, ye motorists. Get over the excessive speed habit. Be alive to the rights of the other fellow. Put yourself in the place of the farmer for a few moments. Look the problem square in the face from his view point, and then see if you do not curse the automobile speed fiend, as the farmer now curses him.

Big sentence for motorist—Gets from 1 to 20 years and $500 fine for killing child.

Seattle, Wash., June 14.—Guy C. Stratton, a prominent lumberman, whom a jury convicted of manslaughter on the charge of having run over and killed 7-year-old Henrietta Johnson, while speeding his automobile, has been sentenced by Judge Frater, of the Superior Court, to an intermediate term of from one to twenty years in the state penitentiary, and to pay a fine of $500.

This is the first conviction for manslaughter under the provision of the state automobile law. The defence gave notice of appeal.

The 'Globe,' Toronto, Wednesday, October 20, 1909.

The British parliament is considering the advisability of building special tracks for motor vehicles and separating the two kinds of road traffic. Roads constructed for ordinary vehicles are destroyed by the automobiles, and the two kinds of traffic require radically different methods of road building.

Confiscate the cars of wicked motorists—Duke of Northumberland advocates this plan—keep them for, say, six months.

London, Nov. 14.—I do not believe that you will ever get over the difficulties unless you have, for certain definite offences, the right to confiscate the car for so many months. The speaker was the Duke of Northumberland, and, in view of the road casualties we have again to record this week, his Grace's remarks would seem to have the fullest justification.

Clinton 'News-Record,' June 3, 1909—The Auto question not yet settled.

Seventy-seven persons were killed by automobiles in New York alone during the past twelve months.

The cause of many of these killings is found in the reckless driving of high-powered engines through crowded thoroughfares by men intoxicated either with the speed of motion or in the ordinary way. Women, children and the aged should be free to go and come without fear of being run down by an engine capable of travelling fifty miles an hour, and which may be in the hands of a drunken driver.—Sun.

The Auto Nuisance in England.

It is not only in Ontario rural districts and villages that the auto has made a nuisance of itself. The same thing has occurred in England. As a result a petition to the Queen is now being signed for presentation by the women of English villages in the following terms:—

'We women of England humbly beseech your Majesty to help us to get some relief from the motor cars. We are sure Your Majesty cannot know how much we suffer from them. They have made our lives a misery. Our children are always in danger, our things are ruined by the dust, we cannot open our windows, our rest is spoiled by the noise all night. If they could be made to go slow through the villages it would be a great thing; but we are only poor people, and the great majority of those who use motor cars take no account of us. We do not know what to do, so we appeal to Your Majesty to use your great influence on our behalf.'

The 'Huron Expositor,' Seaforth, Friday, July 23, 1909.

The automobile, which is becoming more common every day, is still a terror to many travellers on the public highways with horse vehicles. Some of those in charge of these machines are commendably careful and considerate, and with such there is not much danger. Others, however, are just as reckless and inconsiderate and evidently seem to care little how much trouble or danger they occasion. These latter should be sharply looked after and severely punished. We heartily agree with the Montreal 'Star' when it says: If the owners and drivers of automobiles will not observe the common decencies of life while they are on the public roads, then the community must treat them like the dangerous criminals they make themselves, and let them see that the resources of society are not yet exhausted in dealing with men who take their pleasure at other men's peril. We would arrest and send to prison a reckless fool who should fire a rifle down a public highway upon which vehicles and pedestrians might easily be, and there is no reason why we should deal more tenderly with those who charge down these same peopled highways with immense cars.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 14) respecting offensive weapons and capital offences.—Mr. Lewis.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The purpose of this Bill is to avoid the unnecessary inspection of Canadian ships. Under the present regulations Canadian ships are practically subject to two inspections each year. A ship has to be inspected by Lloyds' inspector in order to obtain qualification for insurance, and when she arrives in a Canadian port she is also subject to inspection by the Canadian government inspector. In England the Board of Trade accepts Lloyd's inspection as quite sufficient. Everybody knows that Lloyd's inspection is the best inspection in the world and that a second inspection is absolutely unnecessary if the ship holds a certificate from Lloyd's. This inspection is an expensive piece of business for the owner of the ship. It means the cooling down of the boilers, the cleaning out of the hold, the taking the coal out of the bunkers; it means that the ship may be several days in the dock, and it often costs thousands of dollars. As Lloyd's inspection is accepted by the British Board of Trade, and Great Britain being the greatest shipping country in the world, I see no reason whatever why Lloyd's inspection should not be accepted by the Canadan government. My Bill provides that a ship holding Lloyd's certificate of inspection, shall not during that year be subject to a second inspection by Canadian officials when she arrives in a Canadian port.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEED CONTROL ACT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Seed Control Act.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FISHER. The use of alfalfa has become so general in the country that it is thought well to include alfalfa seed amongst the seeds to be affected by this Act. The Bill also provides for the inclusion of certain other seeds. There are some minor amendments to facilitate the working of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY CONNECTING LINES.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire by lease lines of railways connecting with the government railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. The object of this Bill, in short, is to give the minister power to enter into negotiations to lease any line or lines or part of a line that may be thought by the board of management to be of benefit to the Intercolonial railway. One provision of the Bill is that such railway must be leased on the report of the managing board, that it must be certified to by the chief engineer of the government as being in a safe and proper condition for operation, and that no such lease shall be operative until ratified by parliament?

Mr. J. D. REID. Do I understand the minister to say that he can enter into a lease and practically purchase a railway without first submitting the lease for the approval of parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no; the lease does not become operative until it is ratified by parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is better.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANK ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. S. SHARPE (North Ontario) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Bank Act.

Mr. FIELDING. Explain.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The object of the Bill is to provide that all stock on which no dividend has been claimed for upwards of six years shall be transferred to the government as trustees; that dividends on that stock which have not been paid for upwards of six years shall also be transferred to the government as trustees, and that balances remaining unclaimed in a chartered bank for upwards of six years shall be transferred to the government as trustees. The Bill also provides that should any person afterwards establish a legal right to these balances or to the stock the government will pay the accumulated interest at the rate of three per cent.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act. He said: the object of this Bill is to reduce the time of service required before an employee of either of these lines is entitled to be placed on the provident fund. During the past few months one of the strongest arguments made in favour of certain employees who have been dropped from the service has been that they were dropped just a short time before they would have been permitted to be placed on the provident fund, thus losing what they had paid in. This Bill is to obviate what might in a measure be an injustice to these old employees.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE IMPERIAL DEFENCE CONGRESS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister one or two questions with reference to the papers brought down as to the conference in London. In looking them over, it seems to me that they are incomplete. For instance, I was very anxious to find out what was the position taken by New Zealand and the position taken by Australia in reference to the provision that should be made for aiding in the imperial defence. I find nothing in the papers which gives any information as to that. The other day the Prime Minister spoke of what New Zealand and Australia were going to do and read an article from a newspaper. That, he knows is not the best kind of information for us to go on. I supposed that when these papers came down, we would see accurately, as we see in the case of Canada, what Australia and New Zealand proposed to do. It struck me that this paper was prepared for consumption in Canada, and therefore that the parts relating to Australia and New Zealand were not included. I may be wrong in that. The other point on which I would like to ask for further information, if it can be brought down, is this: I find that there are in that report allusions to the admiralty trying to meet, as far as they could, the wishes of Canada; but I do not find in these papers any expression of what the wishes of Canada were; and that is somewhat vital, I think, to an understand-

ing of the whole question. Are there not some lacunas which might be filled up?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All the papers, as far as I know, and I think I am correctly informed, have been brought down, with the exception of the deliberations of the imperial conference So far as we are concerned, we have no objection to these being brought down, but I understand that objections come from other parties. The deliberations of the imperial conference, comprising all the self-governing dominions—New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and Canada—have not been given to the public.

Mr. FOSTER. Then Australia and New Zealand will get information from the papers laid on the tables of their houses which we have not got?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. There was a separate conference with the admiralty by Australia and one by New Zealand.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). We did not get permission to bring down the papers with regard to Australia and New Zealand. I suppose we might inquire from the imperial authorities whether there would be any objection to bringing down those papers. The papers brought down are those which have been sent here by the imperial authorities. The proceedings of the imperial conference and the papers laid before the conference are secret, and cannot be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that the papers already brought down were the proceedings of the conference. By the word proceedings, does the hon. gentleman mean the oral deliberations of the conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are not before us at all?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only things before us are some written documents put in on one side and on the other?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may explain more fully the situation. There were, of course, in the conference some discussions, which, as may be seen from the papers, were private; and at the close of the conference it was decided that they should not be published, but should be kept secret. As a result of that decision, the papers laid before the conference and also the proceedings of the conference have not been brought down. It was understood that a statement should be made by the Prime Minister of England and a synopsis or précis of the documents would be prepared by the Colonial Office, and this has been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may be allowed, I would like to get this matter clear. It seems to me that in these papers we get the general conclusions of the conference, and then we get the results of the modification of the general plan laid down as between Canada and the admiralty. It seems to me that New Zealand and Australia will look for, and will undoubtedly get, the same laid upon the tables of their houses of parliament. They are not secret documents. It is only supposed that we do not want to know anything about them, and therefore they were not included in what was sent to Canada. But it does seem to me that, as we are all colonies together, it is very important for us to know what position New Zealand and Australia have taken, and there would be not the slightest objection, I am sure, to our getting that information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me explain again that the conference was between the imperial government and the governments of the self-governing dominions. It was decided that the oral discussions should not be brought down. Then, there was a separate conference between the admiralty and Canada and offers between the admiralty and the other colonies. We brought down the papers relating to the conference with Canada. I understand that what my hon. friend wants is the papers relating to the conferences with Australia and New Zealand. We have no objection, and we will at once wire for them.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the recommendations of the Canadian government or the expression of their wishes, are entirely in the hands of the government here. Have they any objection to bringing these down?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it was in the discussion which took place at the conference.

Mr. FOSTER. It might have been a memorandum.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there was no memorandum prepared by the Canadian representatives. The only thing was some wishes which were expressed in the discussions before the conference.

Mr. J. D. REID. From the return brought down, it is quite evident that the government have their scheme already prepared. Is it the intention to bring the Bill down at an early date or to hold it over until after the holidays?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We intend to bring it down at an early date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a good deal of inquiry for the report. I do not know

how many copies have been prepared, but I would suggest that a sufficient number of copies should be prepared to have it generally available.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think two thousand copies have been prepared, but I shall speak to the Secretary of State about that.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Supplementary report of the International Waterways Commission, 1909.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

PROTECTION OF VEGETATION FROM PESTS.

House in Committee on the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent the introduction or spreading of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation; providing for the granting of compensation for matter destroyed for this purpose, the appointment of inspectors for the enforcement of the Act, and penalties for its contravention.—Mr. Fisher.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The object of the Bill to be founded on this resolution is to provide against the introduction into Canada of various insect pests which are prevalent in other countries but from which, so far, we in Canada have been fortunately free. It is also intended to provide that where insect pests or infectious diseases exist in Canada precautions may be taken to prevent their spread. The House will remember that we have in Canada an Act known as the San José Scale Act, which was adopted by this parliament some seven or eight years ago for the purpose of protecting this country against the introduction of that well known pest. That Act was aimed simply at the introduction of the pest from abroad and provision was made at first for the absolute prohibition of the importation of vegetable matter, trees or shrubs, from countries infested with the San José scale. Afterwards provision was made for the importation of such things from those countries under conditions which would still protect this country. That Act has worked very well and from its inception until to-day we have been able to trace no instance of the existence of San José scale in Canada to an importation from abroad. Unfortunately before the Act was passed there was a little San José scale in Canada.

Last spring we were informed of the existence of an insect pest in France commonly called the brown tailed moth. We were informed that shipments of nursery stock were coming to this country which were infested with the eggs of that very injurious insect. We had no power to deal with the matter. We, however, took what precautions we could and owing to the information obtained from the Customs and from shippers we were able to find out where the importations of nursery stock from France were coming in, and with the co-operation of importers we were able to examine something like 1,500,000 stock obtained from France and on that we found a very considerable number of the eggs of that insect, probably, in the aggregate, millions of eggs, and these, with the concurrence and the forbearance of the owners, we were able to destroy. There was, however, at first, a very decided objection on the part of the importers to having their stock examined, delayed or destroyed. I must say that they acted with great consideration and public spirit after they were impressed with the dangers existing and the importance of the work. Still, at any time any one of those importers would have been quite within his rights in refusing to permit the action of our entomologists.

Under these circumstances it seemed necessary to provide a further safeguard to the orchardists and fruit growers of Canada and to the people generally who have property that might be injured in this way. I therefore examined the cognate legislation in other countries and in the provinces of Canada. I found that in British Columbia they have an Act in very good form which has been in operation for some time, I think, very successfully. In Ontario they have two Acts, one aimed directly at the San José scale and another more general Act which provides for certain precautions or regulations but comparatively little advantage has been taken of these Acts. In Nova Scotia there is an Act on a very small scale. In many of the American states there are Acts of this character, but I do not think there is any Federal law in the United States. They have experienced difficulties there owing to the Acts being State and not Federal Acts. In Great Britain a good many years ago, I think in 1887, an Act was passed to protect Great Britain against the ravages of the potato beetle, and quite recently, I think in 1907, a general Act very much of the same character as I am now proposing was passed in Great Britain to protect that country against the dangers from which I am now proposing to try to protect Canada. The present Act follows largely the lines of the British Act, giving power to the department to make investigations and to the Governor in Council to pass regulations dealing with the niceties of the case. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with entomology or the insect diseases and pests which attack our agricultural products well know that the character of the pests varies greatly and therefore the treatment that would be required to guard against one pest would be quite different from that required

in the case of another, and consequently the regulations dealing with any particular danger or menace would have to vary according to the character of the danger. Under these circumstances I find it impossible to embody in the Act the details of regulations. I have therefore found it necessary, as it has been found necessary in Great Britain and other countries where Acts of this kind are on the statute-book, to ask for authority to deal with each individual outbreak or menace by regulation made by order in council at the time, without waiting for special legislation in regard to it. This is the substance of the Act and the reason for it; I can give more detailed explanations when the Bill itself is under consideration.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is aiming at two things—first the prevention of the import of these pests and the other power to deal with these pests within the limits of the Dominion. Do I understand that he will specify the pests under order in council?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. Of course, the hon. minister is thoroughly familiar with the various legislative and administrative efforts in this same direction which have been made by the provinces. I take it that he agrees that the provincial and Dominion powers in these matters are concurrent. And I suppose he has tried to avoid any clash with the legislation already existing and the administrative steps already taken by the provinces to safeguard the interests of their own people in this matter. May I suggest that those interested in the various provinces be given an opportunity to examine the details of the Bill before it becomes law.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this Bill would conflict with the measures passed by the local legislatures of any of the provinces?

Mr. FISHER. There is no such intention. I said, in the remarks I have just made, that there were laws on this subject in British Columbia and Ontario. I shall be very sorry indeed to have any clash with the working of those Acts. There is no doubt that, under our constitution, there is concurrent jurisdiction between the provinces and the Dominion on these subjects And there is certain work which can be done better under a Dominion law, because that law applies to all the provinces, whereas each provincial Act covers only the territory of the province by whose legislature it is passed. In the working of this Act, I should be disposed to be very careful not to overlook the operation of any provincial Act and certainly not to clash with anything in those Acts that tends to the accomplishment of the general object sought. I think that in every province the people will be quite aware of the danger of the spread of pests of this kind from one province to another, which spread can only be dealt with by a federal law. I would say, in answer to the hon. member for Yale Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) that the Bill is ready, and I propose to introduce it to-day on the passage of this resolution. It can then be printed, and I will not proceed with it until members have had an opportunity to examine it, and, if necessary, to communicate with those whom they desire to consult concerning it. At the same time, I would like to have it pushed forward as rapidly as possible consistent with the public interest.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why not add a clause dealing with foul seeds?

Mr. FISHER. That is another Act altogether, the Seed Control Act.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to prevent the introduction or spreading of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—EXPENDITURE ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject of the civil government expenses, which, I understand, it is proposed to take up to-day. I was talking not long ago with a very intelligent man, who takes as deep and continuous an interest in the public affairs of this country, probably, as any other man in it, and, in looking over some figures of our expenditures, or rather estimates of expenditure as set forth in the main estimates, and contrasting them with the expenditures of previous years, he made the statement that he would not have believed it to be true were it not before him in a most incontrovertible way. That is, he expressed his utter astonishment that expenditures in these lines had gone to the limit to which they have. I believe that this is by no means an isolated case. I believe that the people of this country, for whatever reason, have not any adequate idea, in the first place, of the extraordinary large dimensions to which these expenditures have grown, or in the second place of the extraordinarily rapid rate at which these expen-

ditures have increased. It may be that the members of His Majesty's opposition are at fault for not having put these matters before the people. Certainly, some things are different now from what thew were before. While we were in government and the party on that side were in opposition, every Liberal and Grit paper, large and small, printed repeatedly in large letters, kept constantly before the people, the increasing expenditures of the country, until, by daily repetition, by almost hourly reveiw, the people had it impressed upon them that there was a dangerously large expenditure and a dangerously rapid increase in that expenditure. But that large and influential portion of the press is to-day absolutely, or almost absolutely, silent with regard to the growing expenditure of Canada. There are no more large headlines in these papers, no more reiterated expressions in large figures and bold-faced type warning the people of danger, notwithstanding the rapid increase of expenditure that is taking place. Our own press—I mean by that the press that generally voices the opinion of the Liberal-Conservative party may have failed in this respect, as we as members of this House may have failed, and that may be a good reason why the country as a whole is not alarmed.

The great convention of 1893 made a unanimous proclamation that they viewed with alarm the large and growing expenditures of the country, and the rapidly increasing debt of the country. To-day the people do not seem to be alarmed. That condition is not prevalent in the country, it seems, and my view of it is that the people, in a time of comparative prosperity and of large dealings, have had their minds more upon their own business than upon the business transacted under the administration of the Dominion government, and consequently have not taken time to inform themselves with respect to this matter. Well, I think it is the part of His Majesty's opposition in this House, partly, outside the House more than in it, and of the press which is favourable to our view of the question, to see to it that these expenditures are brought before the people, that they are understood by the people, and then, if the people absolutely desire that that shall be the rule, why the people are the arbiters in the final decision of the question. And so I am going to take up this matter of civil government expenditures, and just for a moment place two or three facts before the House in the hope that they will get to the country, that they may form an impression, and that at least the minds of the people shall be directed to what is going on so that they may form their own conclusions whether they consider it to be proper expenditure or not.

When these gentlemen sitting opposite were in opposition, there was nothing about which they thundered and volleyed with more persistence and vehemence than the increase and quantity of the expenditures upon the different services of the country. If there was one subject more than another to which they paid especial attention, it was the item of civil government expenditures. They talked about the number of people that filled the corridors and were placed in the offices in the city of Ottawa; they talked about the extravagant salaries that were paid; they talked about the useless men and women that were employed, and they made it a strong point that if they came into power they would reduce this civil government expenditure, they would root out the useless officers, and they would put in just a sufficient number to carry on the work, and that they would effect notable economies.

Now what has happened? In 1883-4, civil government cost this country $1,084,417; thirteen years afterwards, in 1895-6, when the Liberal-Conservative government went out of power, civil government cost this country $1,396,628, an increase of $312,211, or a little over thirty per cent; thirteen years afterwards, in 1907-8, civil government cost this country $2,088,416, an increase of $691,788, or a little over fifty per cent. In 1908-9, civil government cost $3,283,265; in 1909-10, it cost, according to the estimates, $4,537,074; in 1910-11, civil government costs according to the estimates, $4,703,707.

Now I say it is absolutely startling that on this hill, and surrounding it, for civil government alone, nearly $5,000,000 is taken out of the taxpayer's contribution that he has to lay before the government each year for the expenditures of this country. No man can convince me that it is necessary that $5,000,000, or anything near it, should be spent in order to get a fair and effective service in the offices and departments here in Ottawa. It is absolutely unthinkable that such is necessary, or that such ought to be the case.

Now, I want to be absolutely fair. In 1908-9 there were seven months in which the civil government estimates bulked larger, because a number of those that had been employed and paid out of contingencies in the different departments were brought into the civil service, and after September 1, 1908, went then into the civil government list. That makes it somewhat larger. But I purposely took the year before that, when no such translation had taken place, and showed that at that time there had been the large increase up to $2,088,416, while from 1908-9 when the Civil Service Act was in force throughout the whole year, the increase is a startling one. In 1908-9, $3,283,000; in 1909-10, under the same conditions, $4,538,000; in 1910-11, under the same conditions, $4,703,407, an

increase in this last year of pretty nearly $160,000.

Now that is a statement which I think ought to make even ministers thoughtful; it ought to make every good citizen who believes in economical administration thoughtful. But when you take into consideration with that the increase of the expenditures in every other department, brought up last year to $127,000,000, whereas in 1896 it was about $41,000,000, those things all put together, I think, ought to give pause to the business people of this country, and to every good citizen, and at least ought to set him thinking.

Here is a list of civil government expenditures as provided for in the estimates for 1910-11:

CIVIL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES.

Estimates for 1910-1911

		$	$
Gov. Gen's. Secty.... ..	14	20,000	40,600
Privy Council..	20	35,137	7,400
Justice..	53	103,498	11,000
Militia..	98	127,000	10,000
Sect'y State..	34	56,412	9,000
Printing and Stationery	70	86,648	7,300
Interior..	722	876,886	47,000
Indians..	75	111,825	12,550
N. W. M. Police..	11	18,425	900
Auditor General..	79	103,200	5,000
Finance..	92	113,500	12,000
Customs..	182	244,975	10,500
Inland Revenue...	69	100,912	8,000
Agriculture....	274	359,175	13,500
Marine and Fisheries..	175	250,150	30,000
Railways and Canals..	89	130,187	15,000
Public Works..	243	358,537	15,500
Mines..	103	174,689	
Post Office..	505	546,260	64,800
Trade and Commerce..	34	44,887	21,500
Labour..	23	32,300	12,000
Supt. Insurance..	15	18,750	11,300

All of which is, of course, supported by the insurance companies.

		$	$
Consulting Engineer. ..	2	7,300	700
External Affairs..	9	14,875	3,500
Conservation Comm. ..	8	12,950	
C. S. Comm....	10	18,675	13,500
Depts. Generally..	..	.....	54,000
Totals at Ottawa..	2,909	3,966,757	436,950
High Comm's. Office....	6	11,350	21,280
Grand totals...	2,915	3,978,107	458,230
In all.....			4,436,337
Add Ministers and Governors..			267,066
Grand total.			$4,703,403

I do not think that needs any comment

Mr. FOSTER.

and I do not wish to add anything in the way of comment except to make a plain presentment of this one single branch of government expenditure. Take into account the necessary increase owing to increased business, take into account, if you like, the increased salaries which came into vogue in 1908, take into account the progress of the country and when you have done all that there still is a mighty big margin of, I believe, absolutely unnecessary and wasteful expenditure which is taking place under the shadow of this parliament on the hill at Ottawa in the departments. There is a way by which this may be tested. I challenge the government to test it. They have appointed their own Civil Service Commission, men of their own choosing; there is authority in the Civil Service Act to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make an inquiry into the different departments and report as to whether they are sufficiently manned, or over-manned and whether the services rendered are equal to the salaries that are paid. This then can be tested. Let the ministry avail themselves of the power which they have in the Act and at least give to the people in the country, even though it be through officers appointed by themselves and consequently supposed to be favourable to themselves, a little chance to know whether or not they are paying too much for the work which goes on on the hill at Ottawa.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ever need accuse himself of any lack of duty in the matter of calling attention to the increase in the expenditures of this government. I want to do him the justice, if it be justice, to say that in every session when he has been amongst us he has discharged that duty. The only difference that I can recall is that in previous sessions my hon. friend has deferred his arraignment until the close of the session while this time he has been good enough to give it to us at the beginning, which perhaps will make for the expediting of public business and I have no fault to find with him on that score. My hon. friend, while referring particularly to the civil service has generalized with regard to the increased expenditure of the country. I would only remind him that some changes have come over the condition of the country during the period to which he has referred. He refers to the expenditure on the civil service in 1883 and then he points out what the increase had been down to 1895. He says that it had been some thirty per cent. Then he compares it with the very large increase of recent years. Well, we cannot very well challenge the accuracy of my hon. friend's figures, but it appears to me that

there are some other things which he ought fairly to have introduced into the discussion.

Now, the business of the country may be measured in various ways. The revenue of the country is one measure, and increased revenue means increased cost of collection. Increased revenue is usually followed by increased expenditure and increased expenditure involves increased cost of management in every department of the government. Had my hon. friend looked at it from that point of view he would be obliged to tell us that in the year ending the 30th June, 1883, the revenue of the country was thirty-five and three-quarter millions, that in the year ending the 30th June, 1905, the revenue had actually fallen short and the country was making no progress. It was a period of comparative stagnation, and so for the year ending the 30th June, 1895, the revenue was less that $34,000,000 and the highest revenue of any of the years my hon. friend cited was about $38,000,000. If my hon. friend is going to make comparison as between two periods, one period showing stagnation all along the line, a period when the Northwest territories were not being filled as they are to-day, a period when little or no growth was taking place in Canada, then my hon. friend should have told us of these conditions and compared them with the prosperous conditions of the country when the revenue has grown to more than $96,000,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) reminds me that according to the hon. gentleman's own statement his government increased the expenditure of the civil service more than 30 per cent at a time when the country was in a condition of stagnation. While it is true that we have increased the expenditure we have increased it only to meet the expansion of the business of the country. I am quite sure that upon careful examination it will be found that the expenditure has only kept pace with the growing needs of Canada. Then, turning from the civil service the hon. gentleman made reference to the general expenditure, I would remind him that while he and hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to condemn the increased expenditure generally, yet when you come to deal with matters of detail, with very rare exceptions the cry of gentlemen opposite is not for less expenditure but for more. They are very human on that side of the House. Some hon. gentleman who sits on the Speaker's left, goes home to his constituents and he discovers that in this growing time the post office accommodation in his town is insufficient, and he comes back to this House and he is quite as ready as any Liberal to say it is time that a new post office should be built.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They cannot get it though.

Mr. FIELDING. They get it in many cases. Never was there a time in the history of this parliament when the opposition were so well treated in the matter of public expenditures as they are to-day. Why, Sir, it is a matter of notoriety that in the days when the Conservatives were in power the counties which did not return supporters to them could get little or nothing. We know that by our experiences in the eastern provinces. But, in the estimates now on the table of the House it will be found that constituencies that do not support the government are treated most generously and liberally, and that the needs of the public are considered without reference to the question of politics at all. There is only one way to consider the question of the expenditures of civil government and that is to take each department on its own merits. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) speaks of the enormous increase that has been made to the staff of the Interior Department. We grant there has been an increase there but we say that it measures the expansion of Canada in the northwest. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) compare the cost of managing the Interior Department to-day, with its abundant revenue, with the tremendous immigration coming into the country; would he compare it for one moment with the Department of the Interior in the days of stagnation when the Conservatives were in power? If he looks at it in that light I am sure that his sense of fairness will compel him to admit that there is just cause for the very large increase in the public expenditure in relaton to the civil service. I do not know the details respecting every department of government; but I am not prepared to say that the hon. gentleman can find of no instance where a department is over-manned. There are many departments in which you have old officials, men who have served the country well in their day and generation, but who to-day are not able to do very much work. We, from a sense of fairness and in appreciation of the services rendered by these old employees retain them in the service when we are not able to get as much work out of them as we would out of younger men. Probably my hon. friend could find that here and there he could economize by getting rid of those old and faithful servants, but I think the hon. gentleman himself would rather bear the responsibility of some enlargement of the expenditure in this respect than treat these old officials in a harsh way. There is another thought, and that is that the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are generally disposed to increase the expenditure on the civil service rather than to reduce it, because we frequently

have had complaints from them that the public officials are not sufficiently paid, and I know of no proposal to increase the salaries of civil servants at Ottawa that was not warmly advocated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) or by those who sit near him. It is rather too late to arraign the government for this large expenditure on the civil service, unless we are prepared to take due account of the tremendous change that has come over Canada; of the enormously increased public business, of the great increase in our revenue, and the thousand and one things which devolve upon the government to-day and which did not devolve upon the government of some few years since. When the people take into consideration not merely the increased expenditure but the increased business and the increased prosperity of Canada, the conclusion I believe will be reached by them that we have been simply keeping pace with the growth of the country.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Agriculture—Salaries (including George F. O'Halloran) $6,000, $359,175.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does this include payment for those who will be engaged in the census?

Mr. FISHER. It includes an additional vote for the extra labour entailed in Ottawa in the coming year. I will possibly have to get an amendment of the Civil Service Act to enable me to employ extra help of a temporary character in the city of Ottawa. The extra work on the census will not commence in the city of Ottawa until well on in the coming fiscal year. This, of course, does not include any work done outside the city of Ottawa. Under the present Civil Service Act I cannot employ temporary clerks for work of that kind for more than a few months in the year. When the staff comes to be formed for the compilation of the census, it may be requisite to employ a number of extra clerks in the city of Ottawa for one or two years. To enable me to do this, there will have to be an amendment made to the Civil Service Act or to the Census Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that there is provided for here an additional clerk in the first division, subdivision A.

Mr. FISHER. In the organization of the department I find that I shall have to have certain work in the department, which is increasing very materially, done under an officer who will have responsibilities and duties which will justify his being placed in that position.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FISHER. First of all, dealing with the correspondence and other matters connected with the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome, obtaining information regarding Canada for that institute, and receiving and dealing with the information procured from that institute for the service of the people of this country. It is proposed that that same officer shall have charge of the correspondence of the department, which is at present under the special charge of the office of the deputy minister. There is also the question of the distribution of the hundreds of thousands of documents sent out from the department. These are now being sent out from the different branches, and there is a duplication, which is unnecessary and adds to the expense. I think one officer ought to have charge of that. There are also other details which have not been worked out.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to me that the minister has made a very good case for having a $2,800 to $4,000 man for that work. What is it that we send to or get from the International Association? I suppose that it is certain kinds of information that all the countries connected with it send. I notice that generally some person goes to it, and his expenses are paid by the country. What would it be necessary for this man to do with reference to that?

Mr. FISHER. The object of the institute is to collect information, chiefly on agricultural and statistical subjects, from the different countries which adhere to it, and file it in the office of the institute, so that it will be available to the various countries in a concise and complete form. That will be done in Rome by the staff there.

Mr. FOSTER. That you do not pay for?

Mr. FISHER. No. The information sent from Canada to Rome—all kinds of information with regard to statistics, the reports of various departments, the work of the different provinces, and the agricultural development of the country—has all to be prepared and sent forward. There has to be constant communication between the headquarters of the institute in Rome and this country.

Mr. FOSTER. It is statistical information?

Mr. FISHER. Largely statistical, but scattered through a very large number of publications in Canada, and obtained from many sources. As a matter of fact, the work in Rome is all done in the French language, while a great deal of this statistical information in Canada is obtained from English sources. The work is very considerable, much larger than I expected,

and it will no doubt increase in the future. At the same time, I think it is a necessary and very useful work, and we shall get a direct return in the information of the same character which we shall receive from other countries, and which, if we were not a member of the institute, we would not get. The work as yet has not been thoroughly established. We have not been receiving any information, although we have been sending large quantities of information. There is a great deal of correspondence, which comes to us altogether in the French language, and this has to be dealt with here by somebody who understands that language.

Mr. FOSTER. It is plain to me, from what the minister says, that any bright business man with an aptitude for figures, could gather and collate that information. It is not necessary to have a $4,000 man for that or for receiving the correspondence from Rome. It is not expert correspondence, but only clerical. If the minister desired to be economical, it seems to me that he could get a man to do that in a class lower than the highest class in the service. For instance, I think you could get a man in the class from $1,600 to $2,100 who would do that and do it excellently. A man who would know French would probably be of French descent. I do not think it is impossible to get a man at that price, but even if it was, could you not get one in the class from $2,100 to $2,800? Why should it be necessary to appoint a man of the very highest class who, within a few years, will be getting $4,000? It does not seem reasonable to me.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend minimizes both the value and the difficulties of this work and also ignores the other work that will be given into the charge of that officer. He will have other duties and will have to direct and control the lower officials in charge of the work. He will have a considerable staff under his guidance and under these circumstances it is right to appoint an officer of this class. It is true that in the course of time he will reach $4,000, the maximum of his class, but he will begin at $2,800.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When will his information be before the House and will it be printed in English or in French?

Mr. FISHER. French is the official language of the institute, and I presume that anything that goes out from it will be in that language, but we would distribute the information in both the languages which are official in this country. At the general meeting of the institute in December I expect to hear that the organization has been completed. It has been in progress of creation during the year, and as soon as it is in thorough order the information ought to be gradually available to the different countries.

Mr. FOSTER. How large and how expensive will the staff under this officer be?

Mr. FISHER. For the particula work of the institute I do not know that he will require more than two or three, but, as I said, this is not the only work to be assigned to him. It is hoped that he will be able to do the general correspondence of the department and also a large work in the distribution of what I may call the literature of the department. We send out annually between half a million and three quarters of a million of documents from the department, and I have found difficulty and in some respects inefficiency, although I do not like to use such a harsh word, in the way in which at present these bulletins, reports and documents are sent out, emanating as they do from all the branches of the department. I want to bring this distribution under one office, and I propose to place that work in charge of this new officer. The work requires an officer of considerable standing and authority in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it to be a promotion or a new officer?

Mr. FISHER. A promotion, the position will be filled by Mr. Doherty in the division below.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary is he now receiving?

Mr. FISHER. I think about $2,300.

Mr. FOSTER. And you propose to give him $2,800?

Mr. FISHER. He is raised to that position.

Mr. FOSTER. Would he not be able to do that work on $2,300? Would he be any less effective?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say that he would be less effective, but at the same time he is not doing anything like as important work as he will be doing when placed in charge of this larger and more important work.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no officer in that class now under whom the work could be placed?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Minister thinks Mr. Doherty would not be at all efficient if he did not get the rise?

Mr. FISHER. I think that the rise is a just recognition of the importance of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the Minister expect to get from that institute? He has been airy and flying around, perhaps he would descend to particulars.

Mr. FISHER. I have explained on several occasions what we expect to get from the institute. In the first place, we will take our position among other nations whose interests in agriculture are large, and I am conceited enough to think that the interests of agriculture in Canada are very large. We will get information and give information to an organization of an international character which has been started for the purpose of acting as I have explained as a sort of receiving house for the agricultural information of the world and the redistributing of that agricultural information and statistical information in connection with the production of the world to all the countries taking part in the institute. That information will be of great value in more than one way. First of all, in a purely statistical way it will give information of the amounts of production in the different countries and the condition of the produce and crops. This information to a certain extent will be of use in dealing with the markets for these agricultural products. One of the chief aims of those who instituted this organization was to be able to get authoritative and accurate accounts of the crop production. At the present time there is no doubt that many of the reports that appear in the newspapers and even in some of the official statements of great corporations are tinged by a desire sometimes for personal gain, sometimes to make the market in regard to these great stable products of the world, and it is hoped that the reports of the International Institute will be of a sufficiently authoritative character to be able to counteract that kind of thing.

There is another direction in which it is hoped this institute may be of value. There is constantly going on to-day, in all the most important countries of the world, scientific research into agricultural problems. The discoveries resulting from that research in each country are made known to the people of that country. But the people of Canada know little of what is going on in other countries, and those of other countries do not know all that is going on in Canada. There will be an interchange of information with regard to all problems of agriculture, which to-day are more scientifically studied than they used to be years ago. By this institute the investigations made and practical work going on in all the great agricultural countries will be made of benefit to the farmers of Canada. Until the machinery is in working order and results are shown, I grant you, we should get no benefit from this expenditure. But when we have the organization and machinery to do the work, the results will be worth many times the cost.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is Canada's share of expense in Rome, and what is the total expense for this country?

Mr. FSHER. Our contribution to be expended in the institute at Rome is about 12,000 francs ($2,315) a year. Then we have an item in the Estimates, about $10,000 to provide for our representation there and for incidental expenses. This will be besides any expenditure under civil government in the department here for procuring this information. A good deal of information has come through the various documents already in existence. I could not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) just what was spent last year. The item under consideration does not relate exactly to that. But I will have the facts ready for the hon. member when the item relating to that expenditure is before the committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There will be some officials in addition to the expenditure here?

Mr. FISHER. At present, I am not asking for any addition to the staff of my office. There is a rearrangement of the staff as I have suggested. There are one or two vacancies in my civil government estimates here, some of which may have to be filled for the purpose of completing the staff. I could not say at the moment how many or which of them.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an additional clerk in the second division, subdivision 'A.'

Mr. FISHER. That is to provide for the promotion of one of the patent examiners. The younger examiners are in the lower division, and, when they render efficient service, they are promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be promoted, and what is he receiving now?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Bonnell. He is receiving $1,200. He was transferred from the Interior Department to mine at that salary.

Mr. FOSTER. And what salary will he receive?

Mr. FISHER. $1,600.

Mr. FOSTER. You are making an increase of $400?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. We try the patent examiners in the lower division; and if they prove satisfactory they are promoted to the other.

Mr. FOSTER. What experience has Mr. Bonnell had in the Patent Department?

Mr. FISHER. He was, I think, a draughtsman in the Topographical Branch of the Interior Department, and he was transferred to the Patent Branch because of education and special qualifications. He is a graduate of applied science of Toronto University and took a post-graduate course with the Westinghouse Electrical Manufacturing Company of Pittsburg. I may say that I appoint no patent examiners except those who have scientific degrees from one or the other of the universities.

Mr. FOSTER. He has only been there a few months. He received no pay from the Agricultural Department last year?

Mr. FISHER. He was transferred some time during last summer. He will be promoted in the ensuing year, after he has been a year in the department at this work.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there are three less in the next division. One goes up from that division, I suppose?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. In the framing of the estimates last year, we included enough for one or two vacancies, thinking we would require the clerks. But we have stricken these out.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an extra in the third division.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, taking the place of one of those struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. And two extra in the next, subdivision 'B' of the third division.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, that is the lowest division. We have to make provision for bringing in clerks for the work of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you making provision for two new clerks there?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister (Mr. Fisher) may have been present at a discussion in this House as to the advisability of employing too many of one family in the Civil Service. On page D—5 of the Auditor General's Report, about half the column is taken up with two family names. There are five Browns. These may or may not be of one family.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know myself, but my accountant tells me they do not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there must be another family just above that, the family of Bradleys.

Mr. FISHER. Well, one of those left the department this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

Mr. FISHER. Resigned.

Mr. FOSTER. So that leaves only two?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I just called the Minister's attention to it, because it looked to me like a family affair.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Minister give us the number of employees in each branch of his department, and the actual salaries paid?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I have that here just now. The arrangement is in the subdivision under the Civil Service Rules. I can go over the list according to the branches, but I have not got that under my hand just now.

Mr. FOSTER. In the matter of travelling expenses, I see Mr. Doherty has $328 for travelling expenses—in what capacity does he travel?

Mr. FISHER. That is his travelling expenses as the minister's private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Did any good come of the Minister's going to Rome?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost to the country of the expedition to Rome?

Mr. FISHER. I can look that up in the Auditor General's Report. Of course my own travelling expenses come out of the Minister's travelling expenses in contingencies. I think it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500.

Mr. FOSTER. Much less than other men charge.

Contingencies, $13,500.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent in contingencies last year?

Mr. FISHER. We had the same vote, I suppose nearly all of it was spent. We calculate very closely.

Mr. FOSTER. In D—20 you appear to have spent $15,574. If you had the same vote you must have over expended.

Mr. FISHER. So far as I can make out, the explanation is that in the salaries at Ottawa there was an overdraft in consequence of a mistake in the time of the change of salaries from the outside service to the new arrangement of the inside service. I confess the explanation does not seem to me very clear. There is nothing in the Auditor General's Report which explains it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister might look into that.

Mr. FISHER. I will. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the whole increase of civil government in my department amounts to only $650.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the whole increase last year?

Mr. FISHER. Except for the change from the outside to the inside service about equal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are any of the officials of the Experimental Farm carried under this head?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, all of them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many officials?

Mr. FISHER. We would have to pick their names out from this list.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Any increase in the number over last year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I have appointed two gentlemen to succeed the late Dr. Fletcher, one as an entomologist and the other as a botanist. Dr. Fletcher was both an entomologist and a botanist. The work has increased very much, and I did not think I could get one man qualified to do both classes of work. They get $2,100 each.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it true that the Minister imported an expert from England?

Mr. FISHER. It is true that through the Civil Service Commission two gentlemen imported from England are now in those two offices. I applied to the Civil Service Commission to look into the recommendations and qualifications of the applicants, and they recommended these two men to me. I did it through the ordinary course of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Had we no men in Canada sufficiently capable to fill those two positions, in the estimation of the Minister?

Mr. FISHER. The Minister did not express any opinion or estimation. There were between 20 and 30 applicants, some Canadians, some from the United States, some from Great Britain and some from India. We advertised for applications, and the applications, qualifications and everything of that kind were submitted to the Civil Service Commission, who, in conjunction with Dr. Saunders, examined the qualifications, and recommended these two men to me.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask the Minister if he believes that the very best work it is possible to do in the interest of the farming community is being done at the Experimental Farms. I am asking this question very much in earnest, because I live comparatively near the Experimental Farm in Brandon. The present government, I believe, did not have the locating of that farm, and I am of opinion that it is not in the proper place. An experimental farm, I understand, should have for its object the making of experiments in grains and other matters in connection with farming. If I am right in that conception, of an experimental farm, then I think that land should be selected for the purpose which is as nearly as possible like most of the land in that neighbourhood. I think that is a very fair conclusion. I do not think that ten or even five per cent of the land in Manitoba is similar to that upon which the experimental farm at Brandon is located.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend and I would like to hear what he has to say in regard to the introduction and location of experimental farms, but what we are dealing with at the present time is civil government. My hon. friend is quite within his rights if he wishes to discuss the question of experimental farms, it is a very interesting question and I would like to have it discussed at length at the proper time.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I believe the question is as important as the minister states, but if he thinks it better not to continue this discussion I will leave it over until some other time when I hope we will have a thorough discussion as to the places where these farms are to be put.

Mr. FISHER. I invite the hon. gentleman to take up the discussion when the item for experimental farms is on because I am quite in sympathy with what he has said and I would be only too glad if we could have a thorough discussion on the question. I look upon this as one of the most important services in the government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give us the names of the two men who were imported and the salaries they are receiving, and would he tell us whether he took into consideration the question as to whether it was possible to promote any men who were in these branches previous to the time when it was necessary for these positions to be filled?

Mr. FISHER. There was only one branch before, that of the entymologist and botanist. I consulted Dr. Saunders as to the possibility of a promotion. He said that he would recommend the obtaining of men who were thoroughly scientifically trained and that there was no such officer in the branch The gentleman who was appointed entymologist is Mr. Hewitt who comes from the University of Manchester where he was lecturing on entymologist and botany and who had the highest recommendations and diplomas possible to be obtained in that branch of science. I may also say he was intimately concerned in and was consulted about the drawing up of the law which was

passed not long ago in England to deal with insect pests. The gentleman who was appointed botanist is Mr. Gussow, originally a German, but who had been working in England, in the Kew Experimental gardens, with the famous Dr. Carruthers, head of the botanical work of the Department of Agriculture in England. He has the highest diplomas from German and British institutions, he has had scientific training and long experience in that kind of work and he carried with him recommendations from Dr. Carruthers of most positive and flattering character. They are to receive $2,100 a year each in subdivision B of the first division. I have an explanation in reply to the question which was asked by my hon. friend; I find that the item referred to which my hon. friend quotes at $15,000 was a part of the expenditure of the same year out of an appropriation in the estimates of $22,000 and not of $5,000.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $100,912.50.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The only increases are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an extra clerk in the first division of subdivision B.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, we have created an extra clerkship for the purpose of promoting the accountant, Mr. Campeau, who is at present at the maximum of the lower division and who is getting $2,800. We purpose recommending him for subdivision A of the first division.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is that done?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Campeau is an official of the department, having served 35 years, and he is a competent man. This is putting him on an equality with the accountants in the other departments.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there work for him to do?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, the chief accountant in the Inland Revenue Department is a very important official of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the accountant's branch made up of the seven clerks in the first division subdivision A and the first division, subdivision B?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They are not necessarily all in the accountant's branch. Mr Campeau is now in the first division, of subdivision B, and we propose to promote him. That will make one vacancy. We are creating one more clerkship for the purpose of promoting two clerks from subdivision A of the second division to subdivision B of the first division.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are being promoted?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have not decided yet. We are creating the vacancies. We have considered that probably two of the best clerks at the head of the subdivision 'A' of the second division will receive the promotion. We are doing the same with regard to the next division. The vacancies created by these promotions will be filled by promotions from the lower division. In the second subdivision 'B' there is no change. There are four increases in the third division, subdivision A. This is simply making provision for promotion from the classes below under the Civil Service Act. There is an increase of two over the total employees of the department last year—44 instead of 42. The work of the department has been increasing. Last year we passed the Commercial Feeding Stuffs Act which comes into force the 1st of January and the Patent Medicine Act, which entailed additional work, and we are providing for two extra clerks if required. They are not yet appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not given much information or reasons. He sets out with the idea that it is his duty to deplete the lower division and get the men into the higher division as quickly as possible. He has taken half from the third division, subdivision B, and put them into a higher division. There is something to be said in favour of promoting men, but if the minister is going to bestow all his activity in putting people up from lower divisions to higher divisions, he will soon have no lower divisions at all. What salaries are these four in the third division, whom he proposes to put into subdivision A, now getting? and what work are they doing?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are no promotions from third division, subdivision A.

Mr. FOSTER. What about third division, subdivision B?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. gentleman said that I was striving to promote from one division to another. Well, there are no promotions from third division, subdivision A, but I propose to move some from subdivision B to subdivision A of the third subdivision.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the reasons you are promoting these four?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These clerks are largely statistical and are doing very good work. They are now receiving the maximum of the salary in their class and are deserving of promotion. Several of them have been a long time in the service. It is proposed to promote them and give them the minimum salary of subdivision B, to be strictly in accord with the spirit and intention of the Act. They can only get

their promotions on the recommendation of the deputy minister and the approval of the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister give me the names of the four who are to be promoted?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Their names are Yetts, Lyon, Allen and Lewis. They are the senior clerks in that division.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has Mr. Yetts been in the service?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Since 1895. Mr. Lewis came in on the reorganization of the service, but was employed temporarily before that for about two years. Mr. Allen has been in the service about two years and Mrs. Lyon about two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister kindly give me the names of the four left in possession, and state how long they have been in the service?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Arthur Robert came into the service in 1901, Ekins in 1907, Teevens in 1907 and Cantin in 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. If you are going to recompense those who have been longest in the service, Mr. Yetts, who came in in 1905, has a fair claim to promotion. You have promoted one who has been only two years doing temporary work, while Robert, who has been eight years in the service, and is I suppose at the maximum of his staff, is left. What is it debars him?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is all a question of the ability of the clerks. Those I have named are, in the opinion of the deputy minister, the ones most efficient and most worthy of promotion at the present time. The whole matter of promotion is absolutely in the hands of the deputy minister, subject of course to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the clerks myself, and cannot pass any opinion on them. In that respect I suppose I am pretty much in the same position as the minister, who says he leaves all the promotions to his deputy. I am inclined to think that he has sometimes ideas of his own on the subject. If he left it entirely with the deputy, I am inclined to think that the proper ones would be apt to get promoted.

Department of Inland Revenue—contingencies, $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that B. C. Nicholas has an account of $609.30 for travelling expenses. Who is B. C. Nicholas?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He is my private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister think it would be more the square deal not to shoulder off on Mr. Nicholas the charge of $609 for flaunting around the country when it is really the minister who has been doing it? The only justification for paying Mr. Nicholas $609 for travelling expenses is that he has been on some official business. Was he on some official business, or was he accompanying the minister?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend will probably see in the Auditor General's Report a small charge for travelling expenses for the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I complain of. The minister is a larger man, and why does he not bear his own expenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman does not accuse me of charging to my private secretary a sum of money which I have expended—because that is the suggestion. The travelling expenses of my private secretary were incurred on a visit to Nova Scotia and on a visit to British Columbia, accompanying me in both cases. I assume that the difference in our expenses is due to the fact that, like my hon. friend, I travel on a pass while my private secretary does not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister not travel in a special private car, in which his private secretary would travel also, at no expense to the country beyond the cost of hauling the car? I would be surprised to find the minister travelling in an ordinary car such as we common mortals on this side of the House travel in. In the west during the last summer I did not find any of the ministers travelling otherwise than in a special car.

Mr. FISHER. You did not look very hard then.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) looks at me because I found him travelling as a pilgrim in the pilgrim car.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was delighted to meet you too.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was delighted to meet the minister because he treated me to a very nice dinner. I had a foretaste of what may happen some day when members on this side of the House will have an opportunity of going on pilgrimages. Surely the Minister of Inland Revenue is not going to travel in a less gentlemanly way than the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Militia or the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. Did the Minister of Agriculture travel through the west in a private car?

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not see him in one.

Mr. FISHER. Or anywhere else

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly he does not. I think when he went to Halton to try to induce the farmers there to elect a doctor from Toronto to represent them, he travelled in a very plain way and tried to show himself as the friend of the farmer. I may be mistaken, possibly the Minister of Agriculture does not travel in a special car, but I would be surprised if a minister from British Columbia would come down here and go down to Nova Scotia and not travel in a special car. I thought that every one of the ministers had a private car. Perhaps the minister can explain whether he actually did travel in a private car and that may explain how it was that the expenses of his private secretary were so large as compared with his own.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If it is of any interest to the House I have no objection to stating the facts. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find very excessive travelling expenses against either my private secretary or myself. I was in Nova Scotia on one occasion on an official visit but I was not in a private car, I paid my Pullman car accommodation to the Intercolonial railway and my private secretary did the same. I was in British Columbia a year or two ago in company with Mr. Brock, director of the Geological Survey, visiting all the mines. On that occasion I had the use of a government car, an old private car which was very useful, indeed, as we stopped at all the small places from the Crowsnest to the west end of the Columbia & Western and the Victoria & Eastern road. Without a private car it would have been absolutely impossible to have visited very many of the small mining towns of British Columbia. On my last visit to the west I travelled as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) travelled and paid my Pullman fare as he did. I met him in Vancouver and I do not think he saw me in a private car. I do not think the ministers generally, travel in private cars to any extent, but I would certainly do so if I thought it necessary. It was sometimes necessary in my case, not only in order to be able to live in the car, but to receive visits from persons interested, for instance, in mining.

Mr. FISHER. I would not have interjected anything if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) had not said that he met ministers in the west who had been travelling in private cars. I happen to be one of the ministers who spent a good deal of time in the west this summer and I asked him if he met me in a private car. If I had felt it to be in the interest of the public to carry a private car with me I would have done so. As a matter of fact I find it more convenient not to have one, and generally do not have one. I do not think that on any trip around the country I have taken a private car. I can understand that ministers may find it more convenient to do so and if they do find it more convenient I think they should take the car.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the Minister of Railways would explain how the expense of hauling private cars over other lines than government lines is met. Do the ordinary railways charge so much a mile for hauling a private car or do they haul it free of expense?

Mr. GRAHAM. When a minister takes an official car he makes his own arrangement with the railways as to its transportation. The Minister of Railways on account of the position he holds, is entitled to free transportation on any railway in Canada and he gets free transportation for his car on any railway in the United States as well. My department is under compliment to the railways for hauling a car, in fact I have been censured several times modestly by managers of railways because I did not take my car, as they always took theirs. When any other minister takes a car he makes his own arrangements for its transportation.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is that arrangement?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. The Minister of Public Works travels sometimes in a private car. Perhaps he would inform the House how the expense of hauling the car is arranged with other railways than the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the accounts of my department it will not be found that any charge has been made for the transportation of my not private but official car. I never travel in a private car. The car is an official car where I transact the business of my department when I travel, but as far as possible I very much prefer to travel in an ordinary Pullman. It is very much more expensive to the Minister to get a car from the Department of Railways than to travel in an ordinary Pullman. I find that we have to pay for all our food and even to pay the laundry bills and in going a comparatively short distance as to St. John and other places in New Brunswick I have found it very much more expensive to engage a car from the Railway Department than to travel in the Pullman and pay my own expenses, and ordinarily I take the Pullman. During the last summer I made an official visit to the Northwest. It became necessary for me to stop off at a great many different places where public works are either under construction or in contemplation. I found that I could not possibly attend to that work without having an official car, and I did arrange to have it. And the Canadian Pacific railway very

kindly transported the car free of charge over its railway—it extended me that courtesy. The same was done by the Canadian Northern.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think that anyone objects to the Minister of Public Works or any other minister, when on public business that requires it, using an official car. But I was a little surprised to find, from the statement of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), that in such cases the minister was called upon to meet the expenditures for food, laundry, etc., used in his private car. Have I understood it aright?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the case.

Mr. DANIEL. I was under the impression that I had seen in the Auditor General's Report on several occasions charges for supplies on private cars. I do not say that any of these was in connection with the private car of the Minister of Public Works, as I do not remember. But I am a little surprised, and I think other members of the House will be surprised, to find that the minister himself pays these expenditures for provisioning and other charges in connection with his official car out of his own pocket.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That not only includes all supplies of every kind for the minister himself, but for every person who is travelling with him, and also the attendants upon the car. So, all the expenditures of every kind in the way of supplies, laundry and so on are paid by the minister who is travelling.

Mr. DANIEL. And the minister makes no claim for that on the public treasury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless he might do it in the way of travelling expenses. I do not say he does.

Department of Labour—Salaries, $32,300; Contingencies, $12,000.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I may mention that there is a clerical error in the explanation of this item of salaries. In the fourth line, relating to second division, subdivision 'A', it is stated that there are two clerks at $800. That should read one clerk at $800. Then, in the sixth line, referring to third division, subdivision B, instead of one clerk at $800, it should be two at $800. This is a mere reversal of the figures and does not add to the total.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that, if it appears in the estimate as third division, subdivision B, one clerk at $800, the minister cannot make it two. I should be inclined to think that could only be done by a supplementary estimate.

Mr. KING. It will not change the total amount asked for, but merely reverses the figures.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are any of these employees now in the eastern provinces making an investigation of the coal strike?

Mr. KING. The deputy minister of the department has made a full investigation into the situation there and has prepared a careful report on the whole situation, which report I shall be glad to lay on the table of the House in the course of a day or so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long is it since that report was completed?

Mr. KING. It is some weeks since it was prepared.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And will it be placed on the table at an early day?

Mr. KING. I think I can promise it for Monday possibly.

Mr. CROCKET. How many employees are there in the Labour Department at Ottawa?

Mr. KING. At present nineteen.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that there are two extra in the second division, subdivision A. Will the minister explain that?

Mr. FIELDING. The details are given on page 26 of the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. But what we want is the reason.

Mr. KING. That is the item I called attention to. There should be only one clerk at $800. That provides for an additional clerk one with a knowledge of French.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is an addition of two besides.

Mr. KING. One is a stenographer and the other is accountant.

Mr. FOSTER. At what salary does the stenographer enter?

Mr. KING. At $500. The additional clerk to take the position of accountant is provided for in in the second division, subdivision A, a clerk at $1,200. Heretofore the accounting of the department has been carried on by the accountant of the Post Office Department. But now that the Department of Labour has been given a separate standing in the service, it is proposed to have an accountant of its own.

Mr. FOSTER. But there are two additions in the third division, subdivision B. One is a stenographer at $500 and what is the other?

Mr. KING. A stenographer at $800, one with a knowledge of French to assist in the correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does he enter at the maximum of his class?

Mr. KING. I think it would be impossible to find a clerk at less than $800 who would carry out the work satisfactorily. Something more than the ordinary routine work is required of the one in this position.

Mr. FOSTER. But the schedule provides that in this class they commence at $500 and go up to $800. If clerks are to be appointed at the maximum, you might as well have no Civil Service Act at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister (Mr. King) be good enough to give us a general idea of what these officials in the department are doing?

Mr. KING. It would take some little time to outline, even in a very general way, the work of the officials of the department. But I may say that the department publishes a monthly journal, the 'Labour Gazette'. Several officers conduct investigations and compile reports and statistical tables relating to strikes and lockouts, changes in the rates of wages the cost of living, industrial accidents, and like subjects. The services of others are made necessary by the Industrial Disputes' Act, establishing boards under that Act, carrying on correspondence and the preparation of the reports sent by the different parties concerned. There are also officers whose duty it is to prepare schedules of wages for insertion in public contracts—the fair wage officers. They travel in different parts of the Dominion and investigate what are fair rates of wages to be paid for the different classes of labour on works being carried on for the government. Then there is a great deal of correspondence in the department itself, in the nature of answers to inquiries in regard to industrial questions in this country, wages changes, and a great variety of subjects. There is also a great deal of correspondence from other countries and from individuals, as to the working of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Then there are other officials of the department who are engaged in the work of translating, as the 'Labour Gazette' is published in French as well as English. There are also clerks who have to keep track of the expenditures, and the amounts derived from the sale of the 'Labour Gazette', subscription lists and such work as newspaper offices are obliged to do. There is also a library in the department under the charge of a clerk.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do contingencies include the cost of printing the 'Labour Gazette'?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this item include payment of correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' all over the country?

Mr. KING. No, that comes under the general estimates. The cost of printing and publishing the 'Labour Gazette' includes the amounts paid to correspondents.

Mr. DANIEL. How many copies of the 'Labour Gazette' are issued, and to whom are they issued?

Mr. KING. The department has a list of paid subscribers numbering, I think, about 9,000. Then there is a free list, including secretaries of the trade unions, boards of trade, members of both Houses of parliament, labour departments in other countries, and societies with which we exchange periodicals. Altogether about 14,000 copies of the 'Gazette' are issued each month.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the revenue obtained from paying subscriptions?

Mr. KING. The revenue as given in the Auditor General's Report last year is $1,669.82. The amount charged for the 'Labour Gazette' is 20 cents per annum. Bound copies of the 'Labour Gazette' are sold at 50 cents a copy. The revenue of the department is derived from the sale of bound copies, and from the sale of individual copies, and the general subscriptions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where is the "Labour Gazette' printed?

Mr. KING. The department obtains the 'Gazette' from the King's Printer. There have been times when the Printing Bureau has been much crowded, and the King's Printer has found it necessary to have his own arrangements. But as far as our department is concerned, we deal with the King's Printer.

At six o'clock committee took recess

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CROTHERS. I see that there is $600 here for 'Allowance for private secretary.' Why it is necessary to make that allowance? Why could not a clerk in the department do the work of a private secretary?

Mr. KING. The other clerks of the department have their specific duties to perform and therefore they are not available for this work. The secretary is a very hard worked official. His time is not his own. Regular clerks work the prescribed hours only. He gives virtually his entire time to the duties he has to perform. My secretary, Mr. Francis W. Giddens has frequently worked with me four nights in a week from seven until twelve o'clock, and I would like to say of him that a more faithful or efficient officer in the discharge of his duties is not to be found in the public service.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that a great many Japanese who were American citizens came over from the United States during the recent fishing season and obtained employment in the fisheries in British Columbia waters. I would like to ask the minister how it was that these Japanese, who were American citizens, came to be employed in Canada. It occurred to me that probably the Department of Labour, being alive to the interests of that class of labour and having seen this statement reported in the press, and had got busy and ascertained why these men had obtained this employment thus depriving a certain number of Canadian fishermen of the livelihood that they were entitled to. Perhaps the minister could tell me if he has any information on that subject?

Mr. KING. In regard to that I would say that any department of government would hardly find it expedient to act on reports that appear in the press from time to time. This particular report of which the hon. gentleman has spoken did not come to my notice. Had the matter been as serious as it appears to have been, the parties, one would think, would have been sufficiently interested to have notified the department of a case of that sort and requested an investigation. If a notification of that kind were to come to the department an investigation certainly would be proceeded with, if it fell within the scope of the department's work. It is quite possible that in the case which has been mentioned these men may have been employed in violation of some existing Act, in the event of which there would have been redress in the courts, but without the particulars having been presented to the department in a formal way I hardly think the department would have been justified in proceeding of its own accord.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I might ask the minister whether that would come within the scope of the duties of the local correspondents, whether they are supposed to take cognizance of a thing of that kind.

Mr. KING. Correspondents are expected to report on matters in their districts of interest to the department, correspondents are not informants expected to notify the department of the violations of any existing laws; they are to send in records of the actual happenings in their district so as to furnish statistical and descriptive records.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There is a correspondent at Vancouver and another at Westminster and this matter was very conspicuous in the press there. It seems to me the Labour Department could not be more usefully employed than in taking up a matter of that kind which is not the business of any person in particular who is not in the government service. How are the correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' appointed? Are they recommended by the labour organizations or by the political organizations.

Mr. KING. The department has sought to secure as correspondent some person who is thought to be persona grata to the industrial classes, not necessarily the labour element alone, but employers as well. Before any appointment has been made the department has as a rule ascertained from different sources the standing of those to be appointed. In some instances recommendations has been made by the member, in which cases further communication may have been had with other parties to ascertain the standing of the person recommended. The appointments are not made as political appointments at all. I am not aware of any having been so made and I should be very sorry to see them made for that reason

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Would the minister consider it the duty of the department, now that attention has been called to the matter, to find out how these Japanese who are American citizens, came to be working in Canada under the guise of British subjects and having licenses issuable only to British subjects. Will the minister investigate and endeavour to protect the labourers on the Fraser river?

Mr. KING. I should like to look carefully into all the circumstances to see whether it properly comes within the jurisdiction of the department to do what the hon. gentleman suggests. If on investigation I find that to be so I will certainly be pleased to follow it up.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is it a fact that the 'Labour Gazette' is printed in an office outside of the Government Printing Bureau?

Mr. KING. At present I understand that is the case. The pressure of work has been such that the King's Printer found it impossible to print the 'Labour Gazette' at the Bureau, and he made an arrangement with an outside office to do the printing.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What office?

Mr. KING. I understand that the Ottawa 'Free Press' is where the 'Gazette' is being printed at the present time. The King's Printer has made an arrangement, I understand, having in view what he regarded as the best arrangement to make.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I presume the King's Printer called for tenders?

Mr. KING. I presume so, but it not being in my department I cannot say.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. This 'Labour Gazette' according to the imprint is printed by 'C. H. Parmelee, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty' and on it there is a union label. I find that on a copy of the estimates which I have in my hand there is no union label. Does that explain the different fashion of printing these two official documents?

Mr. KING. Some nine or ten years ago when the 'Labour Gazette' was first published the union label was put on as an indication that the work was being performed under fair conditions. I understand that the Government Printing Bureau was an open shop, but notwithstanding that, the conditions were such that those controlling the label authorized the Printing Bureau to use it on the 'Labour Gazette.' As it was a publication which was circulating largely among the working classes it was thought advisable to have the label put on it under these circumstances, and there does not seem to be any reason to discontinue the practice.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That is, that in the case of a publication circulating largely among the labouring classes the union label is attached in order to lead the labouring classes to believe that the government printing is carried on under the conditions called for by the appearance of that union label, whereas as a matter of fact the government printing is not carried on under these conditions, and the government printing office is not what they call a fair office, to take the expression used by the minister.

Mr. KING. I do not remember having used the expression 'fair' office.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. My hon. friend beside me tells me that the expression used by the minister was 'open shop.' I believe the open shop is not recognized by union labour as the ideal condition.

Mr. KING. I think that many trade unionists would prefer to have the closed shop, but I do not think that trade unionists necessarily hold that because a shop is an open shop the conditions may not be as fair as they are in a closed shop. The conditions that are important to labour are the hours of labour, the wages paid, and the sanitary conditions under which the employees work; all of these conditions are excellent at the Government Printing Bureau. That being so those who are interested in seeing such conditions furthered by means of the label were quite agreeable that the label should be put on the 'Labour Gazette' when it was printed at the Government Bureau notwithstanding that the Bureau was not a closed shop.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the minister to say that the label was attached as an indication that the work was performed under fair conditions.

Mr. KING. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not the union label usually mean that the shop is not an open shop?

Mr. KING. It usually does mean that, but not always.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is one illustration. Are there any others?

Mr. KING. I think there are others.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the minister name one?

Mr. KING. I could not name one at the moment, but I have no doubt that with a little research I could find one.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Last session I asked the then Minister of Labour whether he would be kind enough to use his influence with the Postmaster General to have the fair wage clause inserted in all postal contracts. I suppose that, owing to the relationship then existing between the Minister of Labour and the Postmaster General, he handed that matter over to his successor. I would like to ask the present Minister of Labour whether he has discussed that with the Postmaster General, and whether there is any prospect of the fair wage clause being attached to contracts of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KING. My present impression is that the fair wage clause forms a part of every contract of the Post Office Department. In connection with contracts for postal supplies, such as letter carriers' uniforms and the like, the Department of Labour has been asked to approve of schedules of rates of wages of firms tendering for this class of work before the Post Office Department would make the contract, and I believe that in some cases contracts have been refused by the Post Office Department because of the unwillingness of some firms to pay what were regarded as fair and reasonable wages.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Are we to understand that the Postmaster General submits all mail to the Minister of Labour and receives from him an opinion whether they provide for the payment of fair wages for the work performed?

Mr. KING. I was speaking with reference to supplies furnished to the Post Office Department. I had not in mind the question of carrying the mails. I have no doubt, however, that the desire of the Postmaster General would be to see that a fair rate of wages was paid to everybody engaged in that work, and if it became apparent that such was not the case, I am sure that he would be willing and glad to confer with the Department of Labour on the subject.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would ask the Minister of Labour to be good enough to take that up with the Postmaster General, because I know that in my part of the country the pay of the Post Office Department for services of that kind is most miserable, and does not at all approximate to what in our country is considered fair wages. I am sure that he could not do a more popular act than to secure the reform I have suggested from the Post Office Department.

Department of Labour — contingencies, $12,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any increase in that?

Mr. KING. There is an increase, which however is more apparent than real. Heretofore the amount of money required for purposes included under the head of contingencies has been voted in the miscellaneous vote, which covered the entire expenditure of the Department of Labour. This year the amount has been separated so as to bring the contingencies under one head. Against an increase of $10,550 there should be offset a reduction of $7,400 in the vote being asked this year as compared with 1909-10, which makes a net increase of only $3,150. Such items as printing and stationery, sundries and clerical and other assistance, will hereafter be paid out of contingencies, in conformity with the practice in other departments. I might say that the staff is larger than before. The minister's office and the minister's secretary's office come into consideration in this connection, as well as expenses for travelling on the part of the fair wage officers and other officers connected with the administration of the Industrial Disputes Act and other measures There is also an additional amount put in to enable the department to purchase necessary books and periodicals.

Department of Customs—salaries, $244,975.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the minister thinks the increase is worthy of a little explanation.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The committee will observe that we are proposing to have six additional clerks. We propose to put them in the second division, subdivision B, ranging from $800 to $1,600, starting them at the minimum. There are statutory increases amounting to $4,525; and there is the proposed promotion of six officers from the third division B, to the third division A. Three of these now receive $800 and three $750. They will be promoted to the minimum of subdivision A, namely, $900. That means increases of three at $100 and three at $150, a total of $750. But we are not asking for that much more money, because certain officers have replaced other officers at lower rates of salary. For instance, a vacant clerkship in the second division B, of an estimated salary of $800, caused by the death of Mr. Rochester in December, was filled by the appointment of T. L. Burns in the third division at $750, resulting in a decrease of $50. Then, a vacant clerkship in the second division B, at an estimated salary of $800, caused by the resignation of F. A. Cleminson in September, 1908, was filled by the appointment of Mr. Ryder in the third division B at $750, making a decrease of $50. A new clerkship in the second division B at an estimated salary of $800, was filled by the appointment of John Nolan in the third division at $750, making another decrease of $50. A vacant clerkship in the second division B, caused by the death of R. McConnell in June, 1909, his estimated salary being $1,250, was filled by the appointment of H. L. Carson in the same division at a minimum salary of $800, making a decrease of $450. Then, Mr. Finnigan, a clerk in the second division, subdivision B, whose estimated salary last year was $1,150, was transferred to the outside service at the port of London, on October, 1, 1909. This vacancy is estimated to be filled by the appointment of a clerk in the same division at a minimum salary of $800. There is a decrease there of $350. Mr. Methot, a clerk in the second division, subdivision B, whose estimated salary for 1909-10, was $1,200, was replaced by Mr. A. B. Sowter, an officer of the outside service at Winchester, B.C., who came in at $1,000, a decrease of $200. A vacancy in the third division, subdivision A, caused by the resignation of J. N. Cram, whose estimated salary was $950, was filled by the appointment of Mr. A. S. Ogilvy at the minimum salary of $500, a decrease of $450. Of the amount provided for flat increases, $23,900, the sum of $800 was unused, $600 in the second division and $200 in the lower grades. As the estimates for 1909-10 were prepared on the basis of officers who were transferred from outside votes receiving their statutory increases from the first of April, whereas they were only granted those increases from the first of October, there was an over-estimate of $1,275. Allowing for these reductions, we have $3,675 as the net increase that we are providing for. The six additional officers we propose to bring in, and for whom we provide $4,800 are expected to be required, perhaps, in the statistical branch, owing to the operation of the French treaty. Of course, we must keep a detailed record of that trade for statistical purposes. Hitherto, under the more limited treaty that has been in existence, there was not much work involved, but the new treaty with its wider scope will make necessary additions to the staff of the Statistical Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand that. Why should it be so?

Mr. PATERSON. We shall have to open another set of books and have a special column in our returns because of the treaty. With the few articles coming in under the old treaty, the clerks could note these entries as they came to them and make up their tables with comparatively little labour. But now this special column will have to be added, and we shall be able to give, month by month, in our unrevised statement, statistics with reference to that trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the minister's theory on this subject. What is it that makes the preparation of these statistics more difficult? Suppose there were no treaty at all, and you had exactly the same amount of imports and exports, would these additional assistants be required? I ask purely for information.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not wonder that the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) asks the question for I asked it myself when the proposition first came before me The same idea occurred to me that, I suppose, is in the mind of the hon. member—that if more goods come in from France there might be so many less come in from other countries. But, under the old treaty, when an invoice came before our statistical officers, they could pick out the articles coming under the treaty, as they were few, and by merely keeping a running memorandum, it was easy to sum them up. But now that the French treaty will embrace a very large number of articles, and with other nations as well as France receiving the benefit of this most favoured nations treatment, there will be many shipments coming in under the treaty—most of them from France, of course, but some from other countries, making it necessary to keep, day by day, a regular tabulated record which will show the workings of the treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether I understand it yet. Is it because the officers are obliged to apply a third tariff, the intermediate tariff, or is it because the government anticipate a larger importation, or both?

Mr. PATERSON. It is the intermediate tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is, you have a third tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I should have said that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister thinks it really necessary to have these additional officers?

Mr PATERSON. I questioned it, just as the hon. member does. It was explained to me. But I further put my officers under promise that unless they found these additional officers to be necessary, they are not to be put on. My officers promised that unless these men are required they will not be put on. Of course these work with other clerks, certain officers take the port of Montreal, others the port of Toronto, and the work will be divided in that way. It may be that we will not have to put on six men.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a very simple alternative, to repeal the intermediate tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, but what a misfortune that would be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To these men who would not get their appointments. As far as the country is concerned, it would be far quicker.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it proposed to have a separate column for every country that will enjoy the same privileges as France enjoys or will all countries that come under that intermediate tariff be thrown together? If so I do not see that it will afford us much information as to the extent to which our trade with France will be improved under this French treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. The intention is to have on the margin the countries for which goods are imported as they are in the general tariff in the trade and navigation returns now. We will apply the same thing to the intermediate tariff so that you will see what other countries are participating and to what extent the trade with France has developed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then we will have to go all through the trade and navigation returns to see what that increase is.

Mr. PATERSON. Unless we do it for you. We have summaries and we will try and do that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of the increase in contingencies?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the Civil Service Act we are empowered to employ clerical and other assistance temporarily as for instance in the case of the illness of an official but without such a vote as this there is no provision for paying these extra clerks. I cannot say that all or any of this will be expended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The commissioner recommends it, does he?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh surely.

Department of Railways and Canals—Civil government, salaries including M. J. Butler at $8,000, $130,187.50.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). By a glance at the

estimates, it will be seen there is a reduction of $9,500. The number of clerks is reduced by six. In one division there is an increase of one. That is caused by the promotion of Mr. Little, the accountant in the department, to the first division subdivision A, which was done in the usual way through the Civil Service Commission. During the last five years I think Mr. Little has handled over $139,000,000. He is one of the most important officials we have and has been in the service some 28 years. That is the only increase in any class and there is a decrease in the total expenditure of $9,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is interesting to observe that a decrease is really an increase. Where is the increase in this case?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is absolutely no increase in the total. The decrease comes from the fact that while some officials have statutory increases, and Mr. Little's salary will be increased in promoting him from one class to the other, we drop some six clerks from the total that were in the estimates of last year. So we have a net increase in the expenditure of $9,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there an actual decrease in the number of clerks employed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The decrease is rather in the estimate of last year. We had several vacancies in the department, and in our reorganization I came to the conclusion that we could get along without filling those vacancies, and they are dropped from the reorganization.

Contingencies, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the same figure as it has been for years.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the item of $10,000 expended for printing and stationery?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is all the printing and stationery for the department, for instance, the annual report. There is almost an unlimited quantity of stationery used in the various branches of the department, books and stationery of all kinds. Besides the annual report, special reports have to be printed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does $10,000 cover all that?

Mr. GRAHAM. It covers the departmental printing.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must compliment the minister on his economy. I should expect it more likely to be $30,000.

Mr. CROCKET. That does not cover the printing for the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not for the Intercolonial, the Intercolonial pays for its own report.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it the intention to start a purchasing agency in Ottawa to buy supplies for the Intercolonial?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, in connection with the Intercolonial we are establishing a purchasing agency. Of course that will come in the Intercolonial estimates. But we intend to have a purchasing agency under the direct control of the department.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is this printing done?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think our departmental work and our reports are all printed at the Printing Bureau, but I am not positive. It all comes through the King's Printer at least.

Mr. HENDERSON. So did the report of the Department of Labour come through the King's Printer, it bore his impress, and yet it seemed to have been farmed out. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways is engaged in farming operations as well as the Minister of Labour.

Mr. GRAHAM. The head of the Printing Bureau would have to say that, personally I do not know. We get our report from the King's Printer, I imagine it is done at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. DANIEL. Are tenders asked for the supply of any of this stationery?

Mr. GRAHAM. I stated before that we do not ask for tenders for stationery, our printed material is supplied by the King's Printer. The head of that department would be able to say how it is done.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand your printing is done there, I was referring to stationery.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a stationery department to which all requisitions go for stationery.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is the head of that department?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Secretary of State is the head of the Printing Bureau, and of the Stationery Department as well.

Mr. PATERSON. When the Secretary of State is here he will be able to show that it is all right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He may be able to say it is all right, but he ought to be here to say it. It is not satisfactory to be told that we should get information from some one else who is not here. If that information is necessary from some one else, that person ought to be here to give it.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean the supplying of stationery to all the departments?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. An inquiry is made as to whether there are tenders; the

minister says he does not know, we will have to apply to the head of some other department. Then I say if we are to apply to the head of some other department that head ought to be here to give the information.

Mr. PATERSON. He will no doubt give it when he is here passing the estimates in his department.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as an item in any department is concerned, we do not ask for tenders, we send a requisition for it. When the Department of the Secretary of State comes up, all this will be a matter for criticism, how he does all this.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the meantime you have got your money voted.

Mr. DANIEL. This is the first time I have learned that you apply to the Secretary of State with your requisitions for stationery. All I have heard mentioned before was the Printing Bureau.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will understand that no person has said that he applied to the Secretary of State. Requisitions are made to the King's Printer. The question was asked who is the head of the department; it is the Secretary of State.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly he is the King's Printer for the purpose of giving information to this House. Is it a charge from one department to the other, as if it were an actual purchase, or what is the system?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think you will find we are responsible to the King's Printer in cash, as if it were a transaction betwen our department and some outside printing establishment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He supplies the other departments at certain prices, and the question is whether or not, in laying in those supplies, he adopts the system of tender, and no one knows anything about it.

Mr. GRAHAM. He will be able to tell you that.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no doubt he does apply for tenders in many cases.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We tried to obtain from the Minister of Labour some information in regard to the printing done in the Printing Bureau, and he finally gave us to understand that it was done by the Free Press Printing Company in this town, and apparently not done by tender at all. That item this year amounts to $23,300. Certainly it is a proper question to ask, and there should be some information.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps the head of that department will say when his department is under discussion that he did get tenders for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. All we could get from the Minister of Labour was that the Printing Bureau did the work, and that he knew nothing further about it.

Mr. GRAHAM. As to buying by tender, knowing something about buying paper and supplies of that kind, I am inclined to think that when the Secretary of State comes to make his reply he will have to say that he buys his paper as any dealer does, getting it from the best people at the best price he can. Any man who is engaged in the paper business often buys his stock by tender.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Customs says that this is a very proper question when the Secretary of State is in his place. What kind of a question is it when the secretary is not in his place? I remember an incident occurring once in a court in Nova Scotia where witness was trying to explain to counsel what kind of a dog a retriever was and finally, to make himself understood, he said: He is a dog which, if you throw your handkerchief away, will go and bring it to you, whereupon counsel responded: What kind of a dog is he when you do not have any handkerchief?

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Salaries, $250,150.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The amount voted last year for this item was $247,830. This year $250,150 is asked, or an increase of $2,320. The increase is made up as follows: In the first division, subdivision 'A', there is an increase of $600 to six officers who have not reached the maximum of their class. In the first division, subdivision 'B', there is a decrease of $750. The decrease is due to the fact that five of the officers who have reached the maximum salary have dropped out and their places will be filled by officers at the minimum salary.

Mr. HENDERSON. What becomes of the officers who drop out? Do they go into some other branch?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they have gone up to some other branch or have left the service. There is the wreck commissioner, one hydrographer, one chief clerk, and the commissioner of lights. In the second division subdivision 'A,' there is an increase of $2,600 which is made up as follows: One translator at $1,600 and the statutory increase of $50 to each of the officers of this class who have not reached the maximum. Three who have reached the maximum salary have dropped out and their places are to be filled by officers at the minimum salary. In the second division, subdivision 'B', there is a decrease of $1,300. In the third division, subdivision 'A', there is an increase of $700 made up

of the statutory increases of $70 to each of the officers who have not reached the maximum of their class. In the third division, subdivision 'B', there are extra shorthand writers at the minimum salary of this class and there is also the statutory increase of $50 to each in this class. Deducting the decreases of $2,050 there is left an increase of $2,320.

Mr. LAKE. Is this new naval vote going to be administered by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Will there be any increase in the staff of the department for the administration of a service which is to cost nearly $3,000,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. Most of the officers for the administration of this naval vote will be technical officers whom the British Admiralty are kind enough to loan us for the organization of the service, and as they cannot be under the regular Civil Service Act they will have to be paid out of the vote itself.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is out of the $3,000,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, out of the $3,000,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand the minister to say that these salaries are inclusive of the salary of the wreck commissioner?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. The wreck commissioner, I presume, is the officer who has charge of the inquiries into wrecks?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. When he does not attend himself he appoints some one else?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not himself. The minister has the right under the law to appoint any officer of the department, or any judge, for the purpose of making these inquiries. It need not necessarily be the wreck commissioner, but generally speaking we have a man who looks after this business and who is called the wreck commissioner. When the wreck commissioner is too busy, when he is doing something else or making some other inquiries, some one else may be appointed under the law by the minister for the purpose of making an inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL. Then it would be the minister who would issue the instructions to be followed by the commissioner who makes the investigation into the wreck? They would not come from the wreck commissioner but from the head of the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no special instructions given. There is simply an appointment made for the purpose of making the inquiry and the inquiry is then made under the provisions of the law.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Contingencies, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an increase of $7,000 made up as follows: The amount set apart for printing and stationery and other such services of the department for this current year was in excess of the amount which was voted and the expenditure would be so close as to require the cutting down of requisitions, such as for typewriters; so that we have to provide for a larger amount.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where is this printing done?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is done at the Printing Bureau. We send our requisitions for stationery and printing to the King's Printer, the accounts are sent to us and we have to pay them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) is in his place he could possibly tell us about the contracts which are let outside of the Printing Bureau. We have been asking for a good deal of information with regard to a number of contracts for printing and stationery which are let by tender or in what manner they were let.

Mr. MURPHY. I will be pleased to give my hon. friend all the information on this subject when the estimates for the Printing Bureau are up, but my present recollection of what has been done is that there are few, if any, contracts outside of the Printing Bureau for printing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We were able to find just a few minutes ago where one contract was let to the Free Press of Ottawa for some $20,000 odd. Perhaps the minister can tell us whether this was let by tender or not?

Mr. MURPHY. Was that last year or this?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There was over $30,000 worth of printing done for the Department of Labour last year.

Mr. MURPHY. I have not the information at hand, but I will be pleased to give my hon. friend all the information when the estimates for printing are under consideration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken the position that the other ministers have taken this evening with regard to printing. He simply says that it is done at the Printing Bureau as far as he knows. He does not

know whether it is let by tender outside of that or not. We have been anxious to find whether the printing has been done outside of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY. I will be pleased to give my hon. friend all the information on that point.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I would like to ask the Secretary of State if the printing is charged to each of the different departments at actual cost?

Mr. MURPHY. That is the procedure, as I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister give us some idea what the $10,000 is needed for in the way of sundries?

Mr. BRODEUR. Telephones, telegrams, newspapers and travelling expenses.

Mr. DANIEL. Travelling expenses if included as sundries would not appear as 'travelling expenses' in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a vote for contingencies and they are taken out of that.

Mr. HENDERSON. A contingency is something that is unexpected, but travelling expenses are a thing that have to be paid every year. It would look as if the word 'contingencies' was used to cover up something. I am not saying there is anything wrong about it, but the word is misleading and does not give us an accurate idea of what the money is intended for. The minister will remember that during the past year or two a good many suspicions have been aroused, and a thing of this kind is calculated to arouse suspicion. It is in the interest of the minister I make the suggestion.

Mr. BRODEUR. The remarks of my hon. friend will apply to all the departments because the word 'contingencies' is used all through the estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand that but it does not improve the situation.

Mr. CROCKET. How much of this vote was for travelling expenses last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant has not the information, but I will procure it later.

Department of Justice—Salaries (including E. L. Newcombe, $7,000), $103,498.75.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). An additional stenographer is provided for this year to commence with a salary of $500.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who decides that an extra clerk is necessary?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It has been discussed with me by the deputy several times during the year as a matter of necessity. It is within my own knowledge that this official is required, but it is entirely on his representation that I am proceeding.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the deputy minister recommends the appointment of a new officer. Who selects the officer?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The officer will be selected, of course, under the Civil Service Act by our applying for him to the Commission, and asking them to give us the name of some person competent to take this position. We have no idea who it will be.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who makes the recommendation to the Civil Service Commission as to whom it should be?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is no recommendation to the Civil Service Commission. They have their list of candidates who have passed the examination, and under the statute they will simply make the appointment and send the person selected to the department to enter upon the duties of the office.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will it be a person who has passed the Civil Service examination or one who intends to apply for examination?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It must, under the statute, be some person who has already passed.

Mr. DANIEL. It does not follow, then, that the person who receives the most marks will get the first appointment?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it does.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That depends upon the manner in which the statute is administered by the Commission, and my own idea was that it would be the person who obtained the highest number of marks, if that person were willing to take that position in preference to waiting for the next one that came.

Mr. CROCKET. I noticed lately that the deputy minister of justice has been practising in private cases before the Supreme Court. Not long ago he appeared as counsel for the province of Nova Scotia in a case in which the province of New Brunswick was also a party. I have heard considerable criticism as to that. I must say that it does seem to me that a gentleman occupying the position of deputy minister of justice should not practise before the Supreme Court of Canada as counsel for private parties. I do not wish to make any reflection at all on the deputy minister of justice, because he is recognized by the profession throughout the country as a very able lawyer and a very efficient minister of justice; but it did seem to me that a gentleman occupying his position should

not practise before the court as counsel for private litigants.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The subject which the hon. gentleman has mentioned is one that I am probably in no better position to say anything upon than any other member of the House. I have never considered that it was my duty or my right to investigate what may be said to be the private affairs of the gentleman who happened to be the deputy minister of the Department of Justice. I think I am in a position to certify, as matter within my own knowledge, which I have learned within the last three years if I never knew it before, that it would be very difficult to find any man able to discharge the duties of the position which Mr. Newcombe occupies, as efficiently as he discharges them; and I think I am in a position to say also that he has never in any way neglected the duties of the office which he holds, or allowed any other considerations, such as those of business or even of recreation, to interfere with the efficient and faithful doing of his work as deputy minister. To what extent he may be given by professional friends who have confidence in him, briefs in the Supreme Court, I am not able to state; I have never made examination. I know, just as my hon. friend knows, that occasionally there is an instance of that happening; it is not very frequent. I am able to say, however, that the doing of any such work, which is outside the regular work of the department, has never been allowed by Mr. Newcombe to interfere in the least degree with full attention to the duties of his position.

Mr. CROCKET. I hope the Minister of Justice did not understand me as suggesting that the appearance of Mr. Newcombe before the Supreme Court rendered him any less efficient as deputy Minister of Justice. My remarks were directed entirely to the question of his practising before the courts of the country as counsel for private litigants, in view of the relation he occupies towards those courts. The salary of the deputy Minister of Justice is $7,000, is it not?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes, that is the statutory salary. As to the other items, I may say that there is no change whatever in the staff of the Supreme Court, except the statutory increases. In the Court of Exchequer an additional clerk is asked for. That clerk, the registrar says, the business of the court requires. He is to do the work of a stenographer, as the present staff of the court is not able to cope with that work without the aid from time to time of stenographers who are employed for temporary purposes. The salary of the new clerk, which it is proposed should be $2,100, is the lowest that an efficient man can be obtained for, and it will be, perhaps not in whole but in large part, met by the charges for copies of evidence, which are paid for by litigants before the court.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November 22, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Chief Justice Sullivan and the Hon. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates and reports relating to the elections for the electoral district of Kings, Prince Edward Island, and the electoral district of Queens, Prince Edward Island, by which the said election petitions were dismissed and the sitting members declared duly elected.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21), respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. VERVILLE. There is no explanation of this Bill necessary, as it has been on the Order Paper for some sessions, and its principle of a shorter work day was discussed last session. I hope that this session it will reach its second reading, so that a chance will be given to members to state whether they are for or against the measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 22) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The Bill is a repetition of a Bill that I introduced last session. It has two provisions. One is to dispense with the $200 deposit now necessary to be made by a candidate. The other asks that the general election day throughout Canada be made a public holiday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907. He said: This Bill is a copy of the Bill which I introduced towards the close of last session, and time was not afforded to reach a conclusion upon it. Its object is to amend the Industrial Disputes Act in several more or less important respects. First, it asks that the authority which the Act now requires to be obtained from a labour union desiring to strike, in the shape of a meeting, and the proceedings consequent thereon in the way of notice, &c., &c., be dispensed with. That is found expensive and cumbersome, and not conducive to the best working out of the Act. The next provision deals with the fees that are payable to the arbitrators. I have not inserted any fees here, leaving the amount to be considered by the government. At present the chairman receives a larger fee than the other members of the board, although he performs no greater service. The present fee is $15 per day. It is thought that a general charge of $25 per day for every member of the board would be reasonable, especially in view of the fact that most of the sittings are continued well on into the night. A further amendment is proposed to section 57 of the Act, which provides that only investigations regarding intended changes in wages and hours of labour can take place. It is desired that these should be extended to any conditions affecting employment. Then, at present the onus of proceeding with an investigation does not rest on anybody. That is found to work hardship, and the provision of the Bill is that on those who set the Act in motion by giving notice of a desire or intention to effect a change in working conditions, shall rest the onus of proceeding with the appointment of the board of arbitrators, and that no change in the conditions shall take place after the notice is given. At present the conditions can be changed by either party up to the time the board is appointed. That is found to work hardship, certain interested parties taking advantage of the delay between the serving of the notice and the appointment of the board to change the conditions of labour. The spirit of the Act is that no change in the conditions of labour shall take place after the notice is once given, when the parties are at arms length and the issue is on.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is to amend section 341. The hon. Minister of Railways recollects that during last session, when his general Bill was moved to the House, I sought to have adopted then the amendment I now propose. Under section 77, no discrimination is allowed a railway company, and section 341 gives the company the right to issue family commutation and other cheap rate tickets. The question has arisen, both before the Railway Commission and in the courts, as regards the right of a railway company to discriminate against a locality by withholding the issue of these cheap rate tickets in any locality, and it is to make the matter clearer and prevent discrimination against localities or persons that I introduce this Bill. The Railway Commission have considered that there is a conflict between section 341 and section 77, and the Act should be amended so as to make it clear.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 25) relating to the water carriage of goods. He said: The object is to declare illegal conditions put in bills of lading by which the shipowners free themselves from any liability arising out of their fault and negligence. The Bill was before the Senate two years ago and made the subject of an investigation. It was passed through that Chamber last year and sent here, but sent unfortunately too late for us to take it up. The other provisions in the Bill are concerning losses in case of accidents or force majeure. It provides also that shipowners shall have the right to remove inflammable and explosive goods which may have gone on board without their consent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this comprise all the provisions of the Bill that came to us last session?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is almost word for word the Bill passed by the Senate last year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MR. LUMSDEN'S RESIGNATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. the Minister of Railways when we may expect the return for which I moved some days ago—papers connected with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden. I was under the impression they would be brought down without any motion.

Mr. GRAHAM. The returns are all ready and will be here to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

LOBSTER FACTORIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

How many owners or managers of lobster factories or canning establishments for packing lobsters holding licenses have failed, on or before September 1, 1909, to send to the minister the return called for by section 78 of the Fisheries Act, and what are their names and addresses?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. Licensees are required to send the returns in question to the different inspectors of fisheries, who arrange the information in the form of statistics, which are forwarded to the department at the close of the fiscal year. The department has not been informed of failure on the part of any cannery licensee to forward the required return.

PAY OF MACHINISTS, &c., ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What is the standard pay for machinists, pipe fitters, boiler makers, and day and night foremen, in engine-houses on entering the service of the Intercolonial?
2. What are the statutory increases for subsequent years for each of these classes?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. The present rates in schedule are:

Machinists, 26c. per hour.

Pipe fitters, 21c. per hour, according to class of work.

Boilermakers, 27c. per hour.

Day foremen, in engine houses, $70 to $105 per month, according to station.

Night foremen in engine houses, $56 to $80 per month, according to station.

2. There is no statutory or other provision for increases for subsequent years.

RURAL FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many rural free mail delivery routes are in actual operation?
2. How many routes have sent petitions to the government asking for mail to be delivered to them?
3. What is the total number of rural free mail delivery boxes erected or disposed of by the government, and the number in actual use on routes?
4. What has been the total increased cost to the Post Office Department since the establishment of rural free mail delivery in Canada?
5. What action, if any, has the government taken with a view to granting to all the people living in thickly peopled portions of Canada, a system of rural free mail delivery similar to that in operation in the United States and other lands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 186.
2. 197.
3. 3,628.

Mr. GRAHAM.

4. $13,372.48 per annum for mail service. Miscellaneous expenditure to 31st October, 1909, $13,528.02.
5. The department is not considering the question of rural delivery as given in the United States or any other country, but is devising a scheme of rural delivery suitable to conditions in Canada at the present time.

PUBLIC WHARFS LEASED.

Mr. FOSTER:

What public wharfs have been leased under the Act passed in 1909, to whom leased, and under what conditions?

Mr. BRODEUR.

None.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Have the questions in difference between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners as to classification of the material dealt with in the construction of parts of the eastern division, been adjusted or determined?
2. If not, what steps have been taken, how far has the matter proceeded, and how does the matter now stand?
3. Have the engineers reported the result of their investigations? If not, what is the cause of the delay?
4. Will the government lay the papers in connection with this matter upon the table for the information of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. Chief Engineer Grant of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and Chief Engineer Kelliher of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have agreed on Mr. Collingwood Schreiber as third arbitrator and are proceeding to arbitrate the matters in dispute as provided by the National Transcontinental Railway Act.
3. The arbitration proceedings have not been completed, and consequently no report has been made by the arbitrators.
4. The correspondence on the subject of these arbitration proceedings will be included in the return ordered by the House in response to the motion of Mr. R. L. Borden, M. P.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. SPROULE:

1. What consideration is the Quebec Bridge Company to receive for their interest in that corporation when the government takes over the undertaking and franchise to construct the bridge?
2. Has an agreement been reached between the government and the company as to the exact amount in cash or its equivalent that the company is to receive for its interest in undertaking and franchise?
3. Is the bridge to be erected in the same place as the first one, and will the present abutments be used for that purpose?

4. What kind of bridge is intended to be erected, a suspension or cantilever?

5. What is the approximate cost of it to be?

6. Will any portion of the work done for the bridge which collapsed, be utilized for the new bridge? If so, what is the approximate value of it?

7. When is it intended that the new bridge is to be completed?

8. Will the province, or the city of Quebec be appealed to for assistance by way of subsidy or otherwise to assist in the cost of construction of the new bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. See Statutes, Chap. 59, Statutes of Canada for 1905, under which bridge was taken over by the government.

2. Yes, under provision of statute.

3. The bridge is to be erected at the same site, the south pier will be used in part but must be enlarged, a new pier will be sunk to the rock on the north side, the other piers will require to be rebuilt.

4. Bids will be asked for both cantilever and suspension.

5. It is not in the public interest to give out approximate estimates of cost at a time pending the receipt of tenders.

6. Yes, it is expected to utilize certain parts, but the value cannot be determined until the plans are finally settled.

7. Pending the receipt of tenders it is impossible to fix a date.

8. The city and province have already contributed.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. What is the total value of agricultural products exported from Canada to Germany?

2. What action, if any, has this government taken to improve our trade relations with Germany?

3. Is the government aware that representatives of the German-Canadian Economic Association are travelling through our land with a view to improving our trade relations with that country, and is it the intention of this government to assist them in the work they have undertaken?

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

1. The total value of agricultural products of Canadian origin (not including animals and their produce) exported from Canada to Germany during the fiscal year 1908-1909 was $303,414.

2 and 3. The government do not deem it expedient to enter into negotiations respecting commercial relations with any other foreign countries until all matters connected with the treaty with France are disposed of.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Were the differences as to classification and other matters existing between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Transcontinental Railway Commission on the 16th of March, 1909, and at that time submitted to Mr. Lumsden, Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Schreiber for determination, adjusted, determined upon and reported before the resignation of Mr. Lumsden from the position of chief engineer?

2. If not, what has been done and how does the matter now stand?

3. If the questions in difference have been determined what is the result, or will the minister bring down the report or findings and lay them upon the table of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM:

All the information sought by this question will be found in the correspondence to be brought down in response to a resolution passed by this House on motion of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

LEASES OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN FRONTENAC.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many acres of government land in the township of Pittsburg, county of Frontenac, have been leased to the Hon. Sir R. J. Cartwright?

2. How many years has the said lessee had the land referred to, and what rental does he pay annually for the same?

3. Have any fences been erected on said lands by the government in recent years? If so, by whom and at what cost?

4. How many acres are in the adjoining farm, formerly occupied by the late Robert Dunlop, and what annual rent did that gentleman pay the government?

5. When was the last payment of rent made on each of the properties mentioned?

6. Are there any arrears of rent from either property? If so, what amount?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. So far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, no portion of the government property in the Township of Pittsburg, in the county of Frontenac, is leased to Sir Richard Cartwright. About seventy-five acres were originally leased to Sir Richard Cartwright in 1868 or 1869 by the Imperial Government. This property is now under lease to Lady Cartwright.

2. The above seventy-five acres have been leased to Lady Cartwright on the 30th of January, 1905, at an annual rental of $59.35. One hundred acres which formed part of the property originally leased to Mr. Robert Dunlop were, at that tenant's death, in August, 1906, leased at the same rental formerly paid by Mr. Dunlop, $42.96 per annum. Only a part of the lands in above leases are fit for tillage, a large proportion being exceedingly rocky and stony.

3. Considerable sums have been expended in properly fencing the property, but the entire cost has been defrayed by the tenant.

4. In addition to the 100 acres above referred to, some 44½ acres of the adjoining land, being part of lots 20 and 21 in the

western addition of the Township of Pittsburg, were also leased to Mr. Dunlop, at a rental of $11.87 per annum. The Department of Militia and Defence resumed possession of this parcel of land in November, 1907, and it now forms part of the Barriefield camp grounds.

5. (a) The last payment made by Lady Cartwright was received at the department on September 27 last, and covered the rent due on the whole 175 acres for 12 months ended the 30th of September. (b) The last payment made by the Dunlop estate on the 125 acres formerly under lease to the late Mr. Dunlop was received at the department October 29, 1906, and covered the rent due for the six months ended September 30, 1906. (c) The last payment made on the additional 44½ acres formerly under lease to the late Mr. Dunlop was received at the department January 28, 1908, and covered the rent due for the seven months ended October 31, 1907.

6. No.

SERVANTS' QUARTERS AT R. M. C.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When were the servants' quarters at the R.M.C. completed?
2. What was the total cost of the said quarters?
3. When were these cottages first occupied?
4. How many of the cottages are at present occupied?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1, I presume this question relates to the quarters recently erected for the accommodation of teachers and instructors in the Royal Military College, some having the rank of non-commissioned officers, and others being civilian instructors in connection with the college. The buildings were completed and inspected by the Department of Militia and Defence on October 25, 1909.

2. Total cost to date, $90,995.40.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

3. These cottages were occupied from Saturday, the 13th instant.

4. All the cottages are at present occupied.

BRIDGE AT KINGSTON MILLS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When were tenders asked for the construction of the bridge at Kingston Mills?
2. From whom were tenders received, and what was the amount of each?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, and when?
4. When was the work completed, and how much has been paid on it to date?
5. What is the total cost of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. April 16, 1909, by newspaper advertisement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN

2. Tenders were received from the following contractors for the abutments and approaches at schedule rates, viz:

The Jenks-Dresser Co., Ltd., Sarnia, Ont.
James McGrath, Montreal.
Fallon Bros., Cornwall.
Patrick Kennedy, Ottawa.

Tenders for a steel riveted highway bridge were received from the following contractors, as follows, viz.:

Jenks-Dresser Co., Ltd., $2,000, plan A; $1,475, plan B.
Dominion Bridge Co., Montreal, $1,690.
Hamilton Bridge Works, Hamilton, $1,340.

The lowest tender in each case accepted.

3. The contract for the abutments and approaches was awarded Fallon Bros., Cornwall, at their tender price, viz, $3,690.55. The contract for the superstructure was awarded The Hamilton Bridge Works at their tender price, viz, $1,340, on the 15th June, 1909.

4. Work was completed on 10th October, 1909. Total payments to date, $3,969.10.

5. Total cost cannot be stated, as the final estimate has not yet been received by the department.

PORT BRUCE HARBOUR.

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. What amounts have been expended upon harbour improvements at Port Bruce, Elgin county, Ontario, in fiscal years 1904-5, 1905-6, 1906-7, 1907-8 and 1908-9?
2. Is it the intention of the government to make any further improvements in the said harbour during the present fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

Fiscal Year.	Construct'n and Dredging.	Repairs.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1904-05	975 54	.....	975 54
1905-06	4,947 76	.....	4,947 76
1906-07	2,122 00	2,877 83	4,999 83
1907-08	.....	665 11	665 11
1908-09	5,846 25	.....	5,846 25
	13,891 55	3,592 94	17,434 49

2. Some additional work is still to be performed to decking of pier.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY IN ELGIN.

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. How many rural mail delivery boxes are installed in East Elgin?
2. What is necessary to be done to secure a rural mail delivery box?

3. What extra remuneration do the mail carriers receive respectively, and who attends to the delivery and removal of mail from the rural mail boxes in East Elgin?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General):

1. One hundred.

2. Upon a receipt of a properly signed petition for rural mail delivery from the residents along and contiguous to the existing mail route the department will proceed at once to organize the service.

3. (a) $1 per box per annum, where the service is performed daily or more frequently; 75 cents per box per annum for semi-weekly and less frequently than daily; 50 cents per box per annum for weekly or less frequently. (b) The contractors for the several mail routes on which boxes have been erected.

RIFLES AVAILABLE FOR CADET CORPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. How many rifles have the Militia Department on hand which are available and suitable for issue to both Junior and Senior Cadet Corps?

2. What are the patterns of such rifles and the total length and weight thereof?

3. Have any applications for rifles been received from any Cadet Corps which have not been complied with? If so, to what extent?

4. Are a sufficient supply of such rifles on store charged to keep pace with the rapidly growing requirements of the quickly expanding cadet system throughout Canada?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 11,470.

2.

—	No.	Weight.	L'gth.
Rifles Snider Shortened	9,199	6½ lb.	37 in.
" Martini-Henry	913	7 "	50 "
Carbines ·303 inch	1,358	8 "	40 "

3. All issues are approved locally by District Officer Commanding and no complaints have been received at headquarters that any cadet corps is short of its rifles.

4. Yes, as far as can be foreseen, for future issues a pattern of Ross rifle is in hand.

TRANSFER OF ESQUIMALT.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Have the negotiations with the imperial government for the transfer of the Naval Station at Esquimalt to the Canadian government been yet concluded? If so, will the papers in connection therewith be laid on the table without a motion being moved therefor?

Mr. BRODEUR:

These negotiations are not yet concluded.

STRENGTH AND EXPENDITURE, PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What establishment has been fixed for the Permanent Force at Halifax, Fredericton, Quebec, St. John, P.Q., Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, London, Winnipeg and Esquimalt?

2. What is actual strength of the Permanent Force at those stations?

3. What was the expenditure at those stations during the fiscal year on the Permanent Force, excluding any sums chargeable to Capital Account?

4. What amounts were expended at those Stations chargeable to Capital?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Present establishment of the Permanent Force:

Halifax	1,297
Fredericton	84
Quebec	381
St. John, P.Q.	99
Ottawa	86
Kingston	338
Toronto	257
London	91
Winnipeg	106
Esquimalt	131

2. Strength of the Permanent Force, November, 1. (The date of the last return):

Halifax	1,219
Fredericton	77
Quebec	357
St. John, P.Q.	99
Ottawa	86
Kingston	316
Toronto	246
London	86
Winnipeg	98
Esquimalt	126

3. The annexed statement marked 'A' shows the expenditure for the whole of the Permanent Staff and Permanent Force for pay and allowances, provisions and supplies at all stations.

There is also annexed herewith a statement marked 'B' showing direct expenditure for repairs to barracks, &c., occupied by the Permanent Force.

It is not practicable to give the amount expended on stores, transport, and clothing as these votes are general for both the permanent and non-permanent militia. It may be stated, however, that quite two-thirds, if not more, of the stores vote and clothing vote is expended on account of the non-permanent militia.

4. None.

STATEMENT 'A'—Expenditure Permanent Staff and Permanent Force 1908-9 and average strength during 12 months ended 31st March, 1909.

Station.	Average Strength.		Pay 'A' Staff.	Pay 'B' Perm't Force.	Provisions and Supplies.	Total.
	Staff.	P. F.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
London	2	101	4,700 00	44,999 49	13,497 49	63,196 98
Toronto	5	312	11,824 33	133,862 90	43,422 66	189,109 89
Kingston	4	274	12,023 37	160,736 44	45,179 64	217,939 45
Ottawa	31	73	81,013 30	73,891 10	1,038 04	155,942 44
Montreal	8	17	11,852 86	20,656 51	799 29	33,308 66
St. John, P.Q.		115		43,832 35	22,014 62	65,846 97
Quebec	2	362	5,125 92	184,970 41	50,624 85	240,721 18
Halifax	6	1,307	9,099 96	530,172 68	154,522 58	693,795 22
Fredericton		78		28,464 05	11,728 42	40,192 47
St. John, N.B.	2	7	6,588 04	7,421 00	488 98	14,498 02
Charlottetown	1	3	2,565 00	2,820 81	129 79	5,515 60
Winnipeg	1	108	1,656 00	44,565 15	23,269 33	69,490 48
Calgary	1	4	3,075 00	4,292 56	587 20	7,954 76
Esquimalt	2	135	3,000 00	68,142 93	22,719 80	93,862 73
England, abroad and general		18		34,595 96	11,664 23	46,260 19
	65	2,914	152,523 78	1,383,424 34	401,686 92	1,937,635 04

STATEMENT B.—Expenditure for repairs to Barracks occupied by Permanent Force for fiscal year 1908-9.

Station.	Expenditure in connection with Barracks.
	$ cts.
London, Ont	589 00
Toronto, Ont	4,184 00
Kingston, Ont	3,008 00
Montreal, Que	46 00
St. John, Que	5,653 00
Quebec, Que	5,212 00
Halifax, N.S.	31,392 00
Fredericton, N.B.	2,377 00
Winnipeg, Man	1,699 00
Esquimalt, B.C.	3,843 00
	58,003 00

ABSENCE OF POSTMASTER GENERAL ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Is the Postmaster General away from the Capital on official business? If so, what is the nature of the business, and when is he expected to return?

2. What minister is acting for the Postmaster General during his absence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes, the Postmaster General is away from the capital on official business. In response to an invitation from the Swiss government, he was appointed to represent Canada at the inauguration of a monument to be erected in commemoration of the forming of the Postal Union. He was also authorized to discuss with the Postmaster General of the United Kingdom the subject of cable rates between Great Britain and Canada.

2. The Prime Minister.

RECORD OF EMIGRANTS FROM CANADA.

Mr. URIAH WILSON:

1. Is any record kept by any department of the government of people emigrating from Canada? If so, how many people have emigrated from this country during the past fiscal year?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to establish a system of keeping a record of this nature.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. No.

2. Not at present.

TREATIES WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. How many treaties have been made or entered into with the United States by the government since 1896?

2. What are the dates of such treaties and in respect of what were they respectively entered into?

3. How many of these treaties and if so, which, have been submitted to parliament for ratification, and how many of such treaties have been brought into operation with the consent of the government only?

4. If any of such treaties were not sanctioned by parliament, why were they not so sanctioned?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY. Since 1896 there have been entered into between Great Britain and the United States, twenty treaties or conventions, of which eight relate more or less directly to Canada. These are:

(a) Convention relating to the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals. Signed at Washington, December 13, 1900.

(b) Convention for the adjustment of the boundary between Canada and Alaska. Signed at Washington, January 24, 1903.

(c) Convention for the adjustment of the boundary between Canada and Alaska. Signed at Washington, April 21, 1906.

(d) Arbitration convention. Signed at Washington, April 4, 1908.

(e) Convention respecting the protection, preservation and propagation of food fishes in waters contiguous to the United States and Canada. Signed at Washington, April 11, 1908.

(f) Treaty relating to the demarcation of the International boundary. Signed at Washington, April 11, 1908.

(g) Treaty providing for the conveyance of prisoners of Canada or the United States through the territory of the other, also providing for reciprocal rights in wrecking and salvage. Signed at Washington, May 18, 1908.

(h) Agreement for the submission to arbitration of questions relating to fishing on the North Atlantic coasts. Signed at Washington, January 27, 1909.

None of these treaties were laid before the parliament of Canada for ratification. Because under the British Constitution the treaties in question did not require parliamentary sanction.

THE ALL-RED ROUTE.

Mr. MONK:

1. When will Mr. Coulter's report in connection with the All-Red route be submitted?
2. What is the present position of the negotiations in connection with the All-Red route?
3. Is the Postmaster General discussing this matter in London?
4. Has the imperial government decided to grant £135,000 sterling to Collooney Blacksod Bay railway in connection with the All-Red route, as reported?
5. Does the government intend to submit legislation in this connection this session? If not, why not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. No.
2. In the condition revealed by the report.
3. No.
4. The government has not been advised of any such actions by the imperial authorities.
5. Matter under consideration

LAND OPEN TO HOMESTEAD SETTLEMENT.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. How many acres in the surveyed areas of land in the Northwest, including Manitoba, are open to homestead settlement?
2. How many acres in the unsurveyed areas of the above are estimated as available for homestead settlement?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Area surveyed excluding Parish and River lot settlements, Forest reserves and Indian reserves, 142,574,308 acres; area alienated at the 1st November, 1909, 101,285,781 acres; leaving a balance of 41,288,527 acres open to homestead settlement.
2. It is impossible to say how many acres in the unsurveyed area are available for homestead settlement as a considerable portion of this country has not been explored.

MEDALS AWARDED FOR HEROISM.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the government awarded or recommended the Edward medal, instituted by His present Majesty for heroic deeds done by miners or quarrymen, in connection with the recent disaster at Extension, British Columbia?
2. If so, how many such medals were awarded or recommended?
3. To what person or persons were such medals awarded or recommended, and for what deeds?
4. What department of the government has charge of this matter, and on whose recommendation or advice were such awards made or recommended?
5. What inquiries were made by the government to properly ascertain the names of the parties entitled to such medals, and from whom were such inquiries made?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Answer to the first part of this question. The Department of the Secretary of State. The second part is answered by the answer to No. 1.
5. Inquiries were made of the member of parliament representing the district in which the disaster occurred.

BARRACKS AT LAMBTON.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is it the intention of the government to place in the estimates an appropriation for the erection of the new barracks at Lambton, to take the place of Stanley Barracks, Toronto? If so, what is the amount of the appropriation?
2. When was the site at Lambton acquired, and what has been the cause of the delay in proceeding with the work?
3. Does Stanley Barracks afford sufficient accommodation for the officers and men stationed there?

4. What is the amount of rental and other additional expenses payable by the government during the current year, for accommodation or quarters outside of Stanley Barracks because of their insufficiency?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $100,000 included in estimates for 1910-1911.

2, 3 and 4. To be answered by the Department of Militia and Defence.

SIR FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Appertains to the Department of Public Works.

2. The property was conveyed to the Crown by the city of Toronto by deed dated February 15, 1909. The delay in proceeding with the work is due to there having been no appropriation for the purpose.

3 and 4. No. There are 75 all ranks in Toronto for whom no quarters are available. The total amount of lodging allowance paid to them is $14,825 per annum.

NORTH ATLANTIC FISHERIES BEFORE HAGUE TRIBUNAL.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. When does the government expect the North Atlantic Fisheries dispute to be submitted to the Hague Tribunal?

2. By what counsel will Canada be represented on this occasion?

3. Has the government retained the services of Sir Robert Finlay, and will he appear for Canada on that occasion? If not, why not?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. In April or May next.

2 and 3. There will not be any separate representation of Canada before the tribunal. It is expected that upon the oral argument His Majesty's government will be represented by the Attorney General of England and by Sir Robert Finlay and probably by one or by two other counsel, but who such other counsel will be has not yet been decided. The government of Canada joined with the government of Newfoundland in asking that Sir Robert Finlay should be retained. He has been retained and if available as counsel when the time comes will no doubt appear in that capacity.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is it the intention of the government to abolish the Alien Labour Law, on the ground that it is useless in its present condition?

2. Has the government received any request from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada to this effect?

3. What is the intention of the government with regard to either the enforcement of the Act or its repeal?

Mr. MACDONELL.

Mr. KING:

1. No.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 1.

PURCHASING AGENT FOR INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Has the department created a purchasing agency for buying supplies for the Intercolonial railway, at Ottawa?

2. If so, what is the personnel of the same, salary and former experience of each member of such agency?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2 (a) Louis Lavoie who entered the service in October, 1894, as clerk in the general manager's office, and where he remained until 1901, when he entered the office of Track Expert Horn, as general clerk, on the reorganization of the railway yards. In August, 1902, Mr. Lavoie entered the office of the late General Superintendent Price, as chief clerk and was employed in that capacity until September, 1905. Since that date, in the general manager's office as all round assistant in transportation work. He is an expert stenographer and typewriter, with a good knowledge of the English and French languages and is thoroughly familiar with railway work. Mr. Lavoie's present title is 'Purchasing agent' at a salary of $150 a month.

(b) O. O. Leblanc entered the service as clerk in the Purchasing and Stores Department in March, 1884, his present sal- June, 1888, salary $100 a month.

(c) F. H. Kinnear, clerk in the Storekeeping and Purchasing Department since June, 1898, salary $100 a month.

(d) George Harshman clerk in Stores and Purchasing Department since 28th July, 1899. Salary $85 a month.

SURVEYS IN TOWNSHIP NINE, PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Has the government done any re-surveying in township nine, range ten, west of first, province of Manitoba, recently? If so, what was the nature and the extent of the work?

2. By whom was the work requested?

3. When did the work begin?

4. How long did it last?

5. Who was in charge of the survey party?

6. Did the surveyors alter or change any of the stakes or lines? If so, what alterations were made?

7. How many persons were employed during the work?

8. What is the total cost of the resurvey?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The lines in township nine, range ten, west of the principal meridian, have been retraced recently. All the section

lines were retraced and marked on the ground. The Assiniboine river was also surveyed across the township.

2. The work was requested by John Kerr, Eldrage Precious, Frank Precious, Albert Catt, Hy. Precious, Alex. Dobbin, C. Pullman, Robt. J. Pullman, J. Wilkinson, W. G. Ross, Wm. T. Grogan.

3. The work began at the end of April.

4. The work lasted about three months.

5. C. F. Aylesworth.

6. The returns of the survey not having been received, the question cannot be answered.

7. Twelve persons and the surveyor.

8. The accounts of the surveyor not having been received, the question cannot be answered.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Was any certificate or other document issued or given by any person at Militia Headquarters, or belonging to the Militia Department, or any other person, which caused the Ross Rifle, Mark II, double star to be admitted by the National Rifle Association of Great Britain for use in the last Bisley competition? If so, by whom was such issued, and what was the nature thereof?

2. What is the cost to the Militia Department of Ross Rifle Mark II., double star?

3. Is the Ross Rifle Mark II., double star, regarded by the Militia Department as a service weapon?

4. Is this pattern the one which will govern future purchases for issue to the Militia as its service weapon?

5. What contract has been made with the Ross Rifle Company for the supply of rifles of this issue, including dates, numbers, payments, &c.?

6. Who are the twelve individuals to whom rifles of this pattern have been issued, and under what regulations were such issues made?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In answer to the first part of this question I would say that as far as I can ascertain, there is no certificate or other document in the Militia Department, or which has been issued through that department, which would answer to the description contained in this question. However, I, myself, while in England, in July last, wrote a personal letter to the commandant of the Bisley team, Col. Bertram, and, as I told Col. Bertram that he could make such use as he chose of my personal letter, it is possible that this is what the hon. member refers to and, if so, I am delighted to have the opportunity of satisfying his curiosity. The letter is as follows:

Waldorf Hotel, Aldwych,
London, Eng., July 12, 1909.

Dear Colonel Bertram.—Having read the correspondence, including the letter of Lt.-Col. Crosse, relating to the use of the Mark II** rifle by the Canadian Bisley Team, this year, I have no hesitation in saying that the rifle issued to the team by the Militia Department is in every respect of the same pattern as the rifles of same mark, duly and previously authorized by General Order, now being manufactured for and issued by the Department. You are at liberty to make such use, as you may see fit, of this letter.

Wishing you every success,
I remain,
Yours very truly,
(Sd.) F. W. BORDEN.

Lt.-Col. A. Bertram,
Commandant, Canadian Bisley Team,
Bisley.

2. The cost of the conversion of the Mark II rifle to Mark II** was $11 per rifle.

3. Yes.

4. It is expected that both mark II and mark II** patterns will be manufactured and issued to the Canadian troops in such relative quantities as may be deemed advisable.

5. The only order given the Ross Rifle Company for this pattern of rifle was by letter dated April 29, 1909, for the conversion of 500. Delivery under this order was completed on September 29, last, and the rifles have been paid for.

6. The rifles were issued to the following:

Colonel S. Hughes, M.P.	1
W. H. Sharp, Esq., M.P.	1
W. D. Staples, Esq., M.P.	1
Vickers Sons & Maxim	2
J. A. Sexsmith, Esq., M.P.	1
W. Price, Esq., M.P.	1
J. Arthurs, Esq., M.P.	1
J. D. Taylor, Esq., M.P.	1
H. Clarke, Esq., M.P.	1
F. B. Carvell, Esq., M.P.	1
Captain Swift, Inspection Staff.	1
	12

PITT MEADOWS, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government made arrangements for the granting of a large area of public lands on Pitt Meadows, in New Westminster District, in British Columbia, to any person or persons, on terms differing from those obtainable by applicants generally under the provisions of the Land Act?

2. If so, what are names of the persons, their occupations, the acreage and the price per acre?

3. (a) Is there any settlement in the neighbourhood. (b) If so, what is the average price of land there?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. W. A. Rannie, contractor, 6,821·2 acres at the rate of $1.50 per acre.

3. (a) Yes.

(b) The department has not the information at hand.

MILITARY COURTS OF INQUIRY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Have officers or soldiers of the Canadian Militia the right to cross-examine witnesses and to procure evidence before Courts of Inquiry as established by the rules of procedure under the authority of the Army Act?

2. If so is the government aware as to whether any such right has been curtailed or diminished by the regulations established by the Governor in Council under the authority of the Militia Act, paragraph 77, line 940?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that the last line of the question should read 'under the authority of the Militia Act, 1904, paragraph 77, line 9.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have the answer here according to the way the question was put. It is as follows:

1. Yes, in so far as the rules of procedure are not contrary to the Militia Act and regulations made thereunder.

2. Yes.

LAND ENTRY OF THOS. G. WARWICK.

Mr. LAKE:

Did Thos. G. Warwick pay the value of the improvements performed by A. R. Mudie on the S.W. quarter of section 24, 38,10, W. 3rd M. within thirty days from the 19th May, 1909, in accordance with the decision of the Minister of the Interior? If not, was his entry cancelled and notice given to Mr. Mudie to make re-entry within the usual 30 days?

Mr. OLIVER. On the 3rd of June, 1909, the agent of the Dominion lands at Saskatoon was instructed to notify T. G. Warwick that if he did not, within thirty days, pay the value of the improvements upon the southwest quarter of section 24, township 38, range 10, west of the third meridian, made by Mr. A. R. Mudie, his entry would be cancelled. On the 16th idem, the agent notified Mr. Warwick accordingly. On the 16th of July, 1909, Mr. Warwick paid the sum of $60, being the value of 30 acres of breaking done by Mr. Mudie. Mr. Warwick having complied with the conditions, his entry was not cancelled.

PRE-EMPTIONS AND PURCHASED HOMESTEADS.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What has been the total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads sold since the 31st December, 1908, to date?

2. What total amount of money receivable by the government does this represent?

3. How much has been paid on this acreage during the above period?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 1,937.696 acres.

2. $5,833,376, with interest to date of payment.

3. $33,504, being entry fees and first instalments on account of purchased homesteads. This statement is for the period extending from the 31st December, 1908, to 31st October, 1909, which latter date is the date of the last returns received from the Dominion land agencies.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, 1909—FRENCH VERSION OF PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. PAQUETTE:

Is it the intention of the government to give to the members of the House, before the debate on naval defence, the official French version of the Imperial Conference of 1909?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to observe that this matter is not under the jurisdiction of the government but of the House itself.

FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. Has the Fisheries Commission which lately sat in the west completed its report?

2. If so, when will such report be brought down?

3. Will all the evidence taken be also laid on the table?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. No.

2. Commissioners are now engaged in its preparation and report will be brought down when completed.

3. Yes.

FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. MONK:

Is there a provision in the existing treaty between France and Canada, respecting trade, for terminating the treaty upon notice or otherwise? If so, what is the effect of the provision?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The French treaty of 1893, now in force, contains a provision that either party may terminate the treaty after twelve months' notice. There is a further provision that if Canada should increase the duty on certain wines the French government may terminate the treaty immediately without notice.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the number of passes issued on the Intercolonial railway from October 1, 1908, to October 1, 1909, whether annual, return trip or trip, to whom issued, the authority and upon whose recommendation the passes were issued and reasons for the issue, the several points at which these passes took effect and the destination, and also a copy of the agreement entered into by the various railways of Canada regarding the non-issuing of passes—Mr. Stanfield.

For a return showing: 1. The applications made to the Railway Board for protection of railway crossings under the provisions of chapter 32 of the statutes of 1909, an Act to amend the Railway Act, and (a) the cases in which these applications have been granted, (b) in which they have been refused, when refused, and the reason for refusal.

2. The names of the persons in each case making the application.

3. The cases in which the board of its own motion made an order for the protection of crossing under said Act.

4. The appropriations made by the board out of the Railway Grade Crossing fund under said Act, and the crossing in respect of which such appropriations were made.

5. The character or description of the crossing in question, and the character, description and cost in each case of the construction work of protection ordered or directed by the board.

6. The amount in each case ordered or directed by the board out of the said fund and by the railway company and municipality or other party to the proceedings.

7. The cases in which the work ordered to be done (a) has been completed, (b) in which it is under construction, (c) the cases in which the municipality has been submitted to or complied with the order of the board, and (d) cases in which the municipality has refused to comply.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing the areas sold or leased as oil lands in the northwest, giving the amount sold or leased, the date when, and the parties to whom sold or leased, and if leased the various assignments, if any, made thereof, and the dates of the same.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, applications, contracts, lease or leases and correspondence with regard to Lac du Bonnet fishing.—Mr. Campbell.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, applications, contracts, and correspondence with regard to the taking of spawn for the fish hatchery at Snake island, Winnipegosis for the years 1907-1908 and 1909.—Mr. Campbell.

THE LATE SENATOR MERNER.

Mr. LENNOX moved for a copy of the resignation of the late Senator Merner and all letters, correspondence and papers in connection with the resignation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no such correspondence in existence.

Mr. LENNOX. No resignation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

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

A copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents in the possession of the government not already brought down, relating to a survey of a route for a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and also relating to the construction of such tunnel.

He said: Mr Speaker, this is a question which has been often brought before the parliament of Canada, although it has not been presented during the present parliament until now. Last year, owing to the fact that there was a serious falling off in the revenues of the country, I did not myself consider it an opportune time to move a resolution which if adopted might mean the expenditure of a considerable sum of money, and consequently I deemed it better to wait for a more convenient time when the revenues of the country would be buoyant and when those in charge of the finances might be in a more melting frame of mind and better prepared to give the people of Prince Edward Island assistance in this direction. At all events the question has been ventilated in the press and in parliament for years. Permit me to say that in my humble opinion the method adopted by some of its advocates, and the press, particularly in the press of Prince Edward Island, has not been characterized by that common sense which would have been better for the tunnel. We have had speeches on the hustings and editorials in the newspapers which have brought ridicule upon a worthy scheme and which to some extent at least has made it a laughing stock. In consequence of this I find it more difficult to remove the wrong impressions created by the absurd declarations which have been made by would be advocates of the scheme, than in gaining the sympathy of those in parliament and outside of parliament when I submit facts. As you were aware, Mr. Speaker, some 19 years ago the government of Sir John Macdonald took steps towards getting a survey of that part of the Straits of Northumberland where this tunnel is to be built. So far as that survey went it was useful, but it did not go far enough and was so imperfect that it would be quite impossible for any one to tender for the construction of a tunnel on the data which it furnished. The survey was made by a Mr. Palmer, of England, who was said to be an expert in this branch of engineering. I met Mr. Palmer in those days in Prince Edward Island, and whatever the cause of it was there seemed to be a great deal of friction between him and those who were then actively interesting themselves in the project. However that was, the survey was not made to the extent we had expected. Possibly we were looking for too much and possibly, and very likely, our imperfect knowledge of that sort of work did not enable us to form a just estimate of the extent of survey that should be accomplished for the sum of money appropriated for it. Of course, I recognize that laymen are apt to be led astray when they come to con-

sider questions which require great engineering skill. However, upon the information reported to him by Mr. Palmer's survey, Sir Douglas Fox made a very important report. It does not require any words from me to add to the fame of Sir Douglas Fox as a great engineer. I shall, with the permission of the House, read certain extracts from the report of Sir Douglas Fox and from the correspondence with the late Senator Howlan, and I shall read these extracts in order to explain to the House perhaps more fully than has been explained in any former discussion the position which is taken by a great many of the people of Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and the position which I myself take now.

Sir Douglas, in the opening of his report, gives us this information. He said:

The greatest depth of water is shown as being 96 feet at high water, with a rise of tides of six feet at springs and three feet at neap, and the speed of the current as not exceeding three knots, with two hours of slack water each tide.

The distance from shore to shore is given as about 13,200 lineal yards, or say from shaft to shaft 13,500 lineal yards, exclusive of land approaches on either side, of which about 2,000 lineal yards would be in the tunnel.

Mr. Palmer further reports that the shores upon either coast are well adapted for railway approaches, varying from 15 to 35 feet in height above high water mark, with a mean altitude of 25 feet, the soil being of a red clayey nature. It appears also that the higher land on Prince Edward Island shore falls away towards the interior which will, therefore, shorten the approaches on that side.

That section of the report bears more upon the nature of the particular material through which the proposed tunnel would run. Then he took up the question of the stratification, upon which he reported as follows:

Upon the all important question of stratification on the proposed alignment, Mr. Palmer quotes the following opinion, given him verbally by Mr. Francis Bain on the occasion of his visit:—

Mr. Bain was a somewhat noted geologist in that section of the country——

'In his belief, a bed of red clay shale, varying in thickness from 50 to 80 feet extends right across the Straits of Northumberland. It lies almost horizontally upon a carboniferous or gray sandstone base, and is said to contain small occasional lenticular masses of fine red sandstone.'

Mr. Palmer adds, as the result of his own investigation: 'The geological outcrop on either shore in which the strata are distinctly visible, the formation of the surrounding country, the stratification seen in neighbouring wells, combined with the opinion of Mr. Bain, the geologist who is a native of the island, and has a knowledge of its entire formation, proves that a most favourable and impervious stratum does exist for subaqueous tunneling.

That, I may remark, is a point in regard to which a great deal of exception has been taken. It has been contended by some that this red sandstone formation is very likely to have fissures through which the water could pass to the underlying strata, which would add enormously to the cost, if not render impossible the construction of the tunnel through that material. But that does not appear to be the opinion of those most qualified to judge. There is no information upon this point, and it is mainly for the purpose of getting that information that we wish to have a survey made.

In this report, Mr. Bain remarks: 'The great shale beds are persistent and uniform, but the small arenaceous or balcareous deposits, which occur in them, are local, lenticular and discontinuous and are not likely to form leads from water.

These shale are impermeable to water. The carboniferous base of sandstone will possibly form a dangerous source of water, and it should be avoided, but as already remarked, it does not break up under the bed of the straits here.

It is my duty to state that, though convinced of the accuracy of what I now present, a more minute and detailed geological investigation should be made before active engineering operations are begun.

That is what Sir Douglas Fox wanted in 1890 or 1891, when he made this report, and that is what some of us, myself among the number, have been agitating for ever since. Sir Douglas goes on to say:

So far as I can judge from the small specimen of shale in my possession, I agree that it is likely to be impermeable to water, and to form a favourable material for tunnelling operations. * * * * *

In very soft and wet strata, and when compressed air has been employed, it has been found desirable to adopt, for the permanent tunnel a cylinder of cast iron with suitable flanges, such cylinder being sometimes lined wholly or partially with brickwork for protection purposes.

In homogeneous and dry strata, such as the shale referred to by Mr. Bain, I have a strong preference for a tunnel, also cylindrical in form, but composed entirely of brickwork in cement (grouted externally when practicable) as being of much more permanent character than an iron structure which, however, well protected, must be more or less subject to corroding influences.

In the present instance, there would be the great advantage in the brickwork tunnel of using local instead of imported materials of much reduced cost, and of more easily providing refuges for the plate layers.

The importance of that section of Sir Douglas Fox's report is this, that some years ago the chief engineer of the Public Works Department estimated that the cost of this tunnel would be $15,000,000; but in making his estimate he provided for a tube or casing of iron from end to end of the tunnel, which would add enormously to its

cost. I have a very high respect for the late chief engineer of the Public Works Department in any matter with which he is familiar; but I must say, with all due respect to him, that I would prefer the opinion of Sir Douglas Fox to his on this subject, and if Sir Douglas Fox takes the view that a cylinder of brickwork is preferable to one or iron, I think we would be safe in adopting it. Sir Douglas Fox then goes on to say:

I should propose to carry on the work——by means of a shield, especially designed for rapid progress in good material, and in conjunction with brickwork, but so arranged that whereas in the sandstone beds, feeders may be met with, an iron casing may readily be introduced to keep back the water, and so reduce the permanent pumping. In my estimates I have allowed for a considerable length (one-quarter of the whole distance between the shafts) of such casing.

In some sections Sir Douglas expected that there would be an inflow or leakage of water, and he would meet that with an iron casing, which he estimated for one-fourth the distance, whereas the engineer of the Public Works Department estimated it for the whole length. The difference in cost between a brick casing and an iron casing would be some millions of dollars; and if we take as our guide Sir Douglas Fox, one of the most famous engineers in tunnel building in the world, it is essential to deduct at least three-fourths of the iron work estimated for by the chief engineeer of the Public Works Department. Sir Douglas made several estimates varying with the size of the tunnel. A tunnel sixteen feet in diameter he estimated would cost in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000, but he did not think that would be large enough for the rolling stock which existed even at that time. He said:

Should it be decided that the tunnel must be of sufficient dimensions for an ordinary railway of the 4-foot 8½-inch gauge, and that the railways of the island shall be altered to that gauge, a tunnel of 16 feet in diameter would appear to just accommodate passengers and freight cars of the normal American and Canadian type, but not drawing room and sleeping cars, nor some of the cars reported to me as running on the Intercolonial railway. This size does not allow of a very satisfactory permanent way, nor does it provide proper space for the plate layers.

Such a tunnel constructed in the shale of brickwork in cement 1 foot 10 inches in thickness and where feeders occur with cast iron casing 1½-inches thick with 9-inch. flanges and laid with permanent way having steel rails weighing 70 pounds to the lineal yard, I estimate to cost, subject as hereinbefore mentioned £122.10s. nearly per lineal yard or say £1,652,500 from shaft to shaft, or with the land tunnel and contingencies a total sum of £1,971,800—$9,859,000.

I am of opinion to properly accommodate the Canadian and American rolling-stock, generally (exclusive of the special cars on the Intercolonial railway) the tunnel should have an internal diameter of not less than 18 feet.

That is the tunnel I am advocating.

Such a tunnel constructed as specified for the 16 foot tunnel. I estimate to cost subject as hereinbefore mentioned £140 sterling per lineal yard, or say £1,890,000 from shaft to shaft, or with land tunnel and contingencies a total sum of £2,252,500—$11,262,500.

Borings similar to these taken at the Sarnia tunnel, viz: from a vessel or platform through six inch wrought iron pipes, so as to ensure cores of sufficient size and undamaged being brought to the surface, should be made at intervals of, say, not more than 500 yards right across the straits, and down to the carboniferous bed rock, but this line of borings should be at some distance, say 300 yards from the centre line of the tunnel. This work should be carried out in the presence of experienced engineers who shoud carefully note the samples taken.

With this information obtained, much closer tenders may be expected for the construction of the tunnel, whilst the cost of these temporary works will be comparatively insignificant.

That extract explains itself. In his correspondence with the late Senator Geo. W. Howland, Sir Douglas Fox, on the 15th of May, 1891, writes as follows:

The cost of construction cannot be definitely fixed (assuming a close figure is required) until we possess fuller information as to the quantity of water that may probably be encountered in the tunnel. The beds of red sandstone which have to be passed through have an outcrop into the straits. These have to be contended with for about one-quarter the whole length of the tunnel, and the quantity of water they will give is the most important factor we have to consider when making the estimate of the cost. It appears to us that satisfactory information upon this point can only be obtained by sinking trial holes at each end of the tunnel through the strata the tunnel will have to pass through, and we suggested that these trial holes should be made before any price for the work be given.

That concludes the quotation I wished to make from the reports of Sir Douglas Fox. These reports I consider so clear that they require little or no explanation. Let me add that this matter has been keeping Prince Edward Island and some parts of the main land of the maritime provinces in a certain amount of turmoil for a great many years. The question is one that will not down. What we wish to know is whether this scheme is feasible and practicable or not, at a reasonable cost. Of course we do not expect the Dominion to bankrupt itself in order to build this tunnel, but if the project be reasonable and practicable, at a reasonable cost, well within the means of the Dominion, it ought to be built. But if a survey should prove that the scheme is not practicable, we ought to know it and get clear of the question and devote our attention to more practical matters. Until

some such survey however, as Sir Douglas Fox, recommends, is made, it will be out of the question to expect that this tunnel agitation will not continue to be a sort of irritation and annoyance from one end of the year to the other.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the distance?

Mr. WARBURTON. The distance under water is not more than seven and a half miles. It has been customary in correspondence and newspaper articles and in discussions on the floor of this House to quote letters written by the late Sir John Macdonald and the right hon. the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as well as speeches by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and others. I must frankly say that I have never been able to see a great deal of force in quoting speeches or letters of that kind. They are valuable to this extent that they show the good feeling of these hon. gentlemen and their willingness to help us; but however eminent these hon. gentlemen may be, however high they may stand in the service of their country and in the confidence of their respective parties, and however eminent they may be in the history of the country, such quotations are not the best way in which to impress this matter upon the attention of the government and the House. I have long come to the conclusion that the strongest argument one can use on behalf of any public work is the argument that it is for the best advantage of Canada, I do not think it wise to argue on purely sectional grounds and say: I want this thing for my province because it is my province. For my part I want this tunnel, not only because it will be to the advantage of Prince Edward Island, but to Canada as a whole. Anything that tends to the consolidation of this Dominion tends to its welfare as a whole. Anything that tends, for example, to unite the island of Vancouver with the main land by material as well as theoretical bonds, by permanent and continuous bonds, does to that extent —and it is to a very considerable extent— strengthen the bonds that unite the various parts of our nation. On that ground, I urge this matter on the attention of the government and the House. You cannot expect Canada as a whole to be contented and progressive so long as there is a festering sore in any part of it. Every day we hear of applications to the government for assistance to improve transportation facilities in various parts of the country. In many cases these improvements will be confined to certain provinces, but nevertheless, they have a great bearing on the general prosperity of the country. Canada is now building the great transcontinental. That railway will be of very little practical use to us down in Prince Edward Island, yet four or five years ago, I went to defeat on that question and am prepared to go to defeat on it again—not because the railway is of much use to us in Prince Edward Island but because it will bind together the various parts of the country and make of us one nation. The greatest question before the country and to-day is that of consolidation, and transportation is the largest element in that respect. In the speech of His Excellency, he mentions the proposed road to Hudson bay. That road will be soon undertaken and built. It will be of no earthly use to us in Prince Edward Island but will be of great benefit to our fellow Canadians in the west by enabling them to get their produce to market more expeditiously and cheaper, and for that reason, although the road is of no benefit to my constituency, I shall give the project my support. Then there is the proposed expenditure on the Welland canal. It is important to the trade of Montreal and the west that the Welland canal should be deepened and broadened. Although we in Prince Edward Island are outside the track and influence of that canal and can derive no great benefit from it, I am going to support the project for the reasons I have given.

I have here a summary of a speech delivered by the Minister of Railways at Stayner, in February, 1908, which appeared in newspapers, and in which he spoke of the Trent Valley canal. I do not propose to give his speech in extenso, but merely a brief summary to this effect: The Minister of Railways defended the spending of money for transportation facilities because the people in that way obtained higher prices for their products. The price of products he added, was governed largely by the speed with which they could be got to market. When the transcontinental railways were completed, he said, the country would still not have sufficient transportation. Again dealing with the Trent Valley canal project, he said the country had been long committed to that scheme and the present government had said it would be built. He added:

If I stay where I am as Minister of Railways I am going to build that canal through to the Georgian bay.

He also referred to the building of better storage facilities on the eastern side of the Georgian bay and elsewhere where they were needed. I think he might have gone further and added a number of other works for the benefit of Canada, not that they are of benefit to Prince Edward Island, had they been brought to his mind.

It is this question of transportation to which the minister so well referred that affects us. We have a very fertile part of of Canada. We have very little poor land on the island; I suppose it is not as fertile

as the more fertile parts of Manitoba, Alberta or Saskatchewan, but taking the average of those provinces it is quite as fertile, and we have very little land that is not fertile. Our land is very nearly all owned by farmers, it is worked by the farmers and their families, and they raise an enormous quantity of produce on those farms. Our population is from 45 to 50 per square mile, and we require facilities not only for freight traffic, but also for passenger traffic. We do not complain about the summer facilities; we do not mind crossing over the Straits in the summer, but we do object to getting stuck in the ice in the winter as we have done in the past. If we could manage to get a line of steamers crossing over in winter that would keep navigation open throughout the season—and this I believe to be possible, as I shall endeavour to demonstrate to the House on a future occasion—we would not complain, but I am assuming that the winter conditions will continue as they have been and that we will still be exposed to the danger of having to cross the Straits on the small ice boats. It is for that reason that I am bringing this matter before the House to-day. I wish to commend it to the consideration of the government. As you can see it is not a very difficult matter to give us this service. I am not asking the government to build the tunnel, I am merely asking them to take such measures as will show whether or not it is practicable to build the tunnel. I am simply asking that the preliminaries shall be carried out in order to enable us or any other practical man to judge what can be done or ought to be done. I do not think this is asking too much. I feel sure that in this matter we will have the sympathy of members on both sides of the House. If they can see their way clear to assist us in this matter I have confidence that they will do so and therefore, without taking more of your time, I shall move the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. J. W. RICHARDS (Prince, Prince Edward Island). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in support of the motion made by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton). The question of transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is of great importance to the people of that province. This position I think will be generally admitted at least by those who are familiar with the conditions which exist in that part of Canada. It is true that our means of communication in the winter season have been greatly improved of late years by reason of our having steamers generally capable of breaking the ice in the winter season. The present administration have done a great deal in that regard; they have put on the 'Minto,' a powerful boat which has done very good service; and recently a new boat called the 'Earl Grey,' costing something like $500,000 has been put upon that service. It remains to be seen how far she will be successful in keeping up continuous communication during the winter. We have every reason to believe from the pains taken in the construction of that boat and from her great power and improved design, incorporating the latest improvements with regard to breaking ice, that she will do a great deal to keep up communication in a more regular way than has been possible in the past. However, during a very severe winter, and we have these occasionally, I am of the opinion that it would be very difficult for any boat, no matter how powerful she may be or what her design, to keep up regular communication in winter and for this reason we are looking for some means by which continuous communication can be maintained.

It is not necessary for me to repeat what my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) has said with regard to estimates and opinions that have been published by so eminent an authority as Sir Douglas Fox. It is beyond question that since he made that estimate the science of tunnelling has advanced greatly, and to-day the work of constructing a tunnel can be done at a much lower cost than would have been possible fifteen or twenty years ago. Tunnelling is not a new thing. In the State of New York there are tunnels of great length and in Ontario large tunnels are also to be found. Tunnelling is practicable in other parts and I have no doubt that it would be practicable between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada.

Prince Edward Island, as many of you are aware, is a very fertile little province. As has been stated, it has a larger population to the square mile than perhaps any other province in the Dominion. We have a large export trade, and what has been done in giving us winter steamers has greatly increased our winter trade, so that our exports during the winter months are nearly as large as they are during the summer, and for this reason there is great necessity for having some better means of transportation. I shall not go into particulars as to the size of this tunnel or other features that have been touched on by my hon. friend, but shall simply say that we want to know whether or not the construction of such a tunnel is practicable and that we think the time has arrived when this question should be settled one way or the other. To my mind the only way in which that can be done is to have a report after investigation or survey. At every election this question comes up and we are all in favour of a tunnel, but so far nothing has been done, and the question has caused

a good deal of agitation, I would not say turmoil, in the province of Prince Edward Island. It has been a burning question there for some years, and I agree with what has been very properly said, that in order that there should be a feeling of good will and peace and harmony among the provinces of Canada, in order to consolidate them, if on no other ground, we are entitled to have this question of the practicability and cost of the tunnel set before our people. If it can be done at a reasonable cost, at such a cost as the province would expect to have expended for that work, then I say we should have it, but it is most important and highly desirable to our people that the question should be settled one way or the other. I cannot complain of the large expenditure made in western Canada because I am well aware that the expenditures made there under a careful administration such as we have are necessary and are for the building up of this great nation of ours. At the same time, our people take the view that while these expenditures are being made in other parts of Canada, we in Prince Edward Island contribute our share to these expenditures, and we are entitled to some consideration in the matter of the construction of public works, and especially in the construction of the tunnel. The survey made there some years ago, so far as it went, was probably of considerable service; but since that time I am informed by engineers who are capable of passing an opinion on such subjects that improved means have been discovered of making surveys of that character. I would, therefore, urgently call upon the government to take up this matter seriously. The people of Prince county whom I represent are very deeply interested, because one end of this tunnel would most likely be constructed from Cape Travers in that county. I can assure this honourable House that this is a burning question in that province, and our people are most anxious that some steps should be taken with a view of satisfying the public with regard both to the cost and the practicability of the construction of a tunnel. I feel that we have the sympathy of the members from the other provinces of Canada, especially from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and whatever support we get from them will strengthen the hands of the government in at least ordering a survey. I can only express the hope that at an early date the government will see its way clear to take some steps to have an investigation on the lines I have indicated. It is a work which would do much for Prince Edward Island, the garden of the gulf, and would do much to bring about a better state of feeling among the people because as has been very well said, we are the only province in which there is a feeling of irritation and annoyance. I shall say no more on the present occasion, but I hope before the session is over to have another opportunity of dealing at greater length with this important question.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.). I wish to endorse what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton), and from Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Richards) on this question. There are no two sides to it in our province, upon this subject at least we are at one. I am sure that seventy-five per cent, perhaps ninety-five per cent of the people of our province desire to have the conditions of confederation carried out if at all possible. One of the conditions under which our province entered into the confederation of this great Dominion, and perhaps the chief condition, was the promise of continuous communication with the mainland. We have that in our bond, and we desire to see it carried out by the Dominion government. If that is a condition that cannot be carried out, then we want to know it as soon as possible. At present it is, as my hon. friends have pointed out, an ever recurring subject of turmoil and trouble at every election, whichever government is in power; I think it is the same with both parties. On the eve of every election certain parties go down there and promise, or half promise, that this tunnel shall be constructed, but when the election is over we hear very little about the tunnel until the next election is coming on. Under these circumstances our people are getting discouraged. We trust now, seeing that we are some distance from an election, that this government will at once undertake to ascertain whether a tunnel can be constructed at a reasonable cost. It has been said that such a tunnel would cost an enormous sum of money, some people have placed it as high as $150,000,000. We will not ask for a tunnel if it costs half that amount. The people of our province do not wish to be unreasonable, we do not ask for any thing unreasonable, we only ask this government to make a proper effort to ascertain what the tunnel is likely to cost. We trust that at this present session the government will set aside a certain sum to have a thorough survey made. We do not want a survey that will be barren of any reliable and useful information, we want a complete survey made, cost what it will, and we want the survey made as soon as possible. This is a question that should not enter into politics, because it is an obligation about which there can be no question. We feel that the federal government should carry out the condition under which we became part of this great Dominion, and that we are entitled to this tunnel. We contribute our full share to the public exchequer, indeed some people argue

that for many years past we have contributed more to the treasury at Ottawa than we are getting back in any shape. It has been figured out pretty closely that we are contributing a larger sum each year, more than we are getting back. Now if that is so, it must be plain that we are entitled to to see this matter taken hold of seriously by the government. Without saying any more at the present on this subject, I have great pleasure in endorsing what has been said by my hon. friends from that province, and I hope that the government will take heed to it and act upon it without delay.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The question that has been brought to the notice of the House by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton), my hon. friend from Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Richards), and my hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Fraser), is, I am well aware, of the deepest interest to the people of Prince Edward Island, and they are quite right when they claim that it ought to be regarded as a matter of general interest to the people of the Dominion. It is a good many years since this question was first brought before the House of Commons. Perhaps it would not be too much to say that in the earlier days the matter was regarded by many members as somewhat impracticable, and possibly even visionary; and for a long time it was hardly treated with the seriousness that our friends from Prince Edward Island desired. But I am glad to recognize the fact that the progress of engineering science in recent years has brought into the realm of practical affairs many projects which years ago would have been regarded unfavourably, and I am inclined to think that one of the matters that has been brought within that realm is the question of a Prince Edward Island tunnel. The subject has been brought before the House from time to time, and I must in justice to my hon. friends say that in no case when I have been present, or when I have read the debates, has it been presented better than to-day. It has been presented to-day forcibly, reasonably and with great moderation, and I compliment my three hon. friends for presenting the matter in that way. If I have to dissent from anything that has been said, it is in view of the words uttered by the hon. member for Kings who treated this matter as an obligation under the Confederation Act. Frankly I do not agree with my hon. friend. I do not think that this is an obligation under the Confederation Act. I do not think the government of Canada, either of one party or the other, has failed in its obligation to the people of Prince Edward Island to carry out the conditions of confederation. But though I differ from my hon. friend in that respect, that does not in the slightest degree affect my disposition to sympathize with Prince Edward Island, and to help the people of that province in this matter. I am disposed to think that if it can be had at a moderate cost the people of Prince Edward Island should have this tunnel, not because it is an obligation of confederation, for I humbly think it is not, but because they may fairly ask it in order that they may keep pace with the progress of the times, and that they may receive a share of the benefits of the great growing time in Canada irrespective of whether it is an obligation of confederaton or not. I look upon Prince Edward Island as one of the fairest provinces of the Dominion. In many respects it is one of the happiest provinces of the Dominion. It is an island almost entirely devoted to agriculture, settled by a fine farming population, by a very intelligent people, and there is no part of the Dominion of Canada, nay, there is probably no part of the world, where the blessings and comforts of life are more evenly distributed than they are among the good people of Prince Edward Island. Nevertheless, the population does not grow. Occasionally, indeed, there are indications that the population is falling away and our island friends are naturally very much disturbed on that account. They think their chief difficulty is this question of transportation. In the past very large figures have been quoted as the probable cost of this work. I am glad to hear my hon. friends from the island say that all they ask is that this matter shall be thoroughly and impartially inquired into and if the tunnel can be built at a moderate cost they think the work should be done. To that sentiment I most heartily subscribe, and I am quite sure that the government will have that feeling towards it. There have been some surveys in the past. I suppose that each of them in its day served the purpose, it was the best that could be had ; but I quite agree with my hon. friends that the matter should be taken up more vigorously and more seriously, and that we should endeavour to get a reliable and thorough survey by the best engineers, and if, as a result of that survey, it is found that this important work can be constructed at a moderate cost, I for one, would promise my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island my most hearty and cordial support.

Motion agreed to.

WRECK OF STEAMER 'HESTIA.'

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City) moved :

For a copy of all reports, correspondence and other papers relating to the condition and maintenance of the buoy on the Old Proprietor Ledge in the Bay of Fundy since January 1, 1908; also of all reports, correspondence

and other papers relating to the establishment, equipment, maintenance and operation of the life boat and life saving station at Seal Cove in the Bay of Fundy; also copy of all instructions issued to Captain Lugar in connection with the inquiry into the wreck of the ss. 'Hestia,' and of the findings and report on said inquiry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making the motion which I have just read calling for the papers which the motion calls for it will be necessary for me, to some extent, to call to the minds of the members of this House the unfortunate and disastrous wreck which took place in the Bay of Fundy on the night of the 24th, or early in the morning of the 25th of October last. The wreck of the steamship 'Hestia' is, as far as my memory goes, the most disastrous wreck, in so far as loss of life is concerned, that has ever taken place in the Bay of Fundy. The crew of the steamship numbered 41, and, in addition, there were four passengers, making 45 in all. Of these 45 persons, 39 went down to a watery grave. The facts given simply and shortly, are these: On the evening of Sunday, 24th October, the steamship 'Hestia' rounded into the Bay of Fundy, passing the Lurcher Light about eight o'clock. At half past twelve she sighted the Gannet Rock light and at ten minutes after one in the morning she rushed on to the rocks known as the Old Proprietor reef, passing at that time, in order to get into that position, within 30 or 40 feet of what is known as a gas or whistling buoy erected to guard against that very reef and known as Old Proprietor buoy. We all know that the life of a sailor is at all times a dangerous one, that he constantly takes his life in his hands. He is exposed to the danger of collision in darkness and fog. He is subject to the dangers both of wind and waves, of storms and hurricanes even when he has plenty of sea room on the broad Atlantic or on any other ocean, but as he nears the land and approaches his destination there is no doubt that the anxiety of the navigator increases very greatly, more especially when he approaches the shore at night time or in thick weather. This Sunday evening that I have referred to it was raining, clearing at intervals, with some mist, with a north-easterly wind, bearing to some extent on the starboard bow of the ship and tending to drive her to the westward of her course. The fact that these dangers when approaching the coast are very considerable for the navigator is well known and has long been recognized by all maritime nations. The consequence is that they have and are spending a great deal of money to provide suitable aids to navigation where they are needed in the shape of lighthouses, buoys, fog whistles, whistling buoys, floating buoys and very many other aids that human ingenuity has devised in order to point out the right course or as a warning beacon to ward off the ship against the hidden dangers, or dangers of any kind, that may be provided against by a light or such other aid to navigation. The principal aids to navigation are all listed and charted so that all the captains and men responsible for the navigation of vessels may become acquainted with all these lights and aids. When coming into any region they have on their charts a statement of these aids and are able to look for them when they require to do so as their course develops and they go on their path towards their proper haven. If it is necessary, as of course it is, that all these things should be made known and the information placed in the hands of people who ought to have it, the navigators or captains, then surely we will readily understand that it is much more important, that where anything happens to these aids to navigation, when the light goes out, or a buoy goes adrift, that these men who go up and down the great highways of the sea should be made acquainted with all accidents of that nature and with any changes that may be made in the listed lights and buoys around any particular coast.

The course which is generally pursued when anything goes wrong with these lights is, for the Marine Department to notify the British Board of Trade which issues a monthly bulletin to be placed in the hands of navigators so that they may be informed of any changes which take place; and not rely on these lights being in their accustomed places. In the Bay of Fundy we have such fixed lights as the Gannett rock light, and there are also these automatic gas whistling buoys which are not fixed on lighthouses but which are equally important to the navigator. Such a light was placed on what is known as the Old Proprietor reef. Off the southern coast of Grand Manan there is a very dangerous reef mostly covered by water which on the eastward juts out on the course which is taken by vessels going to St. John and other ports on the bay. This sunken reef at its outermost end raises its gnarled and scarred surface above the water and it is called the Old Proprietor rock, and for years there has been a high mast on that rock. Some years ago the St. John Board of Trade petitioned the Marine Department to place a lighthouse on that rock, but the request was refused on the ground that the expense would be too great. However, on account of the great danger of this reef the Department of Marine placed, a mile or so to the southward of the rock, one of those automatic whistling buoys supplied by Messrs. Willson, of Ottawa, and which I think cost $8,000. This buoy was for two or three years in commission and was regularly listed and charted. It was one of the most important lights in the Bay of Fundy

and had it been in working order on the night of October 24, or the morning of October 25, there would not have occurred that disaster by which thirty-nine persons found a watery grave, and among them two little Scotch lads who were coming out to settle in this country. It was most pathetic to read in the account of that wreck that when these two little lads were overturned in the boat the voice of one of the little ones in his Scotch accent was heard to cry out over the waters: Oh, mother, mother, save me, I am drowning. But these two little boys, together with two other passengers and the thirty-five hardy sailors, including the captain and all of the deck officers, except one, were drawn down in that waste of waters on that night. I say, Sir, and I say it calmly and coolly, that in their death they were the victims of either the inaction or the indifference or the incapacity of the responsible officers of the Marine Department. Had the defect in that buoy been remedied, it would not be in my power nor in the power of any one to point an accusing finger at the Department of Marine. But, Sir, the agent of that department knew as long ago as January the 22nd last, ten months ago, that the light was out or that the buoy was adrift. Now, what action was taken? They put an advertisement in three of the St. John papers and they inserted that advertisement three times and it read:

The Old Proprietor gas and whistling buoy has been reported as being either adrift or the light out. It will be attended to as soon as possible.

Signed J. E. LEGERE,
Acting Agent

Jan. 26, 1909.

So far as I know that was the only notice given in printed form, but I understand that the agent of the Donaldson line in St. John was verbally notified that there was something wrong with the buoy. Now, was that buoy attended to as soon as possible as stated in the advertisement? Is it necessary to take ten months to put right one of these gas buoys? I put a question to the Minister of Marine on the point and the minister allowed himself to be made the mouthpiece of an answer which stated that the weather conditions and press of more important affairs would not allow of that buoy being attended to. But, Sir, only a week after the wreck took place that buoy which for ten months lay there neglected, was towed into St. John harbour and tested opposite Partridge Island. All summer long, for ten months, the weather conditions would not allow the department to put this buoy right, but in the stormy month of November, in less than a week after the wreck they could go out there and tow it into harbour and set it in order. Why was not the 'Lansdowne' sent to attend to this matter? I would like to ask the minister, so that when he speaks on this subject he will be able to say whether there is any regulation in the department to the effect that that steamer should only leave port when it had several jobs to attend to. I understand that the acting agent at St. John, when asked why he did not send the 'Lansdowne' there, gave that as one of his reasons. I know that day after day and week after week the 'Lansdowne' was lying in the harbour at St. John, and might easily have been sent during the summer months when the weather was fine. It is ridiculous for the minister to say that the weather conditions were such, in one of the finest summers we ever had, that the steamer was unable to go to that buoy. When I heard the minister give that reply, I was astounded. I do not think that even for the purpose of screening his department, which he might naturally be expected to desire to do, he should allow such a ridiculous answer to be put into his mouth as that for ten months in the year the weather conditions in the Bay of Fundy were such that a steamer of the size of the 'Lansdowne' should not go and tow up a buoy of the size of that on the Old Proprietor ledge. The thing to my mind is utterly absurd and farcical. He also says that press of more important business prevented. I would like the minister to say what that more important business was. I would like to call his attention to the fact that that buoy is considered the most important among all the aids to navigation in the whole Bay of Fundy. What did Captain Gillies say on that very point in the investigation which was held? He said:

The neighbourhood of the Grand Manan has always been acknowledged to be the most dangerous locality in the whole bay.

There is the statement of a practical navigator; and yet the minister says that he spent nearly the whole year in looking after more important business while this steamer was lying in the harbour of St. John. To give you some idea of the importance of these aids to navigation in the Bay of Fundy, and the necessity of having them kept in the best possible condition, let me remind the House that in the year 1908-9 there was exported from the city and port of St. John alone for transatlantic ports no less than $24,564,840 worth of goods. I would also like to give the House an idea of the number of vessels trading up and down the bay. I will read from the annual report of the St. John Board of Trade the figures for the last three years 1906, 1907 and 1908, of the arrivals and clearances of the port of St. John:

Arriv'ls	1906.		1907.		1908.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Steam.	474	827,514	339	747,090	393	978,277
Sail....	980	116,664	677	78,574	940	105,319
Coast-wise.	2,403	411,735	649	244,832	829	282,723
Totals..	3,957	1,355,913	1,665	1,070,496	2,162	1,366,339
Clear-ances.						
Steam..	305	565,520	247	531,654	283	667,521
Sail....	1,027	111,112	692	77,819	963	108,000
Coast-wise..	2,651	685,123	720	456,403	939	614,596
Totals..	3,983	1,361,755	1,659	1,065,876	2,175	1,390,115

Besides the tonnage entering and leaving the port of St. John, there is the shipping business of all the bay ports on both the Nova Scotia side and the New Brunswick side. Not that all the vessels take the easterly side of the Grand Manan in going inwards and outwards, but all the large steamers do, and pass this Old Proprietor ledge. This buoy was known for ten months to be defective, and that fact is entirely responsible for the wreck of the 'Hestia.' In this connection I wish to read letter of the only deck officer whose life was saved after the wreck, that is, the third officer, S. A. Stewart. On the 2nd of November this letter was published in the St. John 'Globe'. It is headed:

Aids to Navigation in Bay of Fundy—Strong Statement by Third Officer of ss. 'Hestia.'

Seal Cove, Grand Manan, Oct. 31.

To the Editor of the 'Globe':

Sir,—I inclose herewith a letter from the third officer of the stranded steamer 'Hestia,' setting forth his views and expressing his feelings in this matter. We would ask you to publish the letter in your paper as early as convenient to you, as we think it would be of interest to the general public and possibly remedy a great evil.

Unless something is done the insurance rates will certainly increase on Bay of Fundy trade, which will act against St. John, New Brunswick.

WILLIAM H. LOGAN,
Salvage Officer, Salvage Association, London.

M. V. GILLIES,
Supt. Donaldson Line.

Mr. S. G. Stewart, third officer of the 'Hestia,' speaking of the stranding and subsequent happenings of that vessel and her crew, says:

The night we stranded there was a strong northeast wind with thick rainy weather, clearing at intervals, short high sea running. We were steering a mid-channel course up the bay, and our frequent soundings of over a hundred fathoms were satisfactory.

About half an hour after midnight on Sunday, October 24, Gannet Rock light was sighted, but owing to weather conditions accurate distance off could not possibly be established. The captain kept the ship on her course, evidently looking for the Old Proprietor buoy. At 1.10 on 25-10-'09, the ship struck on the outer part of the latter named ledge, where when the tide rose she fell over on her side and was completely submerged at high water. Myself, the second engineer and four seamen are all that remain alive out of a crew of 41 men.

I find since being brought ashore here that the light keepers in Gannet Rock lighthouse saw the ship passing, also that there is a large whistle and lighted buoy between the Gannet Rock and Old Proprietor shoals. All seamen entering the Bay of Fundy are compelled to depend upon these aids to navigation and if they were not there would not enter the bay under such weather conditions as existed on the night in question.

I feel, on behalf of myself and my brother officers and the many men who have lost their lives, also in the general interests of shipping trading to Bay of Fundy ports, that a strong protest to the department responsible for the lighthouse and buoyage system should be made through the public press, against the existing conditions of the aids to navigation on this dangerous coast.

My direct complaint is that the Old Proprietor Ledge buoy has neither light nor fog signal, whereas it is listed as having both. It is also well known locally that this buoy has been in this condition for months; while it is known that the 'Hestia' must have passed within a few feet of this buoy it will readily be conceded that had it been lit or its whistle sounding the ship would have been warned and cleared easily the ledges upon which she was wrecked. Doubtless the captain, after seeing the Gannet, was looking for this buoy. Can any one imagine a worse trap laid for any man than a buoy listed as marking dangerous ledges, and having a light working at stated intervals, also an automatic whistle signal, whilst neither whistle nor light exist? It is simply a trap worse than any ever thought of by even the old time wreckers that are now but a winter's tale. It is impossible to describe one's feelings when he finds that what he thought was his great factor of safety has proved his ruin.

In the bitterness with which one looks upon the dreadful loss of life that certainly would not have been if those responsible for the conditions of the Old Proprietor Ledge buoy had attended to their ordinary everyday duties; for there is not a shadow of a doubt the loss of the 'Hestia' is due to the long neglected conditions of this buoy.

Again, the keeper of the Gannet admits he did not fire a warning gun because he was afraid he might awake the doctor. Can anyone imagine a man, keeper of an outlying lighthouse, seeing a vessel standing into a probable danger, and not warning her because he thought the doctor might mistake the signal as being intended for him. A few explosive signals from the lighthouse would have been quite sufficient to warn this ship and

save her from destruction; still they were not given, although the keeper admits seeing the vessel and thinking her too close in, because they might call the doctor; and the vessel was allowed to go to her end. Is there any way of describing such stupidity or incompetence? Will the Canadian people allow such things to be? Let them try to think what it would mean if this accident had happened to one of the large passenger vessels plying to St. John, particularly when it is known that there is no life-saving station in the neighbourhood. There is supposed to be one, but it now consists of a boat unfit for use and without a crew. We were from 1.10 a.m. on Monday until noon Tuesday in a helpless and perilous position before any one came near the ship. Notwithstanding our being but four miles from the Gannet Rock lighthouse and making distress signals night and day; especially Monday night, which was clear and fine with all shore lights plainly visible, and during which bonfires were burnt on board the wreck almost continuously.

I would pray that the people of Canada may insist that those who are responsible for the coast lighting and buoyage system will keep that system in order or not put buoys out at all, so that there may not be traps added to a profession which already bristles with difficulty and much danger.

S. G. STEWART,
Third Officer ss. 'Hestia.'

Seal Cove, October 31, 1909.

That is the statement of the only surviving deck officer of the steamship 'Hestia.' With regard to the conditions of this light, let me refer to the evidence taken at the investigation. Here is the evidence of the first witness, Colin MacVicar, able seaman. In reply to a question put by Mr. Boyer, who was counsel for the department, he said:

That he had seen the Old Proprietor buoy from the ship as she lay on the rocks on Monday morning, but heard no whistle from the buoy nor was any light visible thereon Monday night.

The next witness was Andrew West Morgan, second engineer of the wrecked vessel, who was saved. He said:

During both Monday and Tuesday the buoy on the Old Proprietor reef was plainly visible during the daytime about a mile away, but he heard no whistle from it, nor was there any light upon it at night.

The next evidence I will give is that of the gentleman whose letter I have just read, the third officer :

The witness was of the opinion that the captain expected and hoped to take up the Old Proprietor buoy. Had the light on the buoy been burning, the accident could not have happened, since they must have passed within a few feet of the buoy.

That is the evidence of the third officer.

Mr. Holden, continuing the examination of Stewart, asked him whether, in his opinion as a navigator, the ship would have gone on the rocks had the Old Proprietor buoy light been burning to which Stewart gave a decided negative.

Mr. Holden went on to ask him this question:

I will ask the witness whether the fact that the light supposed to be on the Old Proprietor buoy has been non-existent during the whole summer, has been officially brought to the notice of mariners.

The answer is:

Never in any form.

Then there is the evidence of Captain Gillies with regard to the neighbourhood of Grand Manan being the most dangerous in the whole locality. There is no need of citing more evidence of that nature; it is all of the same kind and it must be of the same kind because it cannot be denied.

One would suppose that under these circumstances, when it was shown that this buoy had not been lit or its whistle sounding, and that this had been known for almost a year, a strict investigation would be held into the matter. You would also suppose that there would be some investigation into the cause of a wreck in which 39 lives were lost and an attempt made to ascertain whether all was done that should have been done to put that buoy and keep that buoy in its proper position and every possible effort made to succour the survivors. But what was the result? We have had a so-called investigation but, Sir, an investigation that was incomplete and literally farcical in its denouement. From all that I can learn Captain Lugar, who was chairman of the commission, stated on the streets of St. John before he had taken a particle of evidence that the cause of this vessel going on the rocks was because the compasses were deviating on account of her cargo of iron. According to the press, orders were given that there should be held a secret inquiry into this most disastrous wreck. I believe there was some secret inquiry but that did not by any means commend itself to the common sense or the ordinary judgment of the people down there and there was an immediate agitation for a public inquiry. Then it was stated there would be a public inquiry. It would be expected that the public inquiry would be held in the port of St. John where every available witness was at hand to be subpoenaed. But what was done? Suddenly we were told that the inquiry was to be removed to Montreal. Why? It was stated that the survivors were there. As a matter of fact the survivors were not there. The survivors were taken there after it was given out that the inquiry was to be held there. Then it was stated that Montreal was more central.

More central to what? To the centre of Canada. Then why not take it out at once to the city of Winnipeg? When you take it to Montreal you are taking it away from the men who were in the ship, from the pilots who would be able to give information and from the keeper of the lighthouse, from those who had gone down in tug boats to the wreck and rendered what assistance they could, from every one who was there ready to give his testimony. What was the result? Why Sir, I think with all honesty that we can only come to the conclusion that this so called investigation was not intended to investigate, it was intended more to screen the officials of the department responsible for the condition of this buoy. Otherwise it would appear to me and I think to every reasonable man that an investigation intended to be thorough, intended to be what it was called, would have been held right down there in the midst of those who were in a position to give true and honest testimony, and in the nearest place to the scene of the wreck. There were the survivors, the representatives of the steamship company, the pilots, those who had been off to the ship, the lighthouse keeper, and all of them were there ready to testify and easily accessible. But the inquiry was removed to Montreal. What was the result? We get a finding such as one would have expected, if the statement I have made with regard to Captain Lugar before the investigation was correct and I believe it was. The finding reads:

> The court is of the opinion that the cause which led to the foundering of the steamship 'Hestia' on the Old Proprietor ledge were:—An error in the compass, due probably to what is known as Gauss's error, aided probably by the fact that the vessel carried a cargo of 800 tons of iron.

The statement he made before he held any investigation at all, whereas the evidence in that investigation did not give Captain Lugar the slightest reason for saying that there was any error in the compass of that ship. All the evidence I have seen, and of course I have only seen the evidence reported in the newspapers, is to the effect that the compasses were all right and that before that ship left Glasgow she was swung, the compass was tested and the deviation was found to be extremely slight. What other evidence have we that the compasses were true? Why Sir, the very fact that that ship sailed from Glasgow to the mouth of the Bay of Fundy on her direct course, without any going to the right or left. If her compasses had been wrong, would the ship have made the mouth of the Bay of Fundy just as she expected to do and at the time she expected to get there? That fact of itself is enough to show that the compasses were in proper order and it is supported by the evidence of the surviving officer that the ship was swung in Glasgow after her cargo had been placed on board and her compasses were found true. That is enough to show that the finding was not warranted by the evidence or by the facts.

I want to say this: Supposing the compasses were out of order, there is no doubt the vesesel was off her course. Is that any excuse why the light and the whistle of the Old Proprietor buoy should be out of order after having been ten months in that condition? What is the need of a buoy on the Old Proprietor, or anywhere else, if a vessel is in her course and everything is going well and right? These aids to navigation are wanted when things go wrong, and not when they go right. I have called attention to the fact that this board has stated that the compasses were wrong. Secondly, it says :

> The neglect of the master to take soundings when in sight of the Gannet rock.
> 3. Allowance was not made for the tides and the set of the wind.
> 4. An error of judgment on the part of the master in allowing his ship to get the bearing of the Gannet Rock light to southwest of west nagnetic. It must be borne in mind that the ship was only five and a half miles from Gannet rock when she struck.

Now, Sir, there are the facts as I have learned them from the finding, and I think I have shown the common sense and judgment of this House that that finding was not borne out either by the evidence or by the facts.

The other point I wish to bring before the House is that in that finding no mention whatever is made of the fact that the Old Proprietor buoy light was out, and that the whistle was not sounding. Now, what sort of an investigation is that? Here you set out to find the cause of the wreck, and the actual and veritable cause of the wreck is not mentioned at all. It was utterly impossible for that vessel to have gone on the Old Proprietor rock if that buoy had been lighted or the whistle sounding. It is idle to say that the ship's compasses were out, or that the master had not been making his soundings as he ought to have done, or that other things had happened, when, if the one requisite thing had been done, the wreck would never have taken place. If the man, or men, or officials, responsible for the proper condition of that light had attended to their duty, these 39 people, little boys and grown up men, would now be enjoying life with the rest of us, instead of being buried under the waters of the Bay of Fundy. That is the charge which this wreck, this unnecessary wreck, brings against the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Another point I wish to bring out is that the commissioners state that these other things would be the subject of a later inquiry, that is, with regard to the buoy, and

with regard to the coolness of the light-house keeper and other matters of that kind, and I hope that when the minister gets up to speak he will be able to give a satisfactory assurance to this House and the country on those points. I can assure him that the greatest interest is taken in this matter, more especially by those who are interested in the ownership and in the sailing and operation of ships, and by those who are interested in the maritime affairs of this country, and in the proper operation of the buoy system, and the system of marine aids generally upon which we have been spending so much money for many years past. To these people this is a most vital question. I do not think the people will be put off with any such farcical so called investigation as we have been treated to so far, but will insist, and I hope will obtain, a proper and serious investigation into all these matters. Why, Sir, if a man lost his life through violence on land, there would be an inquest held, and some attempt would be made to find out how he came to his death, who was responsible for it. But here are 39 lives wiped out within an hour or two, and no attempt is made to ascertain why all these people were drowned, and why only six were saved out of the whole number of crew and passengers. I hope the minister will explain these matters, because I can assure him that the people of the maritime provinces are losing confidence in the department over which he has the honour to preside. It will not do for him to allow any want of confidence in that department to exist, more especially in regard to the operation of aids to navigation, and the buoyage system on that extensive coast, and indeed on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. I hope he will be able to satisfy this parliament and this country that he intends to have this matter properly investigated, and whatever is wrong, to have it righted. With regard to the acting agent of marine at St. John, who appears to be the responsible party, I have nothing to say, I have never met him, I do not know him. The only facts I know are those that I have been trying to present this afternoon. But I do not mind saying this, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Fred Harding had been retained in his position as agent of that department, and in the post from which he was removed, so far as I can see, without proper cause, the department at Ottawa would not have remained for ten months without being made acquainted with the condition of that Old Proprietor buoy, nor would that Old Proprietor buoy have been allowed to remain ten months in that condition without being remedied.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I may say that there is certainly no objection to the motion which has been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) being adopted. I will be very glad indeed to bring down all the papers concerning this unfortunate accident to the 'Hestia,' and at the same time the papers concerning the establishment of the life-saving station on Seal Cove. I do not think there were any special instructions given to Capt. Lugar, but I will bring down all the instructions special instructions given to Capt. Lugar, which may have been given to him of a general character.

Mr. DANIEL. And the different instructions which, I understand, he received—instructions for a secret inquiry in the first place and after that a public inquiry in St. John and later in Montreal?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, I shall be very glad and besides I will say a word or two later on in my remarks in regard to that phase of the question. I may say that I am very glad that my hon. friend has given me an opportunity of putting before the public the side of the department in regard to this question.. I do not want to find any fault at all with my hon. friend for having brought the discussion before the House, because I know that this matter has received the attention of the public especially in St. John and in his province, and I suppose that he felt it was his duty to bring the matter before the country. Generally speaking, I am not much in favour of having these questions of wrecks discussed publicly in the press or before parliament and I will tell my hon. friend why. There has been in late years very serious discrimination by the insurance men against our Canadian ports, so much so, that to-day there is great difference between the insurance rates charged for a vessel going to Portland and for a vessel going to St. John, or Halifax, or to the St. Lawrence. There might be some reason for this discrimination with regard to the St. Lawrence because vessels have to navigate a long stretch of water and it might be found that accidents occur more frequently than in the ports of New York, Boston or Portland. But, in view of the improvements that we have made, in view of the aids to navigation we have established in the St. Lawrence, I think I may affirm now that the accidents that occur in that part of the country are very much less in number than those that happen on some other routes where shipping is carried on to the same extent. But, though I deprecate the discussion of these accidents, because they

become too prominent sometimes before the public and because they justify, to a certain extent, the underwriters charging higher rates, I feel that in this case my hon. friend was perfectly justified, in view of the discussion which has taken place in his province and especially in his own city, in bringing the matter before the public.

As far as the department is concerned, I am also very glad to have the occasion of discussing this question because I think I may say to my hon. friend and the House that the rumours that have been set in motion, the charges which in some cases have been made of negligence on the part of the officials, are charges that cannot be substantiated. The officer who was largely responsible for carrying out the work in the St. John district is Mr. Legère, who was acting agent at the time. Mr. Legère is certainly a very good officer. He was assistant engineer in the department under Col. Anderson and I must bear testimony to his character as an officer. I think I cannot do better than quote what is to be found in the last report of Col. Anderson, in which he states:

The assistant engineers appointed to attend to details of construction in the several outlying portions of the Dominion have rendered me valuable assistance and I wish again to bear testimony to the efficient work done by Mr. Legère in the maritime provinces.

Mr. Legère is supposed to be one of our best officers. He has been acting assistant engineer for some time and has given entire satisfaction. When last year, on the report of the persons who were making inquiries into the department, I had to take action and suspend the agent in St. John, we looked around and we thought the man who was best qualified to take the place temporarily was certainly Mr. Legère and he was appointed in St. John as acting agent. My hon. friend has attached a great deal of importance to the gas buoy on Old Proprietor ledge not being lit when the accident happened in the month of October last. I may say that it is not customary for mariners or navigators to rely upon those gas buoys; in fact, if, in a place like the Bay of Fundy, or south of Nova Scotia, you rely entirely, or to a large extent, upon the gas buoys which are there, you will find it is very difficult because one of the greatest problems that we have to deal with in the department is to keep these buoys in proper order. I will take the opportunity later on to read part of a report made by Mr. Legère concerning the work which he has done there since January last and it will be seen from that report how difficult it is to keep these buoys in proper condition. It is no wonder. The tide is very high, the winds are sometimes very strong, and the conditions are such that it is very difficult to maintain these buoys in proper condition. This is true not only of these buoys but of the buoys that we have as aids to navigation in different parts of the country. In our list of lights and fog signals issued on the first of April, 1909—and the same will be found in previous reports —we have this notice:

Mariners must bear in mind the fact that gas buoys are unwatched and if extinguished some time may elapse before a tender can reach them to repair or relight. Their lights cannot therefore be depended upon in the same way as those shown from watched light lighthouses.

(Sgd.) G. J. DESBARATS,
Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Not, only in Canada, but in every country in the world and especially in Great Britain, mariners are warned against relying too much not only upon gas buoys, but also upon light houses because accidents may happen to them. In our case we ought not to be too greatly blamed, because in Canada the government of the country renders the light service gratuitously, whereas in England no vessel can enter a harbour without being taxed light dues for the light in that harbour. Now, here is a company which has taken us to task—I should not say the company because I have had no serious complaint from the company—but here is an agent taking us to task who is probably himself largely responsible for the accident that has occurred. Let us see whether the department should be held responsible. I shall give the result of the investigations which have been held later, but I may say now that I regret to find that the agent of the company is trying to put upon the department the responsibility for this accident. The Donaldson line itself has not made any representations to us in that respect; their agents in Montreal have never made any complaint, but on the contrary the correspondence will show that the work we have done has received their appreciation. There is one thing to which I must call the attention of the House and of the public, and it is: We are providing aids to navigation, we are building lighthouses, we are putting in gas buoys, spar buoys, fog alarms, wireless telegraph stations, and equipping in every way, shape, and form, our navigation system on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. But we must expect that those engaged in the shipping business shall take the necessary steps to utilize the aids to navigation which we supply. In this case, just a few miles from where the accident happened and where such loss of life occurred there is a wireless station—I join in the sympathy my hon. friend has expressed for that loss of life; I am sorry for it, and perhaps more sorry than he is—but I say that if the company had put a wireless telegraph apparatus on their steamer so that they could communi-

cate with the wireless apparatus which we are maintaining at Partridge Island and other places in the locality, the loss of life would not have occurred. Even if the vessel had struck on the rocks she could have communicated with our station at Partridge Island and we could have sent vessels immediately to their assistance. Therefore I say that if the company or its agent find fault with us, I think they are also at fault for not having equipped their vessel with a wireless system. The question is engaging the attention of the American authorities and of the British authorities now, and it should also engage our attention in this parliament, as to whether the steamship companies which are plying to our ports should not be bound to establish a wireless system on their vessels so that loss of life would be prevented, as it would in this case had the steamer been so equipped. Now, the agent of this company at St. John seems to have started an agitation over this accident. Let me say that the agent or his office in St. John was notified that this light was out and I presume he failed to communicate it to the owners of the 'Hestia' or to the master of that ship. There is no evidence to that effect that I know of, but at all events the 'Hestia' was in St. John several times since that notification and the agent should have notified her master that the light was out. I do not know whether he has done so or not. But not only did we notify the agency of the company at St. John, but our acting agent also thought well to publish in the newspapers the following notice which I do not remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) read.

Mr. DANIEL. I read the advertisement.

Mr. BRODEUR. The advertisement was published on the 25th of January, 1909 in the newspapers of St. John, Yarmouth and St. Andrews, and it read as follows:

St. John, N.B., January 25, 1909.

Notice to Mariners:—The old Proprietor gas and whistling buoy has been reported either adrift or light out. It will be attended to as soon as possible.

(Sgd.) J. A. LEGERE,
Acting agent, Department of Marine and Fisheries, St. John, N.B.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the first question we have to discuss is what has been the cause of the accident. My hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) says the department is entirely responsible for the accident and he lays the entire blame on the negligence of the department. I must take issue with my hon. friend in that regard. Before condemning the department, as he has done, I think he should have waited until the papers were brought down. From them he would have found that the accident was not due in any shape or form to the negligence of the department or of the acting agent at St. John. How did the accident occur? An investigation has taken place. The result of that investigation will be placed before the House, when it will be found that the accident was in part due to what is called Gauss's error. On that point I might mention the evidence given by one of the survivors of that unfortunate accident, Mr. John Mackenzie. He stated that he was an able seaman to the ss. 'Hestia,' but had lost all his papers. He had been at sea 16 years, 13 of which he had served as an able seaman. It was his first voyage on this ship. She left Glasgow on October 10, and she stranded about ten minutes past one on Monday, October 25. He was at the wheel from 6 to 8 p.m. the previous day. Could not remember the course he steered by the compass; it was given in degrees.

He considered the 'Hestia' was a very bad vessel to steer. She would sheer some times more than a point off her course.

Some of his friends who had made the previous voyage in her advised him strongly not to go because she steered so badly. Here is a man who was on the ship and who makes that extraordinary statement. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not rely entirely on the evidence of that man. I will take the chart itself, and will show to the House that the accident was entirely due to the causes mentioned in the judgment rendered by the commissioner, Capt. Lugar, and the two assessors, Capt. Francis Nash and Capt. Richard Jones, men of a great deal of experience in marine matters. The first cause assigned for the accident is what is called Gauss's error. This, I may say, is an error that ocurs in the following circumstances. When a ship has been for several days on a course, let us say an easterly or westerly course, the soft iron of which the ship is constructed becomes magnetized. The ship in fact becomes a large magnet. In this instance the magnetism of the ship was increased by the fact that she had 800 tons of iron on board. This magnetism does not affect the needle of the compass while the same course is continued, that is, so long as she goes from east to west, from west to east, from north to south, or from south to north. But if at the end of several days the ship's course is changed, as happened in this case, the magnetism of the ship tends to draw the needle to the position in which the ship had been during the previous course. There are two ways in which this error can be remedied—taking the bearings or making soundings. In this case we have no evidence to show whether on the southern coast of Nova Scotia the bearings could be taken or not; but the soundings could have been taken. The soundings appear to have been taken. Now, the chart in my hand shows first that the boat should go from east to west until it reaches Seal Island, where we have a light-

house or a lightship. It should then go in a northwesterly direction until it comes nearly opposite Yarmouth, when it should go straight north in order to pass the Lurcher lightship, when it reaches a point where there are fifty fathoms of water. Then it should take a straight course to St. John between Gannet rock on the west and Brier Island on the east. We have there two lights, the Brier Island light and the Gannet Rock light. The latter is of the second order, that is to say, the third best class of light in the world. I may say that the best class of light in the world is to be found at Cape Race in Newfoundland, a light which has been erected by the Marine Department here. The first order light is similar to one on Sambro near the entrance to Halifax harbour, and the second order light is the one erected at Gannet rock. By the chart of the Admiralty, the vessel, on leaving the Lurcher lightship, should go nearer to Brier Island than to Gannet rock. There is a great distance between the two, but the two lights can easily be seen. What happened in this case? The captain did not follow this course but evidently got out of his course. If he had been in his right course, and had taken soundings, he would have found a depth of 100 fathoms or more. He went near to Gannet Rock, and instead of directing his ship towards the northeast, he let her go towards the northwest, and in a few hours she was on the Old Proprietor ledge. The commissioners have taken the evidence, and they conclude as follows in the report signed by Capt. Lugar and the two assessors. With regard to Capt. Lugar, he is certainly one of the most experienced navigators in the country. He has a certificate of the British Board of Trade, and my hon. friend knows well that the British Board of Trade never gives a certificate except when they know that the man to whom they give it is capable of doing the work. That court decided as follows:

This court is of opinion that the causes which led up to the loss of the ss. 'Hestia,' on October 25, 1909, on Old Proprietor ledge, were as follows:—

1. Error of compass due probably to Gauss's error. This vessel had in as cargo about 800 tons of iron.

2. Neglect of soundings when in sight of Gannet Rock light.

There are places, where this vessel was supposed to go, where there are 100 fathoms of water. If the captain had taken proper soundings in approaching Gannet Light, he would have found that there were in some places there only eighteen fathoms, ten fathoms, forty-five fathoms and forty-three fathoms of water. Why did he not change his course instead of continuing west? Was that because, as a witness said, the vessel steered badly? Why should the department be held responsible for that?

3. Not sufficient allowance made for set of ebb tide and strong wind.

The wind was coming from the north east and was supposed to bring the steamer on the Grand Manan and the ledges surrounding. What did the master do? Instead of directing his course north-east just in front of the wind, he went on the other side and came on the rocks.

4. Error of judgment on the part of the master in allowing ship to get the bearing of Gannet Rock light to the southward of west magnetic. It must be borne in mind the ship was about 5½ miles from Gannet light when she stranded.

That is a term absolutely nautical which I shall not undertake to discuss. The ship was about five miles from the Gannet light when she stranded. Here is the decision given by three men, one having a certificate of the British Board of Trade, and the two others being master mariners, and they say the accident was due to the causes I have just mentioned. My hon. friend has said that a secret investigation was held. If he will look over the Shipping Act he will find that there are two kinds of investigations—the preliminary investigation and the formal investigation. The preliminary investigation is held in private. It is not necessary that the commissioner should act as a court. He simply goes around collecting information and then reports to the minister and advises whether an investigation should be held in full court or not. Capt. Lugar is our wreck commissioner for the maritime provinces, and his instructions are, whenever an accident occurs, to investigate the facts immediately and find out whether a formal investigation should be held or not. A formal investigation is held in order to give a hearing to any of the parties implicated because nobody, under the British constitution, can be convicted without being heard. If it be found at the preliminary inquiry that the captain of the vessel is responsible or other persons on the vessel, a formal investigation is held, but in this case the master unfortunately was lost. There was so much talk however about the accident that I thought it advisable to order a formal investigation in order that the public should be made aware exactly of what happened.

My hon. friend called the first investigation a secret one. That is not what it is called in the Shipping Act. It is called a preliminary investigation and is for the purpose of discovery. My hon. friend goes further. He asks: Why did you hold the investigation in Montreal? Well, the accident happened on the 25th of October. On the 27th, we were notified. My hon. friend will find in the papers, when they come down, that immediately on representations being made by the agents of the vessel, we

ordered two government steamers to go to the rescue—the 'Curlew' and the 'Lansdowne'. I received thanks from the agents for this assistance. Immediately Captain Lugar left under special instructions for Yarmouth to attend the coroner's investigation, and he reported to us on the 5th of November. He held his preliminary inquiry on the 2nd and 3rd of November. We did not lose any time. He examined all the witnesses who could give information at St. John, and of course he heard the survivors of the accident. Immediately he made his report. On the 4th of November we got the following request from Robert Reford & Company, agents of the Donaldson Line:

Captain Lugar intends holding informal investigation, 10 a.m. Friday, into loss of ss. 'Hestia.' Can we have representation at that inquiry? If our request is not in order, could you arrange hold full, formal investigation while crew are here. Reply wire.

On the 5th of November I appointed Captain Lugar as wreck commissioner in the following words:

Ottawa, Nov. 5, 1909.

I, the honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, by virtue of the powers vested in me under section 781 of the Canadian Shipping Act, chapter 113, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and amending acts, hereby appoint you a commissioner to hold a formal investigation into the causes which led to the grounding of the ss. 'Hestia' on the 25th October, 1909, at Old Proprietor ledge, Grand Manan, New Brunswick.

Sgd. L. P. BRODEUR.

On the same day we received from Capt. Lugar, at St. John, a telegram stating that the crew were leaving for Montreal. His message read:

St. John, N.B., Nov. 5, 1909.

Your wire with authority from minister too late to stop crew leaving for Montreal. Before holding formal inquiry suggest wait my preliminary report. Hold crew of six survivors in Montreal. The Donaldsons' superintendent wants this formal investigation to be big thing; want their lawyer attend and call outside evidence.

Sgd. LUGAR.

When we were informed on November 5 that these men were coming to Montreal we gave instructions immediately to Captain Lugar to proceed to Montreal. We were afraid that the members of the crew would leave Montreal early the next week for the other side, we wanted the investigation to be absolutely complete and what did we do? We simply gave instructions to have the investigation held in Montreal in order that these men might be at our disposal. In fact they were sent to Montreal and were examined there so that the reason assigned by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) for not holding the investigation in St. John falls to the ground.

My. hon. friend has stated that at one time a request was made to us for the erection of a lighthouse station at the Old Proprietor ledge and that the department decided not to build it because it would be too expensive. I do not know whether the last statement is absolutely correct, as I have not been able to ascertain the facts since my hon. friend made that statement, but I may say with the knowledge I have of lighthouses of the same kind that it would cost about $150,000 or perhaps $200,000 to build a lighthouse at that place. Besides that what would be the use of such a lighthouse there? The Gannet Rock light, I understand, is not more than four or five miles from this spot. Some years ago when our lights were of an inferior character a request for such a light would have had more force but now that we have lights like the Gannet Rock light that can be seen for 15 miles, what would be the use of putting another light four or five miles from there? It would be absolutely useless to spend $200,000 for that purpose and I would call my hon. friend's attention to this fact; I am sure he will agree with me that such an expenditure would not be justified under the circumstances. However, I shall inquire into the statement he made, I shall have my officers make a report and if it is found that the erection of a light there might prevent wrecks I will be very glad to favourably consider the erection of a light.

My hon. friend stated also that he heard that the 'Lansdowne' is sent only when there are several matters to attend to. I may say he is entirely mistaken in that respect. As soon as it is reported to the agency of the department that something is wrong with any of our buoys or lighthouses, he has instructions to attend to it immediately and the 'Lansdowne' is supposed to go at once.

Mr. DANIEL. I did not make the statement. I stated that it was reported that the agent had made that statement and given it as an excuse, as one reason why the 'Lansdowne' was not sent to repair this buoy.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is certainly not the report that was before the department. Our report says that the agent has done his best to have the ship go there to attend to that light.

My hon. friend has also stated that the Gannet Rock light keeper did not show any sign of distress because he was afraid to disturb the doctor who was on shore. I do not know where my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) got that statement but I have the evidence before me and it appears that the Gannet Rock light keeper never knew of the accident, did not see the vessel passing there. Here is the report of Captain Lugar:

Gannet Rock did not see steamer passing or wreck till nearly 30 hours after the stranding on account of rain and fog.

By that statement we see that the charge against the Gannet Rock lightkeeper that he did not warn that vessel falls to the ground.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) says that the department has put in my mouth some statements which on their face are ridiculous. It appears that they declared the other day that pressure of more important business prevented their attending to the buoy at Old Proprietor ledge and my hon. friend went on to say that the port of St. John occupies a very important position. that a large amount of business was carried on through that port and that it is ridiculous for me to state that pressure of more important business prevented attending to that buoy and he intimated that I had stated that St. John was not an important port. My hon. friend may be sure that I realize that the port of St. John is certainly one of the most important ports that we have in this country. I am well aware that this port in the winter has been doing a very large amount of business, and it would be certainly a mistake on my part to say anything disparaging as to the importance of that harbour. Not only I but the department realize the importance of the port of St. John. We have done a great deal to improve the service there and my hon. friend has only to look at the chart issued by the Admiralty to find out what we have been doing there in the way of aids to navigation. If my hon. friend goes back only ten years he will not find in the harbour of St. John one half the aids to navigation we are giving there to-day. He will not find any of those gas buoys or the improved lights at Partridge Island, Gannet Rock, Brier Island, the Lurcher Lightship or Seal Island. So it would be very unfair to me to state that I did not realize the importance of the harbour of St. John and I suppose my hon. friend did not intend to put that in my mouth. What the acting agent at St. John stated was that although he was willing and anxious to see that this Old Proprietor ledge buoy was lit, his services were required on more important business, as I shall explain immediately to my hon. friend.

The gas buoy at Old Proprietor ledge is very near the Gannet rock light. There are on the other side of the channel where vessels pass places called the Northwest ledge and the Southwest ledge, and the Yarmouth Fairway buoy. These are places where vessels are passing continually. What occurred? When instructions were given to the 'Lansdowne' to go up there and light that buoy, it was found that the buoys at these ledges had gone adrift. My hon. friend will realize immediately how dangerous it is to leave buoys adrift on the sea in that region, because if you leave them adrift, and a navigator understood them to be in the proper place, a grave accident might occur. There was on one side of the channel, and on the other side a buoy which was not lighted. So there was no particular danger as to that buoy. But there were on the other side of the channel other buoys which were lighted and which were adrift, and if those buoys were not attended to there might be serious consequences to the trade in that section of the country. Then what did the acting agent do? I think it is due to that gentleman who has been devoting himself so faithfully to his business, to read his report on that matter. It is rather long, but since he has been attacked I think it is only fair that his report should be laid immediately before parliament before this discussion ends. My hon. friend will see by it the difficulty with which this government had to contend, and the serious situation in which he was placed. Most of those buoys were adrift. There had been during a considerable portion of the year very heavy winds and gales blowing at that place, and when the buoys went adrift it became absolutely necessary for him to look, not only after the Old Proprietor buoy, but also after the others. My hon. friend will also see in that report that he tried several times to reach the Old Proprietor buoy during a period of four months, and the gales were so heavy that he found it impossible to reach it and relight it. This was a very serious situation, and I cannot understand why, in face of the difficulties which those officers had to encounter, in face of the duties which those captains had to perform in keeping these aids to navigation in proper shape, we should insult them by charging them with dereliction of duty. I will read that report. It is dated November 6, 1909:

I beg to submit the following report in answer to your telegram of October 30, 1909.

The light on the Old Proprietor gas buoy was reported out, or gone adrift by the keeper of Gull Cove light, January 22, 1909. On January 23 I ordered the 'Lansdowne' to sea, and am inclosing a copy of my letter to the captain. You will note at the time the Old Proprietor was reported out that the Yarmouth Fairway was adrift.

My hon. friend knows what the Yarmouth Fairway buoy is.

The agent at Halifax, Mr. Parsons, having wired me as follows, on January 21, 1909.

'Cacouna' reported Yarmouth Fairway adrift 19th, 10 miles W.S.W. Seal island. We marconied 'Lady Laurier' 'Shelburne' rescue. If possible you place another buoy Fairway, we bringing buoy Halifax. Inform board of trade.

My hon. friend will admit that the Yarmouth Fairway was a very important buoy, more important than the others.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister mean the Board of Trade there?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether it is the Board of Trade there or the Board of Trade of a Canadian city, but I suppose it is the British Board of Trade. Then he goes on:

You will note that I arranged to send a Trinity bell buoy to replace the one adrift at Yarmouth Fairway.

In the meantime the Southwest ledge, Brier Island, buoy was reported adrift on January 23, 1909, by the signal agent at Westport, N.S., an in his telegram he stated ss. 'Westport' had gone out to tow it in, but later he advised me that the steamer had returned without the buoy.

On January 27, Capt. Bissett wired that the Old Proprietor was in position,—

Capt. Bissett was the captain of the 'Lansdowne.'

—but the sea was too heavy to light lamp, stated no word of South West ledge buoy yet—strong gales and heavy sea. Search was maintained, and on January 30, the South West Ledge buoy was located, one mooring stone gone. On Friday 3, Capt. Bissett wired that the South West ledge had been placed in position.

My hon. friend knows what the North West ledge is. That is a very dangerous place near Brier Island. Vessels, according to the information I have in my hands, are passing there, and if that buoy had been adrift or nearer the shore, some vessels might have come to grief. It was more necessary to look after that buoy.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that a light buoy?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the North West ledge and the South West ledge are two light buoys.

The North West ledge had been reported out, some time during the latter end of December, 1908, and an effort was now made to have this buoy attended to. On February 5, Capt. Bissett wired that he had placed the bell buoy at the North West ledge, but could not take up the gas buoy.

In the meantime, on February 2, I received telegrams from Mr. Tremaine of Halifax, stating that the Yarmouth (S.W.) Fairway automatic gas buoy was still at Abbott's Harbour, having been towed there by the 'Ralph.' E. S.' on January 22. This buoy had been reported to the Halifax agency.

On Friday 6, when I saw poor progress at North West ledge, I wired Capt. Bissett, stating he had better proceed to Abbott's harbour and to attend the South West Yarmouth and do the North West ledge on the way back; also wired him on February 3, as follows:—'When through with Brier Island, proceed to Abbott's Harbour and if gas buoy Yarmouth (S.W.) Fairway not damaged and can be moored in position, do so. Also upright Candlebox and another upturned buoy whose name you may find locally.

On February 6, I received a telegram from the captain stating he had just returned from the North West Brier Island gas buoy, with no chance to take hold of it. Asked if he should wait and finish there, or proceed to Abbott's Harbour.

On February 8, I received a further telegram from the captain at Westport, stating that he had been out to the North West Ledge buoy, but that it was blowing hard from the northeast and he could not get near it owing to heavy sea. He also stated the buoy to be one mile west of true position, and that on the previous day the chances looked favourable for this day, also advised he would proceed to Abbott's Harbour first chance, and that he had only 25 tons of coal in bunkers.

On February 8, Messrs Hugh Cann & Sons, of Yarmouth, N.S., wired me that the Yarmouth North West automatic gas buoy found adrift had been towed to Yarmouth by their boat.

My hon. friend, I suppose, would not deny that this part of the bay is very important too, because there are vessels running every day, if not every day, several times a week, between Yarmouth and Boston, and it is of the utmost importance for the coasting trade that these buoys should be kept in proper position.

On the 10th of February, I received a telegram from Capt. Bissett, as follows:—Arrived here last evening, got buoys alongside and moorings on board, wire in bad condition, chain fair, stones gone. Reported here that buoy at Abbott's Harbour is South West gas Fairway. Want 60 fathoms (1¼-in.) chain and shackles and two (2) stones for buoy here. Can you send by 'Senlac'?

I endeavoured to send these stones and moorings by the 'Senlac,' but was notified that this could not be done. I then wired the captain February 11. 'Cannot send stones by 'Senlac. Yarmouth Southwest Fairway buoy at Abbott's harbour should be properly secured. Better do this and then return to St. John harbour for gear.'

I also received a letter from Yarmouth, dated February 10, a copy of which I am attaching.

On the 13th, Capt. Bissett wired me as follows, from Yarmouth: 'Visited Abbott's harbour yesterday, found buoy was secured. Could not turn up candlebox bell-buoy, sea too heavy to-day, strong gales southwest and think proceeding first chance.'

The 'Lansdowne' then returned to St. John, coaled, took on needed gear, and was ordered to sea on February 19.

Here is a month which was spent for the purpose of locating these buoys which were more important than the one at Old Proprietor ledge for he reason which I have given to the House.

I am inclosing a copy of my order to the captain. You will note that the Lurcher lightship had to be coaled and then the buoy work was detailed, which had to be attended

to. The Old Proprietor was one of the buoys mentioned in my instructions. The ship did not get away until February 22, and on the 24th the lightship was supplied with coal and all the water she could take.

On February 26 I received a telegram from Yarmouth, as follows: 'Do you wish me to go to the Lurcher lightship No. 15 with pay sheets before handling buoys? Moorings for two buoys on board, weather very bad.' I replied on the same date, 'Want you to tend to buoys first, if weather suitable, you may run over to Lurcher when replacing Yarmouth north-west gas buoy.'

On February 24 the agent at Halifax wired me as follows: 'Blonde Rock buoy drifted, towed into Wood's harbour. 'Lady Laurier' going west next trip, can replace unless your ship undertaking work. Please advise.'

This telegram was received late in the evening of the 24th, and I answered it on the 25th as follows: 'Will endeavour to replace Blonde Rock buoy, but wish you would order 'Lady Laurier' to do so, subject my confirmation to her by wireless. Advise me when she leaves.'

I am under the impression that I held conversation over the phone with Mr. Parsons, but at any rate I wired Capt. Bissett on the same date as follows:

'Blonde Rock buoy towed into Wood's harbour, make endeavour to replace before doing Yarmouth Southwest Fairway, as in my opinion Blonde Rock is more important than Southwest Yarmouth.'

Not hearing from Capt. Bissett, I wired him at Yarmouth, March 2, as follows: 'Please advise me where you are, and whether any further work has been done since the Lurcher was supplied with coal.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the Old Proprietor buoy unlighted during all this time?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did he not give notice to the public that his representation that it would be attended to at once was not being fulfilled?

Mr. BRODEUR. He did give notice on the 22nd January that the buoy was not lighted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the public notice state that it would be attended to at once?

Mr. BRODEUR. As soon as possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But a month had gone by without any attempt being made to remedy it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because he could not go there. Then he went there, but he could not light the buoy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did he not notify the public?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has missed the point; he could not light it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is the minister who has missed the point.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I will read it again:

On January 27 Capt. Bissett wired that the Old Proprietor was in position but the sea was too heavy to light lamp, stated no word of southwest ledge buoy yet.

He went there, but he could not light it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the original notice given to the public?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was to the effect that Old Proprietor gas or whistling buoy has been reported with light out, and that it will be attended to as soon as possible. He gave instructions immediately. He gave instructions on January 23, February 19, on May 3, and on May 15 to relight the buoy. On May 20 the captain found that he could go near the buoy, but that as the upper part of the buoy was out of order he could not light it. He reported that fact to the agency and he wanted to get a new buoy to replace the old one. There were two spare buoys at that time at St. John, the number that we generally keep there. What happened then? Immediately after that a buoy went adrift from near Brier Island and it had to be replaced immediately by one of these spare buoys. Then, he happened to get a No. 11 buoy and he thought that No. 11 was too heavy. Accordingly he asked that a No. 9 buoy be got. He telephoned Mr. Parsons at Halifax and got a No. 9 buoy. Unfortunately, that buoy had no superstructure, so that he had to give instructions to have a superstructure made. That work had to be done at Owen Sound and it took some months to get that superstructure because it is something that is not kept in store by the manufacturers here. Therefore, four months elapsed before he could go near the buoy, and when he saw the buoy he found that it could not be used in the condition in which it was then. He ordered a new buoy, but it took the time I have just mentioned to procure one for this place. The new superstructure arrived about the beginning of September, and it was immediately sent out there. At the same time this same trouble occurred that had occurred before, that is to say, that the buoys of the north-west and south-west ledge of Brier Island went adrift and he had to attend to these. The Lurcher lightship also required attention, and this prevented the 'Lansdowne' from being able to place the buoy at Old Proprietor ledge before the month of October. These are the main facts which have been brought out by the agent. I could read over this report and the House will see how difficult it is to deal with these buoys in the Bay of Fundy. The tide is very heavy, the winds and gales are very serious, and it is a question whether we should continue the buoys in that section of the Bay of Fundy.

If we were sure that no accidents would happen, well and good, but experience has shown us how difficult it is, especially in winter, to maintain these buoys in the Bay of Fundy. This problem is now engaging the consideration of the department. But to come back to the first point, I would say that if the vessel had followed the proper course, if she had followed the course she should have followed, of making proper soundings or if the officer in charge had taken into consideration the error in his compass I am sure there would be no accident and that the loss of life that we have to deplore to-day would not have occurred.

Now, my hon. friend has found fault with me because Mr. Harding has been removed from the agency at St. John and he says that if Mr. Harding had been there no such accident would have happened. My hon. friend knows the circumstances and I do not know why he brings this question before the House now. It was a painful duty which I had to perform, but in view of the report which has been made by Mr. Justice Cassels no other course was open to me than to superannuate Mr. Harding. I do not need to read the report as doubtless my hon. friend is conversant with it, but Mr. Justice Cassels says this:

> No agent can faithfully perform the duties entrusted to him of letting contracts, supervising works and certifying accounts, &c., where he is under financial obligations to those dealing with him, as representing the department, in the manner described in the evidence.

Mr. Harding was a very sick man at the time and we had to superannuate him. I think my hon. friend, on giving the matter more consideration, will find that I acted in that case with the utmost justice in regard to Mr. Harding.

Now Mr. Speaker, I do not need to take up further of the time of the House. I think I have answered the accusations which have been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) against the department and shown that the department cannot be considered at fault under the circumstances. We have done our best to discharge our duty. I was not here at the time myself, but of course I am responsible for everything that happened, and I admit there is something that requires fuller information. I am going to get that information and if it is found that some officers have not discharged their duties properly and have not made to the department the reports they should have made I will have to take the steps that a minister should take. I deplore as much as my hon. friend does the serious loss of life; I am probably more sorry than he is, but I think he will render us the justice of saying that the department is doing everything possible to keep these aids to navigation in proper shape so as to give to navigators proper protection and that in so doing we are discharging our duty to our country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it not usual to give the British Board of Trade notice with regard to aids to navigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. The only mark shown on this Admiralty chart on the Proprietor rock ledge is a red beacon which is in existence; the gas buoy does not appear on this admiralty chart.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That does not answer the question. Is it not usual to give notice to the British Board of Trade?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that any notice had been given.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). It must be evident to every hon. member who has followed this debate thus far that the Minister of Marine has completely failed to meet the case which has been so clearly and convincingly made out against the department by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel). After all that the minister has said these facts stand out conspicuously uncontroverted: First, that this Old Proprietor buoy was established by the department ostensibly as a necessary protection against this dangerous ledge; secondly, that it was charted so that mariners were led to rely upon it as a guide; thirdly, that the buoy—which was provided, I believe by the department's friend, Mr. Willson, to whom reference has been made by the Civil Service Commission, at a cost of $8,000—was defective; fourthly, that the light went out in January last; fifthly, that the acting agent of the department at St. John inserted an advertisement in three of the St. John newspapers for three days, stating that the light was out and that it would be repaired as soon as possible; sixthly, that no notice was given to the British Board of Trade according to the usual custom and practice so that any mariners other than those under whose notice these local advertisements came were apprised, and as to these latter they were given to understand that it would be repaired as soon as possible; seventhly, the light was allowed to remain out and the buoy to remain defective for nearly ten months; eighthly, that the light was out and the whistle not sounding on the night of the wreck of the 'Hestia,' and ninthly and lastly that the 'Hestia' was wrecked on the very ledge which this buoy was established to protect shipping from. It does seem to me that in view of these facts which stand uncontroverted after the speech of the minister, the department cannot hope to escape responsibility for this lamentable catastrophe. The minister has referred to the findings of the commission which was appointed to investigate this wreck and he relies on these findings

as exonerating the department from all blame. These findings were first, that the wreck was due to an error in the compass, what is called Gauss's error, of which the minister gave the House such an illuminating explanation; second, that there were no soundings taken and that a mistake was made in taking the bearings of Gannet Rock light five miles away. These are the findings upon which the minister relies to excuse the department for all responsibility for this disaster. Do any of these findings touch the questions: That the Old Proprietor buoy was defective, that no notice was given to the British Board of Trade; or do any of them touch the question as to the ten months delay in repairing the buoy? Notwithstanding the local notice which was given by the agent at St. John, not one single thing was done to repair that light and put it in a condition that it could be relied upon as a safe guide to mariners for over nine long months. It seems to me that this House has never heard of such a flimsy pretext as that given to it by the minister for the non-repair of this buoy. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have the members of this House believe that for nine months it was impossible because of adverse weather conditions in the Bay of Fundy to repair one of these Willson automatic gas buoys. Was ever a more self-evident arrant absurdity placed before this House and before the public than the statement which the minister placed on 'Hansard' the other day? As has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) the weather during the past season in the Bay of Fundy has been perhaps the most favourable that has been experienced for many years and one cannot believe that during this lengthy period it was impossible for the department to accomplish the repair of this buoy. Then the minister advances another reason for the non-repair of the buoy from January 23, until late in the month of October, and that is that there were other important duties which were engaging the attention of the officers of the department. The minister has read a very long report from Mr. Legère, the acting agent of the department at St. John telling what he had done for the replacement and repair of different lights in different parts of the Bay of Fundy, but it will be observed from the extracts which the minister read from the report that only one effort was made to get to the Old Proprietor buoy and that in the month of January. It is true that the report of the agent which he read showed that the agent of the department was very active in his efforts to find the floating buoys which had been reported adrift in other quarters. But certainly nobody who heard that report can conclude that he took all proper measures to repair this very important light at Old Proprietor ledge, the non-repair of which, without any question, was responsible for the disaster which occurred. It may be that the compass was defective, as the minister has endeavoured to make the House believe; but I do not think that he read from the evidence which he had in his hand any testimony which would bear out that statement. The hon. member for the city of St. John this afternoon quoted the testimony given by the witnesses at Montreal, showing that the 'Hestia' had been swung at Glasgow and the compass tested before she had left that port, and that no material variation had been found. That testimony was given by one of the few surviving officers of the crew. The very fact that the vessel made the Bay of Fundy as she did is pretty strong evidence that the compass was not so defective as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have the House believe.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is quite the reverse. It is because the same course had always been followed; but when the vessel came to change its course, it could not do it properly without having new bearings taken.

Mr. CROCKET. Whether the compass was in error or not, what difference does it make as to the liability of the department for the non-repair of the Old Proprietor buoy, the buoy that was placed to protect vessels from the very rock on which the wreck occurred? The same remark applies to the other findings of the commission and the other grounds advanced by the Minister of Marine as to the failure of the ship's officers to take proper soundings. In that respect also, I think the hon. member for the city of St. John read this afternoon evidence that soundings had been taken, and also evidence with reference to the taking of the bearings of Gannet Rock light, a light which was five miles distant from the scene of this wreck. It seems to me that none of these facts excuse the Department of Marine and Fisheries from liability or responsibility for this wreck. To my mind it admits of no manner of doubt that had that light been working, and had he whistle been sounding as it should have been, on the night of this wreck, the wreck would not have occurred; and in that view, I think it is impossible for any unbiassed mind to acquit the department of responsibility as the minister has sought to induce the House to do. It did seem to me that the excuse advanced about the officers of the department being engaged with more important business was one which under the circumstances the officers of the department should have refrained from putting upon the records of this House. I understand, from the statement which the minister has made, that the other more important business referred

to was the looking after the other buoys and aids to navigation at the other points in the Bay of Fundy that he mentioned. But, Sir, when one recalls the pitiful cries of the poor little boy from Scotland, to whom the hon. member for St. John made reference, within a few hours of his destination, 'Mother, save me, I am drowning,' and when one thinks of the fearful scenes which were enacted in the darkness of that cold and stormy night, when thirty-nine precious lives were sacrificed to, what I think has been clearly shown to have been the neglect of this department, one wonders at the callousness and the heartlessness of the officers of the department in putting such a statement as that upon the records of this House: 'other more important business on hand.' Mr. Speaker, it was not long ago when a Royal Commission appointed by this government exposed to the people of this country the inefficiency, the incompetence and the corruption which characterized the administration of this department. That commission exposed those conditions in very strong language which will not soon be forgotten. But I venture to say that those conditions which characterize this department have been brought home to the people of the maritime provinces at least, by this lamentable disaster and loss of life with an effect which no language, however strong, can produce, and which no such sophistry as the Minister of Marine has addressed to this House to-night will alter.

Mr. W. F. TODD (Charlotte). Mr. Speaker, as the House has been occupied for several hours in the discussion of this resolution, which has been moved by the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel), I feel it fitting on my part that I should say a few words in regard to this wreck. Representing the county in which these waters are, and in which the Old Proprietor ledge is situated, I feel that it is due to my constituency that I should say a few words on this subject. The hon. member for the city of St. John, followed by the hon. member for the county of York (Mr. Crocket), would lead this House to believe that almost a murder had been laid at the doors of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There is nothing whatever in the evidence to justify such blame being placed upon the department. I think the blame for the wreck should be rather placed upon the captain and the other officers of the ship. Any one who looks at the map of the coast of the Bay of Fundy, with its high tides and the small opening at the mouth, will understand that there is naturally a great current in that water. He will also see that from Brier Island light to the light at Gannet rock, two of the best lights in this country, there is a breadth of nearly thirty miles of water, in which this ship was fully nine miles out of her course. So that I believe the judgment of this House will bear me out in saying that there must have been something vitally wrong with the compass of that ship. It is said by the hon. member for the City of St. John (Mr. Daniel) that the compass was tested when the vessel left the other side, and he asked if the vessel was so much out of her course on account of a defect in the compass, how she could have found the mouth of the Bay of Fundy. Well, she was only nine miles out of her course, and still there was an opening of thirty miles between Brier Island and Gannet Rock light. It is altogether too fine a point to pretend that if the gas buoy of Old Proprietor ledge was not working, that was sufficient reason for the captain of the 'Hestia' paying no attention to Gannet Rock light and changing his bearings and shifting his course.

I regret that the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) in his anxiety to make a point against the government, should have cast reflections on the shipping facilities of his own city. We are all trying to build up a winter port in the great city of St. John. Have we not heard over and over again in years past from our sister provinces and the other side of the water that the Bay of Fundy is a tortuous, difficult course for vessels? Should not the hon. member for St. John city rather uphold the advantages of the Bay of Fundy than decry them? I think he would be doing his duty by his constituency much better by urging this government to build up the harbour and equip it with better lights and every protection possible. But instead, he appeals to the House, followed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), and with tears in his voice he repeats the cries of the two Scotch boys who met a watery grave. One of them, he said, in his last moments, as he sank below the water exclaimed in agony: Mother, save us. But as a medical man, has my hon. friend not often heard that cry for help from patients drifting towards the rocks of Eternity? And because he as medical adviser could not save them, are we expected to hold him responsible for their death? I think it would better become the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) to work for the improvement of the harbour of St. John and the better equipment of the Bay of Fundy with aids to navigation than try to arouse prejudice and belittle their own port approaches as they are doing. I would suggest to the Minister of Marine that instead of trying to establish a lighthouse as requested by the hon. member for St. John, he should have a submarine bell, placed in 10 fathoms of water near the Old Proprietor ledge and an electric light on the spindle

on said ledge, connected and worked from White Head Island, by the proper cable. This in my opinion, and that of many living near to this dangerous reef, would remove all danger to vessels or steamers at this point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This subject has been so thoroughly debated that very little remains to be said. I do not think it will do for the minister to take the ground that he and his department are absolutely absolved by any amount of censure cast upon the captain and the officers who are no longer alive to defend themselves. Whether or not the compass was out, whether or not the captain took sufficient soundings, it is perfectly clear that this wreck would not have occurred and these lives would not have been lost if that light had been in proper working order. I do not think any one who has listened to the minister and who has read the reports in the public press could entertain the slightest doubts on that point. True the gentleman who acted as chairman of this board of inquiry took the ground that no great reliance should be placed on these floating lights and Captain Gillies, the superintendent of the Donaldson line, retorted that certainly no one would rely in the future upon floating lights in Canadian waters. But it seems rather peculiar that the course of events should have been what it was. This light became extinct about the 22nd of January, 1909. A notice was sent—not apparently in the ordinary course so that it would reach the mariners—but was pubilished in the local newspapers in the city of St. John. I do not know whether Captain Gillies was correct in the observation he made that no navigator would hereafter rely on our floating lights, but I did observe that in the course of the inquiry he said that no official notice had been given the mariners with regard to it. The minister will know best whether or not that statement was correct. Capt. Lugar, the chairman, remarked:

> But the fact that the light was not burning was published in all the Halifax newspapers.
>
> To which Captain Gillies replied: Perhaps, but not in the official notification issued to the mariners by the government.

Even if it had been published in those official notifications, one would suppose that the department, finding that the light could not be replaced within reasonable time, would have given timely notice in some official communication so that it would have reached the mariners; but for ten months that light was absolutely extinct and no more notice given of that important fact than the notice published in the local newspapers.

These new gas buoys were heralded by the Department of Marine and Fisheries as a most important advance. To such an extent did this go that on January 31, 1906, the deputy minister of the department gave a certificate to the United States government with regard to them. According to the report of the Civil Service Commission, that certificate was in these words:

> This department has had in the past considerable difficulty in carrying out its policy of providing an efficient buoy lighting system and has taken great pains to test and investigate the Willson buoy, with the result that it has been fully adopted; and the department purchases no other types. It is regarded as a distinct improvement on all others which the department has used. I can therefore recommend it to your Board.

This was a most distinct and unqualified recommendation of this buoy from the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada to the government of the United States. This efficiency comes to be tested in a portion of the Bay of Fundy that is regarded as having a special need of every possible aid to navigation that can be devised. The light goes out on January 22, 1909. Perhaps the minister can state when the buoy was placed there?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not state exactly, I suppose two or three years ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose it had been tested before being placed there, yet it goes out and as I understand the whistling apparatus also becomes defective and for a period of nine months both those defects remain absolutely without any remedy or correction. I would not say that this is an efficient buoy for the purpose unless it is of such a character that it can be repaired within a reasonable time and unless the materials and means for repairing it within a reasonable time are available, because, as Captain Gillies very well says, it would be far better to have no light at all than to place a light there and allow it to go out without giving any notice to mariners, the natural reliance on the light, operates as a complete and perfect trap to navigators who are traversing that portion of the Bay of Fundy.

I am not very much concerned with the fine-spun theories about the compass which have been enlarged upon by the minister and to which so much importance has been attached by Capt. Lugar. I think it would not be possible to arrive at any correct conclusion on that subject unless we had the evidence of the captain and officers of the ship who are now no longer here to testify. As far as the taking of soundings is concerned, it is evident from the testimony that soundings were taken as late as 11.30 o'clock that night.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some soundings were taken during the day on the south coast

of Nova Scotia, but he did not take any soundings when near the rocks.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Soundings were taken every half hour according to the evidence of one of the officers, he himself reading the log after each sounding. A sounding was taken about 11.30 p.m., when the depth of water was 100 fathoms.

Mr. BRODEUR. They continued two hours after that without soundings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Those soundings were taken at least as late as 11.30 p.m., and it would seem inconceivable under the circumstances, with the condition of the weather and the position in which the vessel was, that the captain would cease taking soundings when he had taken them every half hour up to that time.

I see that Captain Lugar has rejected what would seem to me to be important evidence. On the dead body of one of the seamen, who was steering the ship, was found a memorandum indicating the course he was steering, a written statement of the course he was directed to steer. I would consider that good evidence, I think it would be received in a court of law and why Captain Lugar, chairman of the board, should have seen fit to reject that evidence is not very clear to me. Further than that, counsel for the steamship company asked especially that as the causes of the wreck were being investigated the Court of Inquiry should be adjourned to St. John, N.B., where men familiar with all the local conditions might be summoned to give evidence in order to make the result of the investigation more accurate and more clear. I do not see why that course was not pursued. The evidence of the survivors of the crew had been taken; the object was to discover the cause of the accident and the wreck, and when counsel for the steamship company asked that the court should be adjourned to a locality near where the accident had occurred, where men familiar with these tides which have been enlarged upon, men familiar with all the difficulties of navigation, could be summoned and might have thrown some light on the subject, the chairman airily put the request aside and said there was no occasion to take any such course. Does the minister approve of that course? Does he not think that some light might have been thrown on the circumstances attending this wreck by adopting that course? I am putting altogether aside the conduct of those on shore and dealing only with the causes of the wreck. It does seem clear that some light might have been thrown on the circumstances of the case by calling men familiar with the difficulties and the navigation of those waters.

The minister has spoken of insurance rates and has deprecated in a mild way the discussion of these matters in the House of Commons. The tone and spirit in which my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) introduced this subject in the House indicated a sincere desire on his part to do only that which was in the public interest and in no way to create prejudice or cast discredit on the navigation of these waters. As far as that is concerned, I think the circumstances brought out in the inquiry, the fact that this buoy remained ten months unlighted and with its whistling apparatus out of order, would do much more to cast discredit on navigation in the Bay of Fundy than anything that could possibly be said in this House.

I do trust that the minister will not permit the matter to remain in its present position, that a further inquiry will be had and that he will be able to come down to the House later on and give us some assurance as to the continuous efficiency of these buoys. One of the chief causes he has urged to the House in defence of the inconceivable delay of nine months in repairing this buoy is the fact that so many other buoys had got out of order and gone adrift. Something must be wrong. Either the buoys are not adapted for the waters of that coast, cannot properly be secured, or are otherwise inefficient, or else there is some neglect on the part of some official of the department. The two things cannot stand together. If the buoys are of the proper type, if they can be made fast, if they are efficient and if the officials of the department do their duty then no such condition of affairs could have occurred in those waters as that which the minister himself has exposed to the House this evening in making his defence in this matter. I sincerely trust that some further inquiry will be held and further explanation will be given and that those who are interested in the navigation of Canadian waters will be able to understand that the course which has been pursued and the conditions which have arisen in this matter are not likely to occur again.

Mr. DANIEL. I have listened very carefully to the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I cannot at all agree that he has made it clear that the acting agent did his duty in this matter. He read a long report from the acting agent. But that report, as I understood it, and as I heard it read, only accounted for four or five months of the year, and stated what he was busy about during those months. But there was a long hiatus between the end of the four months and the end of the nine months. What was he doing the other five months after he had been so busy during these first four months? I also noticed the fact that when the Fairway buoy at Yarmouth got adrift he notified the Board of Trade. Why, Sir, when this buoy went

wrong, if the agent of the department, or the department itself, had taken the action which they should have taken, and had sent an official notification to mariners, then I say the negligence of the department in taking nine months and more to remedy the defects of this buoy, would not have been so reprehensible, in fact would not have been reprehensible to any extent, because they would have discharged their duty and notified the mariners, sea captains and others that when they came into these waters they could not expect to find that Old Proprietor buoy.

Mr. BRODEUR. The acting agent did better than that, he notified the owners, the agents of the 'Hestia.'

Mr. DANIEL. He gave verbal notice to the agent of the Donaldson line.

Mr. PUGSLEY Of this very line.

Mr DANIEL. Yes, of this very line, in January, nine months ago. And what was that notification? A notification to the effect that the buoy was adrift, or the light was out, and that the defect would be remedied as soon as possible. So when it comes to the fall of the year, October or November, had not those captains, those mariners, those navigators, a right to suppose that the defect had been remedied long ago? That is the point of the whole matter—the fact that not only was this defect allowed to continue, but that those who ought to have been acquainted with the fact were not put in possession of it, or still worse, that the notification given was a deceptive one, as it only stated that the buoy was adrift, or the light out, and that the defect would be remedied as soon as possible. Now there is one point in the minister's speech that I was glad to hear, when he says that he intends to have a further investigation. I think it is absolutely necessary to have a further investigation, and I hope that investigation will be thorough and rigid, and cover all these points with regard to which evidence is so necessary, namely, the need of life saving stations and crews, of life boats, the quality of life boat and all those needs in the Bay of Fundy. The minister also spoke about the difficulty of keeping the buoys in a certain place in the Bay of Fundy, and he said he was considering whether the department ought to continue to keep those buoys going. My opinion, formed from the evidence that was given at this investigation, is that it is far better to have no buoys at all than to have buoys listed and put on the chart, and then when you come to the place where you expect to find them, they are either adrift, or there is no light, or whistle or anything of that kind. Such a thing as that is simply a lure to destruction. Far better to have no buoys at all on those exposed positions than to expect them and then find nothing there when you get there. That is the complaint we have to make.

Now before I sit down I want to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Todd). The hon. member for Charlotte reproached me because I made a reference to a disaster in the Bay of Fundy and had drawn the attention of the country to the fact that the Department of Marine had been remiss in its duty in looking after the lights at the Old Proprietor rock. Sir, when he was saying that he reminded me of a bird, I believe a very stupid bird, an inhabitant of South Africa. That bird, when it is pursued and wants to hide itself, simply buries its head in the bush or in the ground, and thinks that because it cannot see any one no one can see it. That appears to me to be the position the hon. member for Charlotte would like me to take. He wants me to say nothing about this, to conceal it, and he thinks that then nobody else will know anything about it. But if we were to take that course the defect would never be remedied. That is not the position I take. I take the position that the proper course to take under these circumstances is to make this thing so public that it will never occur again, that the department will act in a more rigid and conscientious manner in future than it has been doing in the past, and then the navigation up and down the bay to and from the city I have the honour to represent, will be safer than it ever has been in the past.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE MISSION TO JAPAN OF W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier), moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, reports and written representations in the hands of the government, or any department of the same, concerning the commercial or trade mission to Japan of W. T. R. Preston, as Canadian Trade Commissioner for Canada, and of the report of said commissioner, as well as all other reports and despatches received by the government in connection with the execution of said mission.

He said: The object of this motion is to bring before the House all the correspondence that has taken place between the government and Mr. Preston, as well as between the government and any persons in Japan, or between the government and the British ambassador, or any representative of other governments in Japan, during the execution of the mission confided to Mr. Preston by the government. I think that

correspondence will prove very interesting and instructive. As I understand the events that have taken place since Mr. Preston went to Japan, he was entrusted with the mission of opening up direct relations between the commercial houses in Japan, the commercial world generally of Japan, and our own people, in order to establish direct trade relations between the two countries, in consequence of the treaty which was recently concluded between Japan and Great Britain, our adhesion, in other words, to the treaty concluded by Great Britain with Japan some ten or twelve years ago.

From what I have been able to cull from the newspapers, what has been published since Mr. Preston went to Japan and since his return, that mission was altogether marred, or came to very little, and the circumstances appear to be as follows: It would seem that in Japan, since that country has endeavoured to develop commercial relations with occidental countries all over this part of the world a certain number of commission merchants have established themselves in Japan and they have succeeded in implanting there a system by which all commercial relations must take place through themselves. They object to any direct relations and they have sedulously spread all over the world the idea that the Japanese commercial houses are not to be trusted but that through them and only through them can safe commercial relations be had with the Japanese merchants. Of course, the arrival there of Mr. Preston under the circumstances was anything but welcomed. He was considered as an intruder, arriving there presumably for the purpose of breaking up this system that existed in Japan. But, he was welcomed by the Japanese. The Japanese merchants are anxious to develop direct commercial relations with Canada and with all parts of the world. They are people with whom commercial relations can be safely maintained just as well as with other people and the moment Mr. Preston began there the execution of his mission and endeavoured to establish direct relations between the commercial men of Japan and Canada he became, so to speak, the butt of the attacks of these commission houses and, as far as my information goes, these commission houses, being confined principally to English and American firms, solicited the intervention of the British ambassador to cause Mr. Preston to cease his campaign. I understand that the correspondence will show that. Correspondence took place between His Majesty's representative in Japan and the Canadian government either directly or through the Home government. I am not sure as to that, but it has been stated in the papers that the claim was made on behalf of the English commission houses that Mr. Preston was interfering with their business, that he was disturbing commercial security and solidity in Japan and that it was desirable that he should be recalled. I think that is a point of very great importance upon which the House should be very fully informed. I have reason to believe that the objections from the commission houses, not only the English commission houses, but others as well, were forwarded to the Canadian government or to the imperial government, to be, by them, communicated to the Canadian government. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will probably know whether these allegations are well founded or not, but steps of various kinds were taken in order to secure the recall of Mr. Preston and his mission there was not only interfered with but was nullified by the influence that I have just referred to. This information has come to me from the newspapers and I think it is very important that the House should see that correspondence that we may know exactly what Mr. Preston did there and what his reports stated as to the possibilities of establishing direct trade communication with that nation, because there is no doubt that we have an immense possible commerce not only with Japan but with all those Asiatic countries. We are therefore interested to know why that mission was brought abruptly to a close and what was the result of the mission itself. I think it is even more important why we should know why that mission came to an end, what were exactly the influences which were brought to bear, the representations that were made against or for Mr. Preston by the associated interests, by those commission houses established there and on his behalf by other commercial bodies, chambers of commerce and Japanese interested in his mission. I think the idea is covered by my motion. I have prepared a motion somewhat longer but I mislaid it. The motion that I had originally prepared after I had seen this matter formulated in the newspapers was to this effect:

Copy of the correspondence between the Department of Trade and Commerce and the late Commissioner of Trade in Japan, Mr. Preston, on all subjects arising out of the controversy between Mr. Preston and foreign commission merchants in Japan during and subsequent to his stay there.

Copy of correspondence between the government of Canada and the British Ambassador in Japan respecting or in any way relating to Mr. Preston's appointment to Japan, the discharge of his duties there or connected with the controversy arising in Japan from Mr. Preston's advocacy of direct trade between Canadians and Japanese.

Copy of correspondence between the government of Canada, the British and the United States and the German Ambassadors and Mr. Preston on subjects growing out of the advocacy of direct trade between Canada and Japan.

Copy of all correspondence, loose paper clippings, memorials from Japanese or For-

eign Chambers of Commerce in Japan, or with the Colonial Office in London, touching or relating to the subject matter referred to herein.

I may say to the House that although it seems to me that it is covered by the motion I gave notice of this one is fuller and may be substituted for that which appears on the notice paper if the House will admit of the substitution. As I am informed Mr. Preston was actually recalled. I do not believe that the reason of that recall was that he was not carrying on properly his commercial mission, but that he had fallen upon a mare's nest there, had stirred up a great deal of trouble, and that, in reality, it was that opposition to the execution of his mission which brought about his recall —all the more reason why the House ought to be fully informed of all the circumstances. I understand also that since Mr. Preston's return, or simultaneously with his recall, another commissioner, a Mr. Harris, was named to replace him. It is stated in the newspapers that Mr. Harris rather inclines to the views, or falls in with the ideas, of those who think that direct commercial relations with that country are difficult because it has been stated in the public press that Mr. Harris has written a letter from Japan to a commercial house here stating in effect that the Japanese, in matters of business, are not to be trusted. That is what the newspapers state is the purport of his letter. Then there would be an absolute contradiction between the representations and reports made by Mr. Preston and the statement or representation made by the new appointee. A newspaper has stated that in that statement which he communicated to a commercial house here the new representative had not the support of the government. All this, it seems to me, is rather confusing and it would be very interesting for us to have the whole of the papers before us because this is a singular case that has never, to my knowledge, come to the notice of the government since we attempted to establish direct relations and I think the House will find some interesting data if these papers are all brought down. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will substitute this rather longer motion but in effect it is the same as that on the Order Paper.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am not sufficiently acquainted with the matters to which my hon. friend has referred to justify me in making a reply to his observations. I quite realize that the matter is a proper one for inquiry and I would have no objection to the notice which appears on the Order Paper. It may be that on further consideration we would have no objection to the motion he now presents, but if my hon. friend thinks there is a substantial difference between the two I would suggest that he drop the motion on the Order Paper and substitute the other by way of notice. If the motion on the Order Paper is substantially what he wants I think he had better take it and any papers dealing with the matter which can properly be brought down will be produced at an early date.

Mr. MONK. I am induced to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Finance because I understand there are a considerable number of papers and I do not want to have delay. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that some of these papers might not properly be brought down, and if so I would remark that this is not a confidential or state matter and that none of the papers relating to it can very well be withheld.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish to indicate that to my knowledge there are any papers that should not be brought down, and my remark was intended only to put in the usual general saving clause. I am not unmindful that in international matters it frequently arises that there are some papers that cannot be brought down. It was with that general thought in my mind, and not with any particular reference to these papers, that I made this remark.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TRAIN SERVICE.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if the Minister of Railways were in his place I would direct his attention to a resolution of the Board of Trade of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, which has been sent to me relative to the railway service between Windsor Junction and Dartmouth. It is stated that a change has been made in the arrival and departure of trains which has been found very inconvenient. Perhaps the Minister of Railways will take this as an intimation that I will call his attention to the matter at an early date.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that the attention of the Minister of Railways is drawn to the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN MONTREAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I ask the government if it is intended soon to give effect to the law which has added three judges to the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. The Council of the Bar of Montreal has recently passed a resolution asking for the immediate appointment of these three judges. Is it the in-

tention of the government to comply with the wish of the Bar of Montreal at an early date?

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask my hon. friend to renew the inquiry when the Minister of Justice is in his place.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works Department, salaries, $358,537.50.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Six additional employees in the department are provided for next year. The total increase in salaries is $5,182, which is largely made up of the salaries of these six officials and the statutory increases to the others.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Are there any who did not receive the statutory increases?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in the first division, they are all entitled to it in that division. Mr. J. A. Robillard, Mr. J. A. Blain, Mr. G. M. Hutchinson, and Mr. G. Perley are promoted from the second division (subdivision A) to the first division of subdivision B. Then there is Louis Coste, who was in this division, and who has been transferred to the outside service. My hon. friend will know that he is connected with the International Waterways Commission.

Mr. BLAIN. What is his salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $25 per day during the time he is actually engaged in the services of the government. In the 2nd division, subdivision ' A,' there are twenty-three statutory increases at $50.

Mr. HUGHES. Were any of the officers of the 1st division, subdivision ' B,' not given the statutory increase?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there are apparently two.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because they were not recommended as entitled to receive it. Under the Civil Service Act it is optional with the deputy minister to recommend them or not. In the 2nd division, subdivision 'A,' there are twenty-three statutory increases at $50, four at $25, and one at $12.50, making a total of $1,262.50. There are seven promotions from subdivision ' B ' to division 'A' of the 2nd division. This makes a total of $14,062.50. From this is to be deducted the salaries of four employees promoted from the first division, subdivision ' B,' the salary of Mr. Lucas who resigned, and half the salary of Mr. McLaughlin, which was paid by the Railways and Canals Department, a total of $10,025, leaving an increase in this subdivision of $4,037.50.

Mr. HUGHES. How many in this division were passed over without getting the increase?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Have the promotions been made on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will have to be made in the report of the Civil Service Commission that they are entitled thereto.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Are they proposed promotions or have the promotions already been made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are proposed promotions.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Are they made as the result of competitive examinations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the promotions are not made as the result of competitive examination, except in the lower division. They are made on the recommendation of the deputy minister and the certificate of the commission that the persons recommended are qualified to be promoted.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Are there any new appointments in that department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two or three are contemplated.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Are they to be appointed on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they will have to be, unless of course officials are promoted from a lower division, in which case there would be vacancies in the lower division to which appointments would have to be made on the recommendation of the commission. In the 2nd division, subdivision 'B,' there are forty-seven statutory increases at $50 and four at $25, and there are to be two promotions.

Mr. HUGHES. Who are they?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A. Dostaler and T. G. Bell. In the third division, subdivision 'A,' there are twenty-three statutory increases at $50 and one at $25, and there are to be nine promotions from subdivision ' B ' to subdivision ' A.' There are some reductions and some transfers, making a total increase in that division of $4,900.

Mr. HUGHES. Let us have the names of those promoted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Miss M. E. Sylvain, V. Lepage, C. A. Narraway, Miss A. Valade, Mrs. M. L. Roy, M. Laframboise, F. O. Hamel, J. E. Kennedy and A. A. Rivard. In the third division, subdivision ' B,' there are three statutory increases at $50, and seven at $25.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Does the minister designate those who are proposed for promotion, or how comes he to have their names there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are proposed subject to the certificate of the commission. There is a new appointment in this division—Miss McPherson, who was appointed after examination and on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Civil Service Commission recommended for promotion those whose names the minister has read?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are what the deputy minister believes are the proper promotions. All the commission has to do is to certify that the parties are qualified for promotion.

Mr. HUGHES. I presume the commission will be pliable.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. If the initiative is not taken by the Civil Service Commission with regard to competitive examination, what is the advantage of this over the old system?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No new appointment, except in some special cases, can be made to the service except upon competitive examination and the recommendation of the commissioners.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. No advantage with regard to promotion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, except that they must certify that the person whom the deputy recommends is qualified.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. minister find that those appointed by the Civil Service Commission are much better than those appointed in the good old way of political pull. I must say I believe in the old way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must say I was not here when the good old way prevailed.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board salaries, $113,500.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a decrease here. The number of officials is the same, and it is contemplated that we shall have one promotion to the higher grade under circumstances exactly as described by the Minister of Public Works. The promotion is made subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commissioners as to the officer's qualification. We are contemplating the retirement of one or two gentlemen by superannuation, and younger men will come in at the foot of the ladder so that there will be some saving.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the recommendations for superannuation made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. FIELDING. No, they are made by the minister, with the concurrence of the chief adviser. The applications come to the Treasury Board, and the facts of age, physical condition and other circumstances are reviewed before a decision is given.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the officer to be promoted?

Mr. FIELDING. We contemplate the promotion of Mr. Saunders who has been in the office for many years.

Department of Mines, salaries, $174,689.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the government intend establishing an institution for the better testing and reducing of ores?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is contemplated by the director of mines to have a plant in Ottawa. The building is being erected. Possibly the production of gas from peat will be tested the coming summer. To what extent we will go in providing plant for the testing of ores is a moot question, but we are not losing sight of it.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. gentleman's officers taken notice of the possibility of using peat exhaust or coal in what is termed suction gases or producer gases?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is being investigated. An officer leaves in a day or two to visit an experimental plant in New Jersey for the purpose of acquiring information and he will make a report. The total increases in civil government over last year is $19,675, made up of statutory increases $3,625, increases by promotions $1,450, additional appointments $14,600. We have an additional clerk in the department proper, an additional mining engineer in the mines branch and a statistical clerk. In the geological survey, two additional geologists at $2,100 each and two draughtsmen at $1,200 each. The total increase in the number of officers for the next financial year is 10.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister lost any of his geological survey officers in recent years?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, we are losing one at the present moment.

Mr. HUGHES. And the minister knows why?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With the concurrence and approval of the Civil Service Commission, I propose to recommend these increases by promotion to council. In this way we propose to increase the salaries of half a dozen of the senior geologists.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the minister think the salaries he pays to his first-class officers are not adequate to retain good men?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite true. In the Geological Survey we have half a dozen geologists who have served from 25 to 35 years They are in subdivision B of the first division, the maximum of which class is $2,800 The geologist who is likely to leave us now has been thirty odd years in the service. He is receiving $2,300 or $2,400 and he has been offered $4,000 to take charge of the Mines branch of the province of Quebec. While he was reluctant to sever his connection with the department where he would be entitled to superannuation in a few years and where he was carrying on congenial work, we were unable to offer him a larger salary at the moment, but his name is here as one of those proposed to be promoted in the event of his not accepting this position in Quebec. His increase would be $460 to bring him into subdivision A where he would go up from $2,800 to $4,000. I desire to put all six of the senior geologists into subdivision A of the first division where they will ultimately go to $4,000. It is absolutely impossible for the Department of Mines to retain well qualified technical men unless we can pay them larger salaries. We have lost half a dozen men who have gone to private enterprises and it is for the purpose of giving fairly adequate salaries that this increase is made. In providing for these additional positions, we are anxious to have the vacancies so that we may secure good men if opportunity presents itself.

Department of the Secretary of State, salaries, $56,412.50.

Mr. MURPHY. There is a decrease here of $1,375 due to the transfer of one of the officers and the death of another. These vacancies will be filled by new appointments at the minimum salaries of the divisions.

Department of External Affairs, $14,875.

Mr. MURPHY. It will be observed that the number of officials has been increased by four, comprising three clerks in the lowest division and one messenger. The work of the department has increased to such an extent that it will be necessary to make these appointments in the lowest division and also to secure a messenger.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the head of this department?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Joseph Pope.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Will these appointments be made as the result of the Civil Service examinations?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the officer in subdivision A?

Mr. MURPHY. That is Mr. Walker, transferred from the Governor General's office.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the next one in subdivision B?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Brophy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this department make any report?

Mr. MURPHY. The department was only organized on the 1st of June last. It will make a report.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Civil government.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 23, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. From answers given by the Minister of Militia to a couple of questions in the House in the last day or two, and the form in which those questions were put, a wrong impression might be created throughout the country. I would take the liberty of suggesting to the minister that he get some one in his department to answer the questions placed on the Order Paper in a little more definite manner than these questions seem to have been answered. It is very well known that for some years past a conspiracy or agitation has been carried on in this country by agents, direct and indirect, of concerns in the motherland, with the object of discrediting the Ross rifle and injuring it in this country. That rifle, Sir, has spoken for itself; it has silenced all critics by the answers it has given on the ranges throughout the world during the past year. As president of the standing committee on small arms for the Dominion of Canada, last spring, before the rifle had been very much distributed throughout the country, and in order that it might reach every riding in the Dominion, as far as possible, and be placed in the hands of competent men who would judge it on its merits, I requested the minister to distribute a number of these rifles amongst the members of this House who would see that they were placed in the hands of expert riflemen in their respective localities, and thus meet

the slanders and falsehoods circulated throughout the country against the rifle. Accordingly, some were distributed. I thought one was issued to nearly every member of the House; but I am very sorry this was not the case. They were issued only to a few members of parliament, with that object in view. It is a very meritorious object, and I trust that the minister will see that a rifle is sent to every riding as an eye-opener and an object lesson to the critics and slanderers of the rifle.

However, the fact that the rifle has swept everything before it, although only a few were issued, at the Rifle Association meeting in Quebec and Ontario and at the meetings of the Dominion Rifle Associations, where nearly every place on the Bisley team and in the Governor General's match was won by the Ross rifle is proof of its superiority. In every provincial and Dominion match, the Ross rifle has made a name for itself as superior to every other. For the first time in history a rifle—of which only a few were used, less than 20 among 4,000—took more than one half of the first prizes at Bisley. I make these remarks in justification to gentlemen whose names were brought rather frivolously before the House on a recent occasion when there was no need for levity.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I rise to a question of privilege. I was both amused and surprised at the manner in which the hon. minister answered the question yesterday. He appeared desirous of leaving the impression that I had secured this rifle in a somewhat irregular manner. Let me advise the minister that although he may have had some trouble in recovering certain goods and chattels, he will have no trouble in securing this rifle at any moment. It is now in the hands of a good young marksman in my constituency, a member of the Rifle Association. He has keenly followed all the improvements on this rifle and asked me to try and get him one. I made application to the hon. minister and the rifle was forwarded me. I handed it to this young marksman, and if the minister wants it back, I can wire and have it back here to-night.

Hon. SIR FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). If I may be permitted to say a word, I wish to say that yesterday a question was put asking for information regarding the distribution of a certain lot of rifles. I gave the information. I said that 12 rifles had been issued to individuals.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On a receipt.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That goes without saying. The hon. gentleman who asked the question was not satisfied and wanted to know the names. What could I do but give them? There was no intention to cast any reflection on my hon. friend. He will look in vain in the answer I gave for any such suggestion or intention. On the contrary, I quite agree with my hon. friend from Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that it was a perfectly proper and laudable thing to give these rifles and I was very glad indeed to have had the opportunity of issuing them. As a matter of fact they were issued on receipt. I am sorry if my hon. friend misunderstood my remarks as casting any reflection on him. Quite the opposite was the case.

CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETIES ACT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 26) respecting the Co-operative Credit Societies Act. He said:

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to enable loan and savings banks, such as are termed 'People's Banks,' and working on co-operative principles, to obtain incorporation under Dominion legislation. The House will remember no doubt that a Bill dealing with co-operation was introduced in the course of last parliament, for the purpose of enabling or authorizing these associations to obtain incorporation under Dominion legislation. The Bill as introduced dealt with co-operative associations as a whole. And, as no distinction was made, it turned out that the main objection offered on behalf of some of the provinces and people interested in preventing such legislation from being passed rested on the ground of its being ultra vires.

The House will remember that the retail merchants, who were also formed into an association, opposed the passing of such a Bill. And, while it was unanimously carried through this House, the Bill, after consideration in the Senate, was rejected, mainly on the grounds set forth by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, that it went beyond the powers granted by the constitution. Accordingly, it was deemed preferable to introduce two separate Bills, one dealing entirely with people's bank, loan and savings associations. Nobody denies the right of the Dominion government to legislate as regards savings and loan banks. That explains why a separate Bill is introduced as regards credit and loan associations. The labouring classes take a deep interest in this legislation and for the last ten years to say the least organized labour, as I understand, have been requesting from year to year, at their annual meetings, that such legislation in regard to co-operative associations be carried out. The hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Harris), who, representing as he does in this House a large manufacturing centre, is greatly interested in such legislation, proposes, as I perceive at reading the notice contained in the orders of the day,

to introduce a Bill for the incorporation of co-operative producing and distributing associations, these being of great interest to the working classes, in the same way as people's banks.

The House has not forgotten what occurred in regard to the first Bill. The government stated their approval of such legislation; and the Bill was taken charge of by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Lemieux), who at the time had also the Department of Labour under his supervision. He took charge of the Bill, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister granted us an inquiry which gave most interesting results. We had as witnesses experts in agriculture, university professors, representatives of labour, agriculturists, and even His Excellency the Governor General, who has from the beginning concerned himself with that movement in England, is honorary president of the international co-operative league, and whose evidence was of a most useful character.

This House unanimously voted the Bill of which the government had taken charge; but in the Senate, as session was drawing to a close, and through the pressure which was exerted, as previously stated, on behalf of the retail dealers, whose claims did not appear to me well grounded, the Bill was rejected by a vote of 19 against 18, a number of the senators being away.

I think this is an opportune time for the introduction of these two Bills. The movement, started several years ago, has made great strides throughout all the provinces, especially as regards people's loan and credit banks. I may say that in the province of Quebec, there are already in existence over 32 associations of that kind, and that in the same province the number of members of such associations exceeds 15,000. The movement is growing rapidly from day to day.

Clergymen in all parts of the Dominion who are in close touch with the working classes and farming community, have taken a deep interest in the movement, and especially in the province which I represent, they have in this connection taken the lead with the best results.

I may say to the House that in this Bill we are entrusting the Minister of Labour with the superintendence or control of these associations. That is the rule followed in most countries. In England co-operative associations—and there are many of them—are under the law controlled by the chairman of the Board of Trade, whose duties correspond to those of the Minister of Labour here. In France, that control lies also with the Minister of Labour and provident associations. The same condition of things exists in the neighbouring republic; that is, in those states which have voted similar legislation, in Massachusetts, for instance, where the Minister of Labour has under his control co-operative institutions. In entrusting these powers to the Minister of Labour, the object is in no way to detract from the prestige or the importance of the duties assigned to the hon. Secretary of State. The latter department has charge of the granting of charters applied for by private stock companies; but such charters as a rule grant important privileges and for their cancellation require going through a tedious and expensive procedure. In this case, the Minister of Labour will have no such duty to fulfil, he will merely be called upon to grant authority for the formation of such associations, and to cancel the same without going through numerous formalities, whenever he thinks it advisable in compliance with the provisions of the Act.

As I have previously stated, the most serious objection with which we were met was that based on the ultra vires character of such legislation. It was claimed that this parliament was without jurisdiction, although it was acknowledged at the same time that as regards loan banks, such business being in the nature of banking and finance, the Dominion parliament, no doubt, had jurisdiction. However, it seems to me that this parliament has jurisdiction as well as regards co-operative producing and distributing associations. In the first place, we are authorized to legislate in regard to agriculture. Now, it is more particularly the farming community who are anxious that such legislation be enacted and who will benefit by it. That legislation will be enforced throughout the country and will prove of great assistance to the farmers. As regards the industrial classes, it seems to me we have jurisdiction as well. Undoubtedly we have the right to legislate with the object of insuring the welfare and development of the country as a whole, though we would be debarred from legislating in the same fashion for the exclusive benefit of one province. That is the view taken to-day even by those who objected to the proposal as first submitted.

Dominion legislation in this connection is necessary for the following reason: There are nine provinces in the Dominion, and as such a movement requires to be forwarded on uniform lines, it is important that the Dominion government be in a position to act efficiently. Wherever that movement has taken foot, it has developed in marvellous fashion. Is it not desirable that such happy results be extended to the whole Dominion? In the absence of Dominion legislation, this movement would lack uniformity and cohesion. Two provinces only have legislated in this respect, and they have done so on different lines; apart from these two cases, there exists no legislation emanating from the provinces in this connection. If all the provinces were to legislate in this

regard, we would some day be confronted with nine different systems emanating from as many legislatures. It would be impossible to collate uniform statistics, since each province would have its own system. Now, if this House voted this Bill, the movement no doubt would be greatly accelerated and extended owing to this Dominion legislation. I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by stating that those requesting such legislation are increasing in numbers from day to day. The benefits of co-operation are making themselves felt more strongly throughout the world. I hope that the government and the House, as they have already done, will enact this legislation, and that no further check will be put upon it by the Upper House.

Bill read a first time.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask when it is intended to have the committees organized. No committee has been organized yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Immediately.

SUPPLY — INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TRAIN SERVICE.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House goes into Supply, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) whether he has received a resolution of the Board of Trade of Dartmouth in regard to the present train service, both passenger and freight, between Windsor Junction and Dartmouth. I have under my hand a copy of that resolution—it is rather lengthy—I have no doubt the minister has had communication of it. In effect, it declares that the recent changes in the train service have completely demoralized business conditions, both as regards passengers and freight; that it has accomplished the maximum of inconvenience with the minimum of economy; that under present conditions the train service probably costs more than it did formerly, and it is not giving nearly as good accommodation to the public. Not only is there alleged to be greatly additional inconvenience so far as the transportation of freight is concerned, but there is an almost intolerable inconvenience to persons residing at Waverly, and elsewhere on the line, who desire to go to Halifax or to Dartmouth and do business for a day, and return to their homes the same night. I will not inflict the whole of this resolution upon the House at the present, but I would only ask the minister whether he has taken the matter into consideration, and whether he thinks that any changes could be made. I realize that the Intercolonial management has been placed in the hands of a commission, that a great deal of discretion must be left to them in such matters, and I would not be inclined lightly to interfere with them. But if the representations in this resolution, the terms of which seem to have been very carefully considered, and the condition of affairs are such as are described here, then I think the members of that commission ought to take up the matter at once and endeavour to give to the people of Dartmouth and all along that line to Windsor Junction some better train service than they have at the present time, particularly as it is alleged in the resolution that this could be done without adding one dollar to the cost of operating the line beyond what it amounts to at present.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may say in reply that I have no recollection of receiving such a resolution. If it has been received, it has been transmitted at once to the Board of Management. Since handing the Intercolonial over to the Board of Management I have not interfered in any way with the manner in which they choose to run that railway. I have given them some suggestions but they have had control of the situation and of the management of the trains. I may say that the general superintendent, Mr. Brady, who has charge of the transportation, is one of the best transportation men in the Dominion of Canada, I believe he has few superiors in America as a transportation man, and I am sure that any representations that may be made to him will receive due consideration. I will make inquiry at the department, and if the resolution has been received and has not been transferred to the board, I will see that it is done at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In order that there may be no doubt about the minister receiving it, I will send him a copy of it across the floor of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, $111,825.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). In the third division subdivision B there are four clerks at $800; one at $775, one at $750, one at $737.50, one at $725, and two at $535, making a total of $7,237.50. There is one packer at $800, 4 messengers receiving a total of $2,887.50. Total, $111,825. Add the difference between the amount paid under the flat increase and the amount paid by statutory increase, $1,275. The increase is made up by 10 statutory increases of $100; 45 statutory increases of $50; 1 broken statutory increase at $37.50; 5 brok-

en statutory increases at $25, and 1 broken statutory increase at $75, making a total of $3,487.50. Less saving between estimated salary of officer deceased and new appointment, $650. Less savings due to status of 2 clerkships in grade A of third division, reduced to status of two clerkships in grade B of third division, $800, showing a net increase of $2,037.50. Less amount deducted from estimated salary $200; less amount of difference between money paid under the flat increase and that paid by statutory increase, $1,275. The net increase on the entire showing is $562.50.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the two additionals in the third division, subdivision B?

Mr. OLIVER. Miss Coghlan and Miss Darby, at $525 each.

Mr. FOSTER. The minimum of that class is $500 is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. They were appointed in the first half of the year, and therefore they are allowed the statutory increase which belongs to the latter half of the year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister think it necessary to have so large a staff of officials in the Department of Indian Affairs? As I understand it, there is about $1,500,000 distributed in that department, including salaries of officials. Has the minister made an investigation as to the amount of work done in his department? Does he think there is need for such a large staff, and does he know what they are doing?

Mr. OLIVER. The information I have received from time to time from officers of the department is to the effect that their work is arduous and faithfully performed. I receive this information very generally and persistently when there is any prospect of an increase of salary or promotion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have no doubt the minister will receive suggestions of this kind, but I wish he would give us some knowledge of the amount of work in that department. There are in Canada 107,000 Indians, of whom 85,000 are actually under government control. One half of the expenditure of the department is devoted to salaries, and I would like to know what the work of the department requiring such a large staff is.

Mr. OLIVER. A careful study of the annual report of the department will show that there is a large amount of work. It is not a mere matter of distribution of money but of the oversight of the work and the social life of people scattered from one end of the Dominion to the other who are notoriously difficult to care for. While the work of the department does involve a large expenditure, it is nevertheless very responsible work and must be done if the credit of Canada is to be maintained.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister state the reasons why the officers on whose account items for travelling expenses appear in the report have to travel in the service of the department? I notice the following items for travelling expenses: Mr. Bray, $198.55; Mr. Ogilvie, $284.02; Mr. McKay, $259.70; Mr. F. H. Paget, $520.50.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Bray is the chief surveyor of the department, and these travelling expenses were incurred in inspecting survey work done by other surveyors of the department, chiefly in Ontario. Mr. Ogilvie is the architect of the department and these expenses were incurred in the inspection of buildings of the department. Where it is reported that a building needs repairs or is unfit for use, or that a building is required, Mr. Ogilvie gives the department the expert advice required. Mr. McKay is the accountant of the branch, and made a trip in western Canada, auditing certain accounts of the western agencies. Mr. Paget was sent on an inspection of the agencies in the prairie province last year. It was thought advisable that an important officer at the head office should have personal cognizance of the way in which business was being transacted at the different agencies, and therefore we thought it sound policy that Mr. Paget should make that trip. These accounts are all for out-of-pocket expenditures.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no per diem allowance?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many employees are in the inside and outside service of the Indian Department?

Mr. OLIVER. In the inside service there are 78. At a later date I can give my hon. friend the number in the outside service.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the 75 officers whose salaries we are now considering are employed in the departmental offices, their work not extending outside of Ottawa, so that practicaly what they have to do is largely connected with the distribution of moneys referred to by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). It seems to me that a large number of people are employed to distribute a reasonably small amount of money. I presume those in the outside service will be much more numerous. The whole department seems to be somewhat expensive.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt that the department is expensive, it costs a great deal of money, but I admit that I know of no way in which the responsibilities of the country in regard to the Indians can be dis-

charged without a very large expenditure of money or without the employment of a large staff of officers. I might say that some of the officers whose salaries appear as a part of the civil government vote are not employed in the offices here. I speak of the surveyors, whose work, of course, is in the field, but who still are a part of the inside service. Then there are the two inspectors of the Ontario agencies, whose work is outside but who are part of the inside service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the sale of lands come under the supervision of these employees, and are these sales of Indian lands being conducted in the same manner as they were some years ago? If the minister will recollect, we made an investigation some years ago and found that this government had sold in the neighbourhood of 600,000 acres of Indian lands since they had come into office, and though a large portion of these lands were sold at an upset price fixed by the department they brought ten and fifteen cents an acre. Islands were sold for one dollar apiece. Is the minister still allowing sales to be conducted in the same manner, and are these officials the ones who look after that part of the work?

Mr. OLIVER. The department has secured surrenders from a number of bands of Indians within the last few years for the purposes of sale for the benefit of the Indians. In all cases the land has been sold at public auction, duly advertised, and the prices realized have been, I think everybody will admit, fair prices as compared with the value of surrounding land. We have had some sales within the last few days. Land that belonged to a band near Ponoka brought an average of $11 an acre. Lands were also sold near Battleford and in other parts of the country and I think the records will show that we secured a fair average price. I will be very glad to produce the returns of the sales if it is desired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My reason for referring to that is that two years ago we had the returns brought down showing the sales of lands that were disposed of, and, as I have already stated, the bulk of these lands were not disposed of by public tender and in fact a very small proportion of them have been disposed of by public tender. I am very glad to know that the minister is now disposing of the lands by public tender.

Mr. OLIVER. By auction.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I might assure my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that if he will inquire as to the men employed in this department in the outside service he will find that there are a hundred of them and that a large sum of money amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars is going to men employed by this department engaged in other walks of life throughout the country.

Mr. BRADBURY. I cannot help but contrast the remarks of the minister with the facts regarding the sale of lands. I understood him to say that all the Indian reserves which had been surrendered had been sold at public auction and that they had brought fair prices. I would like to recall to the minister the surrender of the St. Peter reserve which is a very important subject in Manitoba. That reserve was surrendered and nearly half of the reserve has been practically given away. It was given in the first place to the Indians on the condition that they would agree to the surrender. The Indians were left unprotected. The department made no effort to protect them and nearly 22,000 acres of this land fell into the hands of speculators at a less sum than $5 per acre when it was admitted to be well worth $15 or $20 an acre. The balance of some 20,000 acres was sold, as the minister says, at public auction. It was advertised and the auction took place about this time of the year. But very strange to say the advertising was so managed that the public were not aware that the auction was going on. The men who bought the land and who attended the auction at St. Peter where, in every case, or, I think nearly every case, the men who had secured the land from the Indians and I think that if the minister will look into the matter he will find that the prices secured even by auction for the St. Peter reserve were away below what the land was worth. The department has an Indian agent in the town of Selkirk. That man, I presume, is supposed to look after the interests of the Indians. In this case whether his hands were tied by the department or not I do not know, but I am inclined to think they were. There was no effort made on the part of the agent to protect the Indians. I understand—and I think I can produce the evidence before the House rises—that the Indian agent himself was in collusion with the land dealers and that he purchased some of these lands from the Indians. I do not know but I think it is likely that the minister is well aware of these facts because the matter was brought to his attention while he was in Winnipeg. I would desire very much that the minister should cause some investigation to be made into the manner in which the St. Peter Indians have been treated. They have a serious grievance. The Indians feel that they have been practically robbed of their rights. In addition to that the state has lost a great deal of money because of the fact that when the Indian loses and becomes pauperized the state has to step in and take care of him.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to the case of the Indians of the St. Peter's reserve I said that all land which had been sur-

rendered by the Indians had been sold by public auction. The land of the St. Peter's reserve that was surrendered by the Indians was sold by public auction. If it did not bring the price that it should have brought I regret it very much, but if at a point within twenty miles of the greatest centre of real estate speculation in the known world an advertised sale of real estate takes place and a fair price is not realized I submit it is not the fault of the Indian Department. In the transaction that took place in securing the surrender by these Indians of their land the department placed itself in the hands of a gentleman against whose character or ability I do not think any person in the province of Manitoba would utter one word.

Mr. FOSTER. Namely?

Mr. OLIVER. He is now the chief justice of Manitoba--Chief Justice Howell. He was, in fact, the Chief Justice of Manitoba at the time. He made such an arrangement with the Indians as was possible in order to secure their consent. The presence of the Indians upon that reserve was an open sore that could not be healed as long as that presence continued. My hon. friend who represents that constituency knows perfectly well that that is the case and will not deny it. It was sound public policy to secure the surrender by the Indians of their land at that place and to secure their removal as far as was possible to some other locality better suited to their nature and to their natural and proper modes of life. In order to secure the surrender Chief Justice Howell was given a free hand and, in the process of securing the surrender, an arrangement was made whereby these Indians—who, by the way, are only Indians in name, who are, as a matter of fact, half-breeds, as well able, in the large majority of cases, to look after their own business, as any member of this House—insisted that they should individually receive for their own personal use and benefit some portion of the land on this reserve and that they should receive that land free from any control or supervision by the Indian Department. That was the condition of the surrender, and having faith in the disinterested motives, the ability, and the honour of the Chief Justice of Manitoba the Indian Department believed these were the best terms upon which we could secure the surrender in the interest of every one. The surrender having been secured on these terms the land which the Indians individually claimed they were entitled to was allotted to them and they disposed of it as they had the right to do under the terms of the surrender, to whomsoever they pleased and on such terms as they agreed upon.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the allotment to each individual?

Mr. OLIVER. About 15 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that to each head of a family?

Mr. OLIVER. To each individual Indian. My information is that the price that the Indians received for this land which they held individually and which they sold individually was to all intents and purposes the price which was received at the auction sale by the Indian Department of the land which the band surrendered.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was that?

Mr. OLIVER. About 24,000 acres was surrendered for sale and was sold by auction and realized about $5 per acre or about the same price as the Indians received for the land which they sold at private sale. Since that time it has transpired that some of the Indians who have sold, claim they have not been paid in full according to the terms of the bargain, but that is a matter in which the Indian Department has no legal right to interfere. Of course, if it is a fact that the Indians have not been properly dealt with by the parties to whom they sold it is possible that the department might take an advisory interest in the matter, the interest of a solicitor for a client. But the department has no legal standing in that transaction. Now, the conditions were arrived at as the result of the best judgment of the Chief Justice of Manitoba and in the estimation of the Indian Department the transaction has been good not only for the constituency of my hon. friend and the province of Manitoba, but is essentially in the interest of the Indians themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. What instructions were issued to Judge Howell?

Mr. OLIVER. I am under the impression that the papers were brought down last session but if not they can be laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Indian Department hand over the whole matter of getting a surrender to Judge Howell, under instructions, instead of availing itself of its own officers or agents?

Mr. OLIVER. An official of the department took the surrender in its proper form but the negotiations were carried on by Judge Howell. There was an extra complication in this case in that there were claims of private owners interspersed with the lands of the Indians and there was a dispute between them and Judge Howell was appointed to adjudicate on the dispute and at the same time if possible to secure a surrender of the Indian lands.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the general quality of the land?

Mr. OLIVER. It varies. I understand that generally speaking it is very good land

but parts of it run into marsh so that there is quite a variation in the value.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am a little surprised at the explanation given by the minister. He first started out to say that all the lands surrendered by the Indians were sold by competition, but he knows that every acre that the Indians received from the government was part of the land they surrendered. They first surrendered the Indian reserve and then the government gave them, not 15 acres but 16 acres for every soul on the reserve. There is nobody trying to cast any reflection on Chief Justice Howell's integrity or ability. I think perhaps he did the very best he could, but it is history in Selkirk that when he went there to negotiate the treaty there was no agitation in the town or surrounding district for the surrender. I have failed to hear or see where the representation came from to the government to take that action. There was no petition from the residents of the town of Selkirk who were directly interested. The surrender was brought about I think by the late member for Selkirk and a few of his friends, and when Chief Justice Howell came down the Indians refused to negotiate for the surrender. They did not desire to give up the reserve. The consequence was that before the surrender could be secured some deal had to be made with the chief and council. I think I can produce evidence that there was a deal made with the chief and council by which they were promised a certain amount of money and a great deal more land than the ordinary Indian would receive if they would consent to the surrender. They did consent and immediately the chief and council received 196 acres while the ordinary Indian received only 16 acres. I am told that in addition to that the chief and council were promised $200 in cash to agree to the surrender. After all this was done, they had to call the band together to secure its consent, and I am told on very good authority that after a good deal of canvassing and a good deal of bribing and the free use of whisky, the consent of the band was secured to that surrender by a majority of one vote.

The department must have been aware of these facts. The minister says the Indian refused to surrender his lands unless he had absolute control of the sixteen acres allotted to him. I do not doubt that, but I do not think there is any question that the Indian was instructed by the men who were seeking to get control of his land to put in that plea. I do not think that would justify the department in leaving the Indian unprotected. The Indian of St. Peter's reserve is just as much an Indian as any Indian in Canada to-day, so far as business affairs are concerned. My hon. friend says that he is as capable of transacting business as the average man. There is not one man in a dozen on St. Peter's reserve who has the slightest knowledge of any written document; he will sign anything he is asked to sign; you can get him to sign away his land for a mere trifle. The price obtained for the land, the minister says, he considers a fair price. I would ask the minister, is it not a fact that the chief justice who negotiated the treaty has himself within the last month approached the minister and made representations to him to the effect that the Indian has been unfairly treated and has not received fair value for his property. I know that in the city of Winnipeg the land titles office has held up every one of the patents, because representations have been made to that office that the Indian has been defrauded and has not received a fair value for his land, because when he signed an agreement for the disposal of his land, he was led to believe that he was only agreeing to give the man the first choice of purchasing it on the issue of the patent. Instead of that, it turned out to be an absolute quit claim deed of the property. This I am sure the minister must be aware of. I myself have brought it very clearly to his attention before. Mr. F. Heap, lawyer, of Selkirk, and Mr. J. O. Clark, of Winnipeg, were both employed and paid by the department, one to look after the interests of the Indian, the other to look after the interests of the old settlers. Neither of these men had any interest in protecting the interest of the Indian. The Indian was thrown entirely on his own resources, which meant that he was thrown into the hands of the land speculators. Nobody attempted to protect him. The department turned their back upon the Indian and told them to do as they liked with their lands. The result is that the lands have passed into the hands of speculators at one-third of their value. The lands comprising the old St. Peter's reserve are the best available farm lands in the province of Manitoba; and the land that was left, after the sixteen acres that were allotted to the different Indians, fell into the hands of speculators. These men bought in the sixteen acre lots here and there. I know a man who got 1,000 acres in one block. At the time he secured this land, the government had surveyors on the ground, and he went to them and had them lay out the land, and he picked out the best land that could be secured in one block to satisfy these allotments; so that every allotment fell into the hands of speculators, and they picked out the best land to satisfy the claims of the individual Indians. The remnant of the reserve, something like 20,000 acres, if I remember correctly, after all the best lands had been picked out was put up at auction. The advertisement for this sale was published in

such a way that the public were not really aware that it was on. The sale was brought on when the snow was on the ground. There was no crying need of rushing that sale. It would have been more in the interest of the Indians and in the interest of the public if the sale had been put off until next spring. The men who attended the sale in Selkirk were, with one or two exceptions, the very men who had been going around among the Indians acquiring their rights, and there was very little, if any, competition among them. This the department is thoroughly aware of. The Indian agent at Selkirk was paid by the department to look after the interests of the Indians. The Indian is absolutely under the control of the Indian agent, to whom he looks to protect his interest, and he will do whatever he is told by him. At the time the surrender of the lands was made, I had not the honour of a seat in this House, and I wrote to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) requesting him to ask the minister across the floor if any protection would be given to any body who secured any of these lands from the Indians until after the patent issued. The minister answered in what I thought was a very proper manner. He said no, that the Indian had no land to sell until such time as the patent issued, and the department would take no responsibility and would protect nobody who bought these lands. In addition to that, a letter was written from the department by one of the officers instructing the Indian agent to make it known all over the reserve that if any man pledged his land or disposed of it in any way before the patent issued, such pledge or transfer would not be recognized by the department. I have a copy of that letter, which I would have brought if I had known that this matter were coming up to-day. In the face of that letter, about 22,000 acres of these lands passed into the hands of speculators before the patent issued, and the department recognized those deals and handed over the patents to these men. I understand that the department requires, before any patent shall issue, that an application shall be made, signed by the Indian entitled to the patent, and again when the patent is handed over by the agent, the instruction of the department is that the particular Indian should make application for it and sign a receipt when he receives it. I do not think there are 20 men on that reserve who made applications for patents or signed receipts. I have evidence in my desk which I shall produce later, to prove that the large majority of these people never saw their patents. The patent was simply handed by the Indian agent to the speculators. This is a serious matter and I would ask the minister to grant an investigation. I am sure that Chief Justice Howell himself would urge that an investigation be granted in order that justice be done these Indians. I am satisfied that not one of these men has received more than one-third the value of his land. The Department of Indian Affairs must bear the full responsibility of the wrong done these Indians on the St. Peter's reserve. It is not too late to remedy this great wrong, because every one of these patents is held up by the lands titles office, and it is a blessing that there is some power in the land which will take cognizance of a wrong of that kind. These patents have been held there for the last five or six months. The registrars in Winnipeg, the gentlemen standing between the Indians and the speculator who has wronged them, have no special right to do so. They are not the custodians of the Indian lands or guardians of the Indians, but the minister is; and I appeal to him, in the interest of justice, to grant an investigation by impartial men. I feel satisfied that the men who helped to negotiate this treaty and who are in charge of affairs in that department, are responsible to a great extent, and therefore I ask an investigation by independent men, not closely identified with the department. The minister is hardly right when he says he has no power to protect the Indians in this case. The best legal minds of Winnipeg differ with him on that point, and I am sure that Chief Justice Howell will not take that position. The Indians claim that they were fraudently dealt with, that the agreements they signed were only agreements providing that when the parties received their patents, the men who advanced them two or three dollars an acre, and in many cases from $2.50 to $5, would have the first rights to purchase the lands at a price to be fixed by the Indians, and if they were not willing to pay that price the Indians were to return the money at a fair rate of interest. This is the manner in which the deed was interpreted to the band by the chief and council. The very first move made was to purchase the chief and council. These men were bought and bribed to deceive the band. I think the department is well aware of the fact. The Indian agent at Selkirk, instead of defending these people and protecting their rights, was himself in the market to buy these lands.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the last statement of my hon. friend. He said that the first move made in connection with this surrender was to bribe the chief and councillors with land and money, and some little time ago he said whisky.

Mr. BRADBURY. I said that when the consent of the band was given at a meeting to agree to a surrender, whisky was then used among these men to get them to vote, and even with the aid of whisky only one of a majority was secured. Surely that was not sufficient to turn these men out of house and home.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend said that the first move to secure the surrender was the bribing of the chief and council with land and money. Now the negotiations with the band were open. The first move to secure the surrender was made by Chief Justice Howell of Manitoba; and if the chief justice opened his negotiations by bribing the chief and council with land and money, my hon. friend will have to take the responsibility of making that assertion.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not think that anything I said would lead this House to believe that I insinuated that the chief justice had anything to do with the bribing. I do not think I said that. I am sure I did not mean to. What I said was the absolute facts, that the land speculators—no doubt the men who induced the minister to throw that reserve open—were the men who did the bribing and gave the whisky.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will have to be more careful in what he says because the men, who are not concerned in the department, were not able to give any land or to bribe the chief or councillors with land. The only bribe of land that could be given, could have been given by whoever made the surrender arrangement, and that man was Chief Justice Howell.

Mr. BRADBURY. Let me point out this fact. The chief and the councillors received, I think, five times as much land as the ordinary Indians. That was one of the inducements offered. I do not mean to say it was offered as a bribe, but it certainly was an inducement. The other statement I made that the Indian chief and council were promised money is absolutely true. That was not done by Chief Justice Howell, but by the men who set out to get the Indian chief and council to agree to meet Chief Justice Howell. These men would not meet the chief justice. They did not want to surrender their homes, but there were men in Selkirk who got hold of the chief and council and made it appear to their interest to meet Chief Justice Howell and agree to that surrender.

Mr. OLIVER. Again my hon. friend has used the word bribe and used it in connection with the distribution of land among the Indians. Bribe is an ugly word. Whoever gives a bribe must be responsible, and whoever makes a charge must be equally responsible for his accusation. If the giving of the land was a bribe, that was given by Chief Justice Howell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly. There was no other authority to give it or to make the arrangement, and the arrangement was made open and above board. It was considered fair and right that the chief and councillors should get a larger share of the land than the other Indians, and my hon. friend is not well advised in using the word bribe in connection with that part of the transaction, and he must take the responsibility of having accused the chief justice of bribery.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not think the minister has any right to keep reiterating that statement. I have explained that I did not state that the chief justice had given this bribe.

Mr. HUGHES. Are the chief and councillors hereditary in that position? If they are not, why should they get any more than any one else? If they are selected, they should get the same as any one else.

Mr. OLIVER. As to whether they should or should not get this amount, I am not pretending to say. If my hon. friend says they should not get it, then he stands with my other hon. friend in holding that the government acted improperly, that the negotiations were improper, and therefore the man who made the negotiations was guilty of an impropriety. When my hon. friend makes an accusation he ought to stand to it, and when he says 'bribed' he ought to stand by the word, and admit that he made an accusation that was not warranted by the facts. As to the assignments from the Indians to the purchasers of their lands, the House and the public were informed that no assignments would be recognized by the department, and in every case my information is that the patent was made out to the Indian and not to any body else, and it was handed to the Indian. Now I ask the House in all fairness how is the Indian Department to be made responsible for the disposition that the Indian subsequently made of that patent, a patent which he received under the agreement of surrender negotiated as I have stated? It was his to do with as he pleased. It may be that it was not proper to give him a patent with which he could do as he pleased. But that was a part of the terms of surrender, negotiated as I have said, on the responsibility I have explained to the House. I say it is unfair and unreasonable to suggest responsibility on the part of the Indian Department to control the action of the Indian in regard to a matter that was placed absolutely under his control by the terms

of the surrender of the reserve. As to the difference in price between the land that was sold by the Indians to private parties and the land that was sold by auction, it must surely appear to any one that little patches of land in areas of 16 acres do not have the same value in a farming country such as Manitoba as an area of 160 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. No, if they all remain 16 acre areas. They were not allowed to remain in 16 acre areas.

Mr. OLIVER. They were allowed to remain in 16 acre areas. If I bought 16 acres of you and 16 acres of another man and 16 acres of another man and so on, I have to take my chances of being able to get those different parcels brought together so as to make a single block. Does my hon. friend suggest that that land would be as valuable to me as if I could have bought the whole 160 acres in one lot?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, if you knew you could get it all put together.

Mr. OLIVER. How could you know? There was no way you could know. If Brown, Jones and Robinson each held single patents for 16 acre lots of land, how are you going to ensure that Brown, Jones and Robinson are going to lump their sections together at your convenience, unless you pay them for it? So I say if that land was sold in blocks of 160 acres it is surely more valuable than the land that was sold in 16 acre pieces. The plea that the land did not bring its full value, that the auction sale was not well known, is, I submit, not worthy of consideration. There is no doubt that the sale was advertised in the public press, and as I said before, it was advertised in a centre of population and business which has the keenest eye for real estate speculation of any place in the known world. I am satisfied that whatever the land may be worth to-day, it realized its full value at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it sold?

Mr. OLIVER. About a year ago.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister says that the value they received at that time was the full value. Now I would like to ask him if it is not a fact that the chief justice who negotiated this treaty has himself brought it to the attention of the minister that the Indians, in his opinion, had not received fair value for their land?

Mr. OLIVER. The chief justice never said anything to me about the value that was received at public auction. No word was said to me by any one except by my hon. friend in this House, indicating that the land which was sold at auction did not bring its fair value at that time, or that there was not every opportunity given to the public who wished to invest in those lands. Now I submit that when the Indian Department does that, it does all it can do, all it was expected to do, all any reasonable man could expect it to do. In regard to the Indians who sold their own lands privately, if my hon. friend is anxious to hear private conversations, I will say that I did have a private conversation with the Chief Justice of Manitoba, and he told me he had heard that some of these Indians had not received full value for their land; he said he had heard it, but he had no knowledge of the matter beyond the treaty; but he had heard so, and he thought that it was right to let me know it. As I have said, it is a matter perhaps of oversight. But I want to point out to the House that the department has no legal standing in that matter because of the terms of the surrender which was made on the responsibility that I have mentioned.

Now in regard to the attitude of the registrar of the land titles in Manitoba, this gentleman is a provincial officer, he has certain duties to perform, and is responsible to those who appointed him for the performance of those duties. The registrar of land titles in the province of Manitoba is responsible, and his actions are no concern of ours. The titles to these lands were registered in the Selkirk registry office under the system of registration there prevailing. When the people who acquired the titles desired to bring these lands under the Torrens system, they took them to the gentleman my hon. friend has mentioned, and it is between the registrar and the purchaser as to whether their title is in proper shape or not. So far as we are concerned, the titles are registered in the proper office. I submit that while we have an interest in seeing that the purchasers get their titles and in helping them to get their titles as far as we can, we have absolutely no responsibility in the matter beyond seeing that the Indians get the full price for the land that was theirs to sell and do what they pleased with.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister make any statement as to the Indian agent?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I cannot make any statement in regard to the agent. If my hon. friend can establish that the Indian agent trafficked in these lands as he should not do, I will guarantee that the agent will cease to be agent on very short notice, but, so far, I have no knowledge of that fact. Certainly it did not come within the scope of our arrangement. My hon. friend has stated perfectly clearly that we gave certain instructions from the office here which we believed would be in the interests of the Indians and all parties concerned. That was our duty in the matter and so far as we are aware those instructions have been carried out. If they have not been carried out then those who should have carried

them out of course will have to suffer, but that does not in any degree establish any responsibility against the department for the action of the Indians who, under the terms of surrender, were secured in their right to do as they pleased with what was their own.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it not anticipated that they would do just what they have done, that is, get rid of the lands very quickly and at a very inadequate price?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that it was or that it was not. That was a matter for the consideration of the gentleman upon whose good judgment we relied in the negotiations with the Indians.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Surely the minister does not believe that the department can shield itself by giving a free hand as he says to some gentleman and then saying: He advised so and so and we have no further responsibility about it.

Mr. OLIVER. We do not propose for an instant to shelter ourselves behind anybody, but it is necessary that the House should be made aware of the circumstances under which the surrender was secured and it would be unfair to the House not to state to them the terms of that surrender. I have already said that we take full responsibility and I believe that the surrender was made on the best terms that could be secured, that it was sound public policy to secure it and it was in the interest of the town of Selkirk, of the constituency of Selkirk, of the province of Manitoba and of the Indians concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. After what the minister has heard publicly and privately does he propose to take any steps towards investigating this transaction?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have said to the House, we are interested in seeing as far as we can that those who are in our wardship get value for what is theirs, and so far as that is concerned, our intention is to investigate; what I am trying to impress upon the House is the difference between a legal responsibility and an advisory responsibility. That is the difference between the position my hon. friend desires to hold us in and the position that we consider we are entitled to be in.

Mr. FOSTER. I heard a good deal about this personally from various parties in Winnipeg and in Selkirk; in fact it is common talk there. I may have mingled with people who were not altogether disinterested, although I think in certain cases I got my information from people who were disinterested, but I can tell the minister that the general opinion, so far as I could gather, is that a great wrong has been done. Sentiments of that kind have been expressed to me by people on both sides of politics; in fact I found no other opinion existing. I think the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has done his duty and was perfectly justified in bringing this matter before the committee as he has done, and I was glad to hear the minister say that he proposed not to let it rest at this particular stage, although he qualified himself in some way that I could hardly understand as to the scope of the investigation that he would hold. But two facts remain and they are to my mind uncontrovertible. You can go anywhere you like in Manitoba and you cannot find an equal area together of better lands than the lands in this reserve, that have gone in this way out of the reserve largely into the hands of speculators. It is also, I think, an absolute fact that $5 an acre for these lands is the merest bagatelle. The minister may stand there from now till doomsday and say he thinks that a fair value was got for these lands but he could not convince me. The lands are beautifully situated, they are on each side of the river, they are near to the town of Selkirk; in fact they jut right into the town at certain places, and are within easy communication. As to the quality of the soil there is but one opinion, they are prime lands. And yet, an auction sale, said to have been well advertised within a very small distance of the centre of real estate activity, realizes only $5 per acre for these prime lands.

Mr. BRADBURY. Less than $5.

Mr. FOSTER. Less than $5 I am told, but the minister said $5 per acre in the bulk.

Mr. OLIVER. I must have been a little wrong, they realized a little over $6.

Mr. FOSTER. Say over $6, the difference of $1 in this consideration matters very little indeed. If the minister puts up school lands in the far northwest, he will get prices, five, six or seven times as great as those obtained here. The reason he gets it there is that while the lands are not better situated or of better soil, the competition is keener, and the competition is keener because people are advised that these lands are to be sold, they attend the sale and run up the price to the limit of what they consider they are able to pay for lands of that quality. Yet in this garden of Manitoba, prime lands, beautifully situated along the river, realize only $5 or $6 per acre in the bulk. It is common talk there that these lands have gone into the hands of speculators. I have myself seen some of the men who have bought them, and they are speculators and speculators simply. They do not propose to sell these lands at $6 or $7 or $8 an acre; I think there is no doubt that the ultimate purchaser will pay three, four or five times the price that has been realized. What is

the position of the minister, who is the guardian of the Indians, who is their trustee and who must not simply shuffle off his duties into the hands of even the chief justice, and then shelter himself, as the minister certainly does, behind the argument that he gave it over to the chief justice and that he only carried out the arrangement that the chief justice made. If any man ought to have protected the Indian, it was the Indian agent who represented the department and the department itself which is the trustee for the Indian. Now, the minister is no chicken. He is well versed in business matters. He knows the history of the whole of the scrip business in the Northwest, he knows how the cormorants got after the Indian or the halfbreed and how they got his scrip or allotment of land by virtually wheedling it from him for whisky or an infinitesimally small part of its value. He knows that what takes place in one case will very likely take place in another, and if the minister did not take all the precautions he could to see that this rich land which belonged to these Indians, when it was taken from them and sold to the public, brought to these Indians at least fair value for what their possession was, he certainly did not do his full duty. Have they got their fair value? I do not believe they have; I do not think there is a man in this House who believes they have. Could the department have taken precautions to have prevented them being sacrificed in the way in which they were and thrown out with a very small, if any, pittance upon which to live? The department could have done it if it had done its whole duty, and its proper officers, in their proper places, had shown as much disposition to protect the Indians as some of them, I am told, had to get a slice of what was the Indians valuable possession.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the minister if the 22,000 acres that were sold by public auction were all sold in bulk and at one time?

Mr. OLIVER. They were sold by quarter-sections but at the one auction sale.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Having devoted parts of two sessions to a study of the Indian Department and knowing, as I do, considerable about that department, I feel satisfied that the minister has not given sufficient attention to it, and that the officers in that department are woefully incapable of handling the affairs of the Indians of this country. There is no doubt in my mind about it. There is no doubt in my mind that for the last ten years the Indian Department has been disposing of lands belonging to the wards of this nation in a manner which is not only unfair to the Indians but most unfair to the people of this country. I am satisfied that if the minister will devote more time and attention to that department and see to it that in future at least lands will not be squandered in the manner in which they have been in the past he will be doing a very great favour, not only to the Indians, but to those of our people who are interested in their welfare. Some 600,000 acres of land have been disposed of since this government came into power, and tens of thousands of acres of that land have been sold at from ten to fifteen cents an acre, when there was no need of it being disposed of. Islands have been sold at a dollar apiece. Yet the minister will stand up and say that this department is being conducted in the best possible manner. I sincerely hope that the minister will devote more attention to the Indian Department and see that affairs are run in a better manner than they have been in the past.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What inducements were offered to the chief and council beyond what the band got and why?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the chief received 320 acres and the councillors 160 acres each. That was a matter that was discussed in council and was satisfactory to the Indians, to all the members of the band, or, at any rate, to the majority who voted for the surrender.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister answer the latter part of the question, and let us know why these parties were entitled to more than the ordinary members of the band.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that question. I did not negotiate the treaty for the surrender. I have already given to the committee the responsibility upon which the surrender was negotiated and the department felt it wise to accept the terms that had been arranged.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Has the minister any information to give to the House to show that the ordinary members of the band knew before the agreement was surrendered that the chief and council were to get these extraordinary inducements?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I am informed that the provisions of the surrender, including the large grant of land to the chief and councillors, were read and explained in detail to the Indians and were discussed for two days by the band before the surrender was signed.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the minister kindly advise us how long these lands were advertised and in what papers ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot offhand give my hon. friend a list of newspapers, but

I am informed that the sale was advertised in the Toronto 'Globe,' the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and the local Selkirk paper and the advertisement was continued for a period of from four to six weeks. I can give my hon. friend the exact data at a later date, but I have forgotten it at the moment.

Mr. STAPLES. Was the sale advertised in the local Selkirk papers?

Mr. OLIVER. It perhaps would not be well to answer offhand because I am not perfectly certain. It is a question of fact. It can be settled without difficulty later on. If my hon. friend would leave it for the present I can satisfy him at another time.

Mr. STAPLES. There should have been no difficulty in securing full value for these lands if they had been properly advertised. Take, for example, the reserve at Swan Lake, which the minister was good enough to reclaim, advertise and sell. It was sold last summer. I had been at the minister for several years, in fact, since I came into this House, endeavouring to have these lands recovered from the Indians and put on the market. The lands lay in very much the same position with reference to the town of Swan Lake as the lands in question lie to the town of Selkirk. As the minister knows, the sale of the Swan Lake reserve was advertised in the principal papers and in the local papers. The lands were sold at public auction last summer and these lands, which are not any better, in my opinion, and, in fact, in regard to location, are not as valuable as the lands in question, brought all the way from $15 to $26 per acre. I did not hear the early part of this discussion but it seems to me that lands, such as have been sold within that reserve, should have brought from $15 to $30 per acre.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The answer of the minister to the effect that the ordinary members of the band knew and understood that the chief and council were getting those extraordinary inducements is rather disappointing to me. The minister knows quite well that any engagement entered into in writing between the Indian Department and the chief and council would in all likelihood be quite well understood by the chief and council, while it is very unlikely that it would be understood by the ordinary Indian. The Minister of the Interior is very anxious to-night about the reputation of the chief justice and as to how that reputation is attacked. It is clear to everybody that it has not been attacked nor has the conduct of the chief justice in any way been attacked by the member for Selkirk or by any other hon. member on this side of the House. But, Sir, whatever may have been said reflecting on what may have been done to the Indians is surely ascribable directly to the minister and to the department itself and not through the medium of the chief justice. If bribery is a correct term to apply, then that bribery is referable directly to the Department of the Interior itself. I am absolutely at a loss to understand why the department should see fit to grant land of this country to the chief and council of the band over and above what the members of the band were entitled to. The minister is in a quandary over that and so am I. Standing on his feet in the House the minister has admitted he could give no reason for it whatever. As is well known the chief and council of a band of Indians are simply elected only to hold their office terminating at the end of each year, and why that annual election should give them the right to hundreds of acres of land and perhaps other inducements, over and above the members of the band who elect them is certainly a mystery. But the purpose of it is only too clear, and if the minister considers bribery the proper word to describe it then it seems to me that his department is responsible. The chief and council in the natural course of events are above the average intelligence of the band; they have very considerable influence over the other members of the band; their word practically goes, for no ward in all the world is more easily influenced than the Indian, particularly by one of his own people who excells in intelligence. And, just so soon as the department, by whatever means they chose to adopt got the good will of the chief and council, they were very likely to get the good will and assent of the band in general. If the Department of Indian Affairs chooses to hand over the lands of this country to the chief and council, even with the assent of their wards the Indians, then it seems to me they ought to be willing to accept the word bribery as a proper word to apply to their conduct. We do not apply it to the chief justice at all, but I can think of no other word better applicable to the conduct of the officials of the department who adopted that method of getting this surrender from the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. The department absolutely accepts full responsibility for every transaction in connection with this surrender, and if the giving of this larger amount of land to the chief and to the councillors is bribery, then I have given to the House the advice on which it was done and we take the fullest responsibility for having done it. It was our responsibility and we stand to be condemned or approved for it. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) is somewhat in error in stating that the chief is elected only for a year; in this case he is elected for three years, but that is hardly to the point. I think

that the hon. gentleman rather contradicted his own argument when he suggested that the chief and councillors were only as the average of the band, and then said that the chief and councillors necessarily had great influence over the others.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I said they had only the same rights as the rest of the band, but that they had greater average intelligence.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend was strong on the point that the Indian could be persuaded to do almost anything you wanted him to do and that the chief had great control over the band. And as this is a rather important question; let me point out that in a recent surrender, the surrender on the Peigan agency, the chiefs were in the minority and the members of the band were in the majority, and the surrender was secured in spite of the adverse vote of the chiefs, and that was one of the objections raised against the surrender. In this case the chiefs were for the surrender and the vote was carried. Now, I want to say that the policy of the Indian Department, as it is at present administered, is to secure the surrender of Indian lands which are not being used beneficially by the Indians, so that they may be transferred at a fair price to white settlers who will use them beneficially, the country thereby receiving the benefit of increased production and increased wealth and the Indians receiving the benefit in money of the value of the land which they themselves were not able to realize. Furthermore, it is the policy of the department that where a reservation is situated near a town or close to a settlement, where conditions are in any degree as they were on that reserve at St. Peter's —and my information is that the conditions on that reserve were more deplorable by reason of the proximity of that reserve to the town than on any other reserve in the west—I say that where that condition exists it is the policy of the department to secure the removal of the Indians to a locality where they will not be subjected to the same temptations, and where it will be better for them in every way than to remain in that location. In regard to the value of the land, hon. gentlemen know that it is easy to say that land is worth more than is secured for it. I have seen the city of Winnipeg surrounded by vacant land that was not brought under cultivation when land 100 or 150 miles distant was closely settled. It is no use to say that because the land at Selkirk is good and because it is only 20 or 25 miles from Winnipeg that therefore it has a certain fixed value. The values of land depend on conditions and reasons that we do not always understand. If we always did understand them we probably would all be richer than we are to-day; it is because we do not understand these conditions that we do not make as much money out of real estate as we would like. I say it is no evidence that an adequate price was not received for that land to say that it was good land and that it was near the city of Winnipeg. I say that when an auction sale of this land was duly advertised and the land was sold, that the price that was received at that auction sale is evidence as to the value of the land that it is not competent for any one to deny.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. At what time of the year was this auction held?

Mr. OLIVER. In the latter part of October or the early part of November, 1908.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister supply us with a list of the purchasers of the land and the prices paid in each case?

Mr. OLIVER. I can if I am given time.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would agree to supply it when this matter is again discussed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the practice of the department to send a man out to investigate the land and ascertain its value before disposing of it?

Mr. OLIVER. All Indian land, before being put up for sale, is surveyed and valued by an officer of the department. The land in question was surveyed and valued by an officer of the department, and it sold at more than the valuation or of course it would not have been sold.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was the officer of the department an Indian agent in the district or an official from the department here?

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman who valued the land was Mr. McLean, one of the surveyors of the department, a man of long experience in the west and of very good reputation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The word bribe may not be a very good word to use, but I think it fits in very well with the circumstances of this case. I would like to ask why it was necessary to pay the councillors and chief anything to get their consent?

Mr. OLIVER. It is in accordance with the principle recognized the world over, that the man of higher position receives the greater recognition. In making a treaty with the Indians, we always give a larger amount of treaty money and a greater recognition in every way to the men of rank, the chief and the councillor, than to the other Indians. That principle was followed in this case.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Was this amount paid to them with the view of having them

influence the other Indians to sell their lands at a given price?

Mr. OLIVER. I would think the tendency would be quite the other way. According to my reasoning, it would have the opposite effect.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The Minister of the Interior has had too much experience in that western country and knows it too well to try earnestly to make anybody from Manitoba believe that he got a fair price for that land. He has tried to bolster up his case by saying that land near Winnipeg or Selkirk might be worth very little. That is quite true, but we know this land, and I do not hesitate to say that land just like it in the province of Manitoba, not near Winnipeg or Selkirk, but hundreds of miles from those places, is selling to-day at from $30 to $50 an acre. Somebody is responsible for this deal, and it should be investigated. It is only a repetition of what has been going on in that western country for some time—lands going into the hands of speculators, and one of the most disgraceful acts this government ever committed has been to appoint the man who did the most to sacrifice the lands of that country, to be chairman of a commission for the conservation of those lands.

Mr. CROTHERS. We have got considerable interesting information from the Minister of the Interior touching this transaction, but I cannot help thinking that he has withheld a good deal of interesting and material information which would enable us to determine whether or not this transaction was carried out in a businesslike manner. The minister might have gone a little further and told us what steps he had taken to inform himself as to the value of this piece of public property. Here were 22,000 acres of land to be sold, worth from $150,000 to $200,000. It would be interesting to learn from the minister whether or not he has gained any information, and if so from whom, as to the price he ought to obtain for this property. He has told us that the gentleman who surveyed these lots reported on their value; but surely it was not a business transaction to dispose of $200,000 worth of property on the strength of that single report. No private individual dealing with a piece of property of his own would ever think of disposing of it in that way. We all have had something to do with disposing of parcels of land, and we never accept the affidavit of one individual only as to the price of it. We get three or four men whose knowledge of the values of property in the district carries weight; we see to it that they are wholly disinterested; we have them go and examine the property; we get their three affidavits before we make up our minds what the property is worth; and then we inform the auctioneer of the reserve bid, and unless the offers reach that, the property is not sold. That is a business way of disposing of a piece of property, and the Minister of the Interior should have proceeded in that way. He has not told us that he got any information whatever except what he got from the surveyor, and I am informed that if all the facts were known his report would not carry very much weight. The Minister of the Interior and also the Minister of Public Works might learn a good lesson if he would study the methods adopted by the government of Ontario in disposing of public property. Let me give one illustration, and I could multiply it by scores. They had a piece of property a short time ago for sale. The highest offer was $50,000. But the Prime Minister said: I have private information that this property is worth a great deal more. And although they were his political friends who had offered the $50,000, he said: I am trustee for the whole of the people of Ontario, I am informed this property is worth a great deal more than $50,000 and you cannot have it. What was the result? He re-advertised the property for sale, and the very same men came forward and offered him $178,000 for the property. Then take public contracts. A short time ago the Ontario government advertised for the construction of a public building. The lowest tender was for a certain sum, but the Minister of Public Works said, I have had that matter investigated, I am informed that building can be erected for much less, we will build it ourselves. They engaged a foreman and put up the building and it cost ony 60 per cent of the lowest tender. That is only one or two instances to show that in Ontario public affairs are carried on in a businesslike manner.

This illustration you have just had of the sale of lands in Manitoba—and we had a dozen such cases last year—shows us that this government does not dispose of public properties in a businesslike manner. I do not wish to go into the particulars of the tenders but I submit that the minister has not—so far as we can judge from what information he has condescended to give us on this matter—taken a businesslike manner to dispose of this property in the interests of the poor Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose it is the privilege of an hon. member to say in this House anything he pleases. But since my hon. friend has been so very critical in this matter, let me repeat that in this particular case, the land was advertised in the public newspapers and was sold by public auction in parcels of 160 acres each, or 60 to 70 different parcels. It was valued, when surveyed, by a competent man and sold at a price above his valuation, and the transaction was in all respects quite on a par with the best illustration the hon. gentle-

man has given the House. Let me point out that the only difference, judging by the instances he gave us, is this, that there must be a difficult lot of people which the Ontario government have to deal with in Ontario.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister, when the main estimates come up, bring down a list of the papers in which these lands were advertised, also a list of the purchasers and the prices paid? Some of my hon. friends behind me asked if they were advertised in the Selkirk papers and the hon. gentleman could not answer the question.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was paid the auctioneer and who was he?

Mr. OLIVER. He was paid one half per cent of the selling price, not to exceed in all $200. I cannot give his name just now.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the minister undertake to say that he considers $6 per acre a fair price for this land?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I think that any land advertised in the public press for a reasonable time and offered for sale within a distance of 25 miles of Winnipeg is absolutely certain to bring its full value at that particular time.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am somewhat surprised at the minister's statement regarding the advertisement of those lands. As I said a few moments ago, although these lands had been advertised, there were conditions surrounding the whole transactions which practically frightened away ordinary purchasers. There was a letter from the department which seems to have been entirely overlooked by the minister. That letter was practically a warning to the people that the Indians had nothing to sell, and the average man got the Indian allotment and the balance of the reserves mixed up in such a manner that he was afraid to touch any land. I have a letter written by the department to the Indian agent, instructing him how to proceed. It is dated Department of Indian Affairs, Jan. 21, 1908, and is signed by Frank Pedley:

Copy.

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, January 21, 1908.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 12th instant (No. 2-37) in connection with the locations of Indians of the St. Peter reserve, in accordance with surrender, and given by them a short time ago, and in reply beg to say that action is being taken with as much expedition as possible to locate the Indians on the lands to which they may be found entitled, and you should notify them that there will be as little delay in arranging the matter as possible.

In connection with Indians disposing of or pledging their holdings, I beg to say that no transfer or pledge by any Indian will be in any way recognized by the department, and when it has been determined what land each Indian is entitled to receive, a patent for the same will be issued to such Indian, without regard to any claims by white men or others.

It is necessary to make this position of the department clear and as widely known as possible, as any recognition of rights by transfer would cause endless complication, and in order to prevent same it is incumbent on the department to issue grants only to the Indians found entitled to receive same.

The representatives of the Indians and the department will deal with all claims to land in accordance with the provisions of the sur render.

Your obedient servant,

FRANK PEDLEY,
Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

J. O. Lewis, Esq.

The point is this, that this letter was written to the Indian agent just at the time these lands were coming into the market. A great many people around Selkirk wanted to purchase some of these lands, including a lot of my own friends, but as soon as it was made known that the department would not recognize any pledges or transfers given by the Indians until after the patents were issued, not one of these men would buy an acre of that land. Not one of these men bought an acre of this land. But very strange to say, the men who did purchase these lands, every one of them, were supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now these men must have received a tip from the department, or from somebody, that these pledges or transfers would be accepted. I ask the minister now if it is not a fact that every acre of this land was secured by the speculators before the patents were issued, in defiance of that letter written by Mr. Frank Pedley of the Indian Department? This is an absolute fact, Mr. Chairman, and this is one of the reasons why I ask the minister to open up this question and make a fair investigation. Now, if this letter had never been written and these lands had been thrown on the market, these frauds would not have taken place. Some of my friends were willing to pay $25 an acre for pieces of the land, but they knew that unless they stood in with the Indian agent and the Indian Department, there was no guarantee they would ever receive their titles. I cannot understand how the minister, in face of the instructions given by his department, can get up and say that he assumes full responsibility for accepting the patents to-day, or accepting the transfers, and handing the patents over to those men who have purchased the lands in defiance of the instruction of the de-

partment. Why, according to this instruction not one of those allotments has been legally sold, and every one of them ought to be cancelled. Now so far as the Indian himself is concerned, it is the Indian I am fighting for to-day. I have no interest, nor have any of my friends, a dollar's interest in these lands, I am glad to say. I want to say this to the minister, that after this letter was written, one of the biggest speculators, one of the biggest holders of this land to-day, came to Ottawa to interview somebody here, I do not know who. But I met him on the train going back, and he said to me: I have fixed the thing all right, I am going to buy the land, and if you like you can come in with me. I answered that it might be my duty, if I were elected, to criticise this matter in the House of Commons, and consequently I could not invest one dollar in the land. That fact, Mr. Chairman, is, I think, evidence that there was collusion between the purchasers and some official in the Department of Indian Affairs. These men who purchased those lands, who were putting up thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to be given to these Indians, do you not think they knew that they were safe? There was no risk so far as they were concerned, they were going to get their patents in defiance of that letter, and they got them; and the only reason why the deal has not gone through is because the Land Titles Office at Winnipeg has held up every one of those patents on account of the alleged fraud on the face of the whole transaction. I hold in my hand a petition from 110 Indians, some of those men that have been wronged, and I am going to present it to this House. I had no idea this discussion was coming on, and consequently I am not as well prepared for it as I would liked to have been, as there is other evidence that I will bring before the House later on. This letter was written from St. Peter's, November 1, 1909, and is addressed to myself:

We, the undersigned, beg to lay before you their following grievances. The surrender of the St. Peters reserve was made on the 24th September, 1907. A few days after the surrender was made, land buyers came and bought land, first of all buying from the chief and council.

Then they hired the chief and council at $2 a day to remain in the offices, and around the offices, and to bring in other men who owned land and induce these Indians to sell to these men.

After this was done, then they were hired to influence their people to sell land, telling them until such time the issuing of patents, a proper bargain could be made, hence the land was sold, and the majority of Indians never made an application for their patents. However, the patents were issued, the Indians only heard of the same, never even having the privilege of seeing their patents.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, that this is an Indian letter, which fact explains the peculiarity of the language.

The Indians were entirely ignorant as to the nature of the documents they signed when selling land, for the reason that no proper interpretation was given at the time of sale or any other time, and that is the reason why there is so much complaint.

There is another matter which we think would be necessary to be understood properly. There were application forms at the Indian office, and each head of a family had to make an application in person for his or for her patent. This was never done, with but a few exceptions. When issuing of patents there were another kind of forms at the Indian office which had to be signed by the Indians before receiving their patents. This was never done, with but a few exceptions. We think it would be only proper to demand those forms in order that you may understand more fully as to the nature of the same.

The hon. gentleman says to-day it was 320 acres. These men are a little more moderate.

With regard to allotment of land, the chief received 196 acres. Each individual councillor received 136 acres, an ordinary Indian received 16 acres. Besides the chief and councillors received more money than the ordinary Indian.

Now, I want the minister to listen to this part:

The land buyers were the parties that selected the choice land, the Indians were simply onlookers. That is the treatment the Indians received from their so-called chief and councillors. In some instances the Indians were only receiving less than $2 per acre, some received $2.50, some $3, and some $4 and $5 to the acre, and some are entirely ignorant as to what sum they received. We are all fully aware that our land was fully worth at least from $15 to $20 per acre.

Trusting that you will be able to understand the nature of our grievances, humbly requesting that you will use your influence to bring the matter before the House if possible, your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed by 110 of the men that have been wronged. Now, Mr. Chairman, in face of all this evidence, in face of the many complaints that the minister himself has received personally, in face of the position that the chief justice takes, the man who negotiated this treaty, in face of the fact that the registrar at Winnipeg refused to allow these patents to go through is it not reasonable that I, the representative of that constituency, should ask the minister to grant an investigation to find out whether these statements are true, or false, to find out whether these Indians have been wronged or not. The minister cannot shield himself behind the fact that the Indian refused to allow him, or to allow

his officials, to insert in the surrender a clause which prevented the department from protecting them. These Indians were mere children, these Indians up to that time had been wards of the government. Every pound of tea they secured from the Indian Department was obtained through the Indian agent. Consequently, the Indian was utterly incompetent to deal with a matter of this kind, quite incompetent to dispose of an acre of land; but suddenly the department made him a landlord. I do not suppose that one of these Indians had ever owned an acre of land in his life before. The Indian had no idea of the value of what he possessed, but the chief and council were a little more intelligent and thoroughly unscrupulous. These men were purchased. In the first place, as the minister admits, they secured more lands than the others, 320 acres. The minister says the chief received this amount while the ordinary Indian, the man who had elected the chief and the council to protect his interests, received only sixteen acres of land. Why? I think it is a fair deduction to say that these Indians received that land in consideration of their inducing the rest of the band to agree to the surrender. In addition to that there is this other fact, which I wish to bring to the attention of the minister although he and his department are well aware of it: Although the term of office of the chief and council of these Indians expired in July in the very year of this transaction the department has refused to allow an election to take place in the band since. They have retained that chief and council there in defiance of the band. Petition after petition has been sent in asking that an election should be granted in order that they might have an opportunity of turning these men out of office. But in spite of all that the Indian Department keeps these men there. What for? To assist the land dealers in carrying out that nefarious transaction.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the department here can keep a chief and council in office in defiance of the band?

Mr. BRADBURY. That is what they have done. They have refused to allow the Indians in St. Peter's to have an election, although petition after petition has been sent in praying for justice. The band do not recognize the chief as their chief or the council as their councillors. Consequently they are practically in a disorganized condition to-day and the Department of Indian Affairs is directly responsible for it.

The whole transaction, from its very inception until the present time, has been notorious in Selkirk. Every one in Selkirk who knows anything about the manner in which the Indian agent and the lawyers employed by the Indian Department to protect these Indians have conducted this affair, realizes that a great wrong has been done to these people. I have here a statement brought down from the Department of Indian Affairs showing the fees paid to lawyers in this connection. One letter says:

I am directed to forward to you an account amounting to $1,509.65 received from the Hon. Chief Justice Howell, in connection with St. Peter's reserve.

There is another account of $1,093. Two of these lawyers, one being Mr. Heap, of Selkirk, were appointed to protect the interest of the Indians. Mr. Heap was looked on by the Indians as their solicitor and he advised them in many cases, but the strange part of the thing is that he was one of the land company who were purchasing this land. The whole transaction was carried on in a room not half the size of one of our committee rooms. The land buyers were in one end of the building, the Indian agent was in the other end, the lawyer was next door, and the chief and counsel were in attendance day after day bringing in these poor ignorant people and advising them to sell their land to this land company and these speculators. In face of the facts that have been adduced here to-day, in face of what the minister knows, I ask him again to grant a fair investigation into this transaction. It surely cannot do any harm to have an investigation into this transaction. It surely cannot do any harm to have an investigation. I feel satisfied in my own mind that wrong has been committed. I believe that these lands have passed into the hands of these purchasers at less than one-third, perhaps one-fourth of their value. I was surprised to hear the minister state that he believed that these lands had brought their full value at the sale. Let me illustrate for a moment. These lands were sold some time in November, 1908. The following spring the Indian reserve at Shoal Lake, hundreds of miles away, was put on the market. That land brought an average of $17.60 an acre, while the St. Peter's land, in the very garden of the province of Manitoba, has yielded the Indians much less than $5 an acre. After the lands were picked over, as I have stated in the earlier part of this discussion, the remnant of the reserve that was left to be sold by public competition, so-called—because it was only so-called, there was no competition about it—brought $5.68 an acre.

Let us take another illustration. At Beauséjour, 35 miles east from Winnipeg, a school land sale was held the same season, and some of the same men who had secured these lands from the Indians paid $22 an acre for school lands by no means

equal to what they secured at St. Peter's for less than $5 from the Indian, and $5.68 at the so-called auction. In face of these facts it must be apparent to the hon. gentleman that the Indians have not received a fair price for their lands. The question arises, what is the responsibility of the department? The hon. minister says they have no responsibility. They made a deal with the Indian to surrender his land. He agreed to take the 16 acres and another reserve, and as far as that allotment was concerned, he could do as he pleased, the department had no authority, no control and consequently did not intend to interfere. I think that is a short-sighted position. The Indian is a ward of the government and if he becomes pauperized this country must come to his assistance and feed him; consequently it is the duty of the department to see that he gets a fair value for every acre of his land. In addition to all these things the hon. minister knows, I am satisfied there are documents in his department which will show beyond any doubt, that there are to-day even more serious complaints from the Indians than those I have made regarding this transaction. This petition I received only yesterday and I am informed by letter that the chief himself, the man who was an instrument in the hands of these land sharks has since declared that he helped to deceive the band, that he did not tell the band the truth, that when these lands were being purchased the explanation given to the Indian in nearly every case was that the Indian was not signing away his lands but only signing an agreement that when the patents were issued, he would give the man advancing him the money, the first chance to buy the lands at the price fixed by the Indian.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in face of these facts, because I believe they are facts, I cannot see how the minister can hesitate one moment to grant a fair investigation. I do not think there is any doubt at all that it can be proven beyond any question that the Indian has been deceived. I do not think there is any doubt that when he signed these agreements he did not realize that he was signing away his rights to his land. He thought that these speculators were giving him an advance, loaning him money on his land. Do not overlook the point that the Indian was misled by the department itself. The department told the Indian that until such time as the patents could be issued the Indian had nothing to sell. The department is on record advising the Indians that they had nothing to sell until their patents were issued. Consequently the Indian did not realize that he was selling his land or that he was disposing of his rights. He said to himself: Here is the letter; the Indian agent tells me I have nothing to sell, and I am only signing an agreement that when I get something to sell I will make a bargain with these men who want my land. There is no question at all that that is the position that the Indian took in the matter. That is what he thought, and when you realize that every one of these agreements is an absolute transfer secured in defiance of this letter you will acknowledge that the minister has the authority and the right to step in and cancel every one of these agreements and you will acknowledge that it is his duty to do so. I have taken up a good deal more of the time of the committee than I expected to do. There is a good deal more to be said on this question, and unless the minister is prepared to grant a fair investigation I can only promise him that this debate cannot end here, because there are matters of very great importance that will have to be ventilated, and it would take up a good deal more of the time of the House than we have taken up this afternoon. But it is only fair, I think, if the minister were inclined to be fair, and he usually is, to ask that he will undertake to have this question thoroughly inquired into. I cannot understand why the minister, in a case of this kind, is hesitating. There must be something behind it that we cannot see, for if there ever was a case for interference by the trustees of these people it is this one. I feel satisfied that the minister ought to step in and tell us to-night that he will give a fair and impartial investigation into all these facts and see that the Indian gets a fair price for his land.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been intimated that very many of the members on both sides of the House have engagements which will prevent their being present to-night, and as we are likely to have a thin House I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November, 24, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

RESTAURANT OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). It becomes necessary to appoint a committee of the House of Commons to act in conjunction with the committee of the Senate in connection with the restaurant. As the present committee of the House has given such satisfaction during the past year, I would move that they be reappointed. I therefore move:

That the members of the House of Commons on the permanent Joint Committee on the restaurant be His Honour the Speaker, and Messrs. Monk, Harris, Macdonald and Stanfield.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

Grey:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st March, 1910, and, in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867', the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, Nov. 24, 1909.

Mr. FIELDING moved that His Excellency's message together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—RESIGNATION OF MR. LUMSDEN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, might I suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) that the papers brought down yesterday in connection with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden ought to be printed without delay. Perhaps he would be good enough to make a motion to that effect. Before he makes the motion I would like to ask whether this return includes all the papers. The motion that passed the House referred to any communications from Mr. Lumsden to the Prime Minister. I did not observe them in the papers. I do not know that there was any such communication but if there was one it should be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps there is. If there is such a communication I will bring it down to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This might perhaps be proceeded with in the meantime if the Prime Minister has no objection. I would move:

That Rule 72 relating to the printing of public documents be suspended in the case of the papers relating to the resignation of Mr. H. D. Lumsden, as Chief Engineer of the Transcontinental railway, and that all such papers be ordered to be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—DELAY OF RAILWAY PASSENGER SERVICE.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr Speaker, at this stage of the proceedings I am going to bring up as a question of privilege, the condition of the railways of this country in connection with the storm of yesterday, and I propose to show why myself and other members have not been able to get here because of the inefficiency of these roads. People who left Toronto the night before last only got here last night while others who left last night are only here now, with the result, that they missed their engagements yesterday and most of them to-day. It seems to me that the railway service in the province of Ontario, which has been organized for years, is altogether inadequate to the requirements of the country, especially between Toronto and Ottawa. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have promised to give us a line from Ottawa to Kingston connecting with their main system at that point, but it has not been built. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have promised to double track their system between Ottawa and Toronto, and this has not been done, although it has been promised for years. In consequence, whenever there is the slightest storm, the road breaks down, the public are not accommodated, and people are not able to keep their engagements. There is another thing which I notice and I believe it is the cause of the inferior railway service in this country, and it is that the railway men, the general managers, whenever they wish to travel, are so distrustful of their own system and so distrustful of the accommodation that the public have that they always go in private cars, with especially well equipped larders. This morning there were two railway magnates with special cars with well equipped larders and they were well looked after. The Chairman of the Railway Commission was there, and he was looked after while the general public was lacking accommodation. When the Minister of Railways travels he has so little confidence in the railways and the treatment that they give the general public that he has his private car. This is an abuse of the railway system of this country. The railway and political magnates travel in these specially equipped cars and we failed to make time last night—we were four hours coming from Smith's Falls—because the engine was overtaxed by these magnates' cars.

If these magnates want to travel on these special cars, and if they cannot give ordinary accommodation to the public, let them hook up to the freight trains. If, instead of that they were compelled to travel as the ordinary Canadian travels there would be a great improvement in the railway service of this country. I will venture to make the statement after a personal in-

vestigation that the equipment of our Canadian railways is always at the minimum. The moment there is a strain the service falls down, trains are delayed, and the ordinary public cannot keep their engagements. It is time the Minister of Railways took up this question in order to see that the city of Toronto and the city of Ottawa have better railway service than they have now and that an improvement takes place throughout the province of Ontario as well as in the older provinces of the Dominion. He will find that we cannot get here in time to attend to our duties because the energy of the railway managements is devoted rather to the acquisition of new lines in the west—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is right in discussing the matter as a question of privilege in so far as inconvenience and delay have been caused to himself in getting here, but not in undertaking to discuss the railway system generally. It must be confined to the question of privilege which is a question personal to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I quite admit what you say, Mr. Speaker, and I must accept your decision in the matter. But, I still say that if I were speaking to the question of privilege I would contend that the reason I am not able to get here in time is that the railway managers are not attending to their business and are not giving the accommodation they ought to. I hope that the Minister of Railways will find a way of stopping these magnates from delaying trains and that he will see that the railways are better equipped.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who was also on the same train as my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) I may say that it occurred to me in looking along the line that the delay was occasioned almost wholly by the breaking down of the telegraph and telephone lines, which I thought could be avoided if these were either put under or upon the ground, because the increased weight from the ice broke them down and the train was obliged to feel its way from station to station to avoid danger.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 27), respecting the British North American Mining Company.—Mr. Geoffrion

Bill (No. 28), respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 29), respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 30), respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—Mr. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 31), respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 32), respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 33), respecting the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 34), respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 35), respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 36), respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 37), respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. Donnelly.

Bill (No. 38), respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

DEATH OF MR. BARR.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, I have just returned from paying the last acts of respect to our late fellow member, Dr. Barr, the member for Dufferin. I have been requested by the Warden and other prominent gentlemen of the county of Dufferin, among whom our late colleague had spent his whole life, to convey to the government and parliament of Canada an expression of appreciation of their courtesy in furnishing a government car for the conveyance of the body of our late colleague to his home.

May I, as perhaps his most intimate colleague, take this opportunity to voice my deep sense of the great loss we have sustained through Dr. Barr's death.

BILL TO AMEND THE RAILWAY ACT—LABOURERS' PAY.

Mr. N. MARTIN (Ste. Marie, Montreal). introduced the Bill (No. 39) 'Act amending the Railway Act.'

(Translation) I will, Mr. Speaker, explain in a few words the object of this Bill. It is intended to amend section 259 of the Railway Act, in its relations to the labourers' pay. The railway companies as a custom pay their employees monthly. By this Bill I desire that these companies should be obliged to pay their men fortnightly.

Moreover, it is the custom with these companies to keep the pay of the first fifteen day of a new employee, which means that when an employee enters the service of the company, he must work during six weeks before receiving a month's salary. This reserve forms a very considerable sum on account of the great number of employees. It is no wonder to see the president of Canadian Pacific Railway Company receiving a salary of $50,000 a year, when this

company is able to economize a sum as large as the interest alone on the money which is kept back and remains in his hands.

I hope that these explanations are sufficient to satisfy the honourable members of this House. As to the merit of the Bill, I will discuss it more fully on the second reading.

(Motion adopted and Bill read for the first time).

QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. Has the report of the International Fisheries Commission, appointed to draft regulations respecting fishing in the international waters between Canada and the United States been completed and placed in the hands of the government? If not, when may such report be expected?

2. Will the report when presented be laid before parliament before being finally ratified by the government?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY:

1. The regulations prepared by the International Fisheries Commission have been received by the government.

2. Inasmuch as simultaneous publication in both countries is considered desirable, and as the regulations cannot appropriately be laid before Congress until that body meets in December next, the government have agreed to defer laying the regulations before parliament until after the date of the meeting of Congress early next month.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE RIDING ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What are the dimensions and what the internal arrangements of the riding establishment on the R.M.C. grounds?

2. When will the building be completed and to what use will it be put?

3. Were tenders called for by advertisement? If so, in what papers and when?

4. From whom were tenders received, and what was the amount of each?

5. To whom was the contract awarded, and what did the contract cover?

6. How much has been paid on the building to date, and to whom?

7. What is the estimated cost of the building completed and ready for use?

8. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, what portion, to whom and the amount in each case?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) 35 by 41 feet.

(b) Basement contains furnace and fuel rooms, storeroom and laundry; ground floor, non-commissioned officers and men's mess rooms, kitchen and lavatory; first floor, men's dormitory and bedrooms for non-commissioned officers; attic, bedrooms.

2. (a) The building is practically completed and is expected to be ready for inspection early in December.

(b) I am informed by the Department of Militia and Defence that the building will be used as quarters for non-commissioned officers and men attending horses and instructing cadets in riding.

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Kingston, 'Freeman'; Kingston, 'British Whig'; Deseronto, 'Tribune'; Trenton, 'Courier'; Napanee, 'Express'; Belleville, 'Ontario'; Brockville, 'Recorder'; Ottawa, 'Le Temps'; Ottawa, 'Free Press'; Ottawa, 'Danebrog'; Peterborough, 'Examiner'; Peterborough, 'Times'; Toronto, 'Globe'; Toronto, 'Star'; (3 insertions in dailies, 2 in weeklies.).

(c) Advertisement dated December 12, 1908.

4. M. Sullivan, $9,490; W. H. Godwin, Jr., and E. Godwin, Jr., $9,890; W. J. Chapman, $10,500.

5. (a) M. Sullivan.

(b) Excavation, masonry, brickwork, carpenter and joiner work, plastering, galvanized iron, plumbing, painting and glazing.

6. Michael Sullivan, contractor, $6,100; Henry P. Smith, services as clerk of works, $99.03; advertising, $205.47; printing and stationery, $60.63; total, $6,465.13.

7. $15,000.

8. No.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government or any member thereof received from the executive of the Liberal Association for British Columbia, or any other political organization, any recommendation purporting to be made by resolution of that body, in favour of the appointment of F. C. Wade, K.C., as Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia? If so, what reply has been made?

2. Is the office of Lieutenant Governor one as to which the jurisdiction of patronage committee is recognized?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must observe to my hon. friend that information of the description asked for in the first part of his question would be considered by the government or by any minister as absolutely private matter. In reference to the second part of his question I do not exactly understand what he means by the expression 'the jurisdiction of patronage committee.'

MANUFACTURE OF AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. How many mowing machines were there made in Canada during the year ending 31st March, 1909?

2. How many harvesters, self-binding, were there made in Canada in the same period?

3. How many reapers were there made in Canada during the aforesaid time?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. This information is not obtainable in any government office or, I think, in any office or any place in Canada. This applies to all parts of the question.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. Is there any provision in the contract entered into between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Company for the construction of that portion of the New Brunswick section of the Transcontinental railway (a) for limiting the subletting of said contract for different sections or otherwise beyond one or any number of subcontracts below the original contract, or (b) for the protection of farmers, merchants and others furnishing supplies and materials to subcontractors for the construction of the railway by providing for recourse against the original contractor or otherwise.

2. Is the government or the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners aware that for certain sections of the railway in New Brunswick the contract has been sublet from one subcontractor to another until in some cases the work has been done and is being done by 4th and 5th subcontractors at a cut of 40 to 50 per cent below the prices contracted for and paid by the government to the original contractor?

3. Has the government or Minister of Railways received any complaints to the above effect, and that as a result farmers, merchants and others, who have furnished supplies and materials for the construction of the railway, have suffered heavy losses by the failure of the subcontractors to pay their bills?

4. What action if any, has the government or Railway Department taken or what action is intended to be taken in the matter?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

1. (a) No, but the contract provides that the work or any part thereof shall not be subcontracted without the written consent of the commissioners. (b) There is a clause in the contract providing that where the contractor fails to make payment for labour, services and material in or about the construction of the work the commissioners may retain, such amount of moneys as the chief engineer deems sufficient to make such payments; or if the engineer reports that there is reason to fear that any such payments will not be properly made by the contractor, the commissioners may pay for any such labour, services and material, from any date to any date and to any amount, which may be payable and charge same to the contractor.

2. The commissioners are aware that certain portions of the work have been sublet, and this was done with their consent, but such subcontractors are not dealt with by the commissioners, who treat them only as agents of the contractor and have no knowledge of the prices that are paid by the contractor to such subcontractors. They do not know anything about a contract sublet from one subcontractor to another.

3. The Minister of Railways has had correspondence with the hon. member for York, N.B., on the subject.

4. The minister took the matter up with the commissioners of the National Transcontinental railway and will be glad to lay a copy of the correspondence on the table of the House, if the hon. gentleman will make the usual motion.

TRENT CANAL—BRADFORD CHANNEL.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals had a survey or investigation made into the feasibility and cost of constructing a channel from the Devil's Elbow on the Holland river to a point in the neighbourhood of the Bradford railway station in South Simcoe?

2. If not, will the department have this done at an early date, and if done, is the report favourable and what is the estimated cost?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, a survey has been made in that locality; but owing to the telephone and telegraph wires being out of order it is not possible to get the information required for the House to-day; but it will be given as soon as it can be obtained.

2. Answered by No. 1.

FISH HATCHERIES, MANITOBA.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. What is the total outlay for the erection and equipment of the three fish hatcheries in the province of Manitoba?

2. What is the annual outlay in connection with the taking of spawn and the running of those hatcheries?

3. What is the annual cost of the Fishery Protection Service in connection with lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis?

4. What is the total revenue received by the government from all sources in connection with these fisheries?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1. $34,013.

2. $14,550, in 1908-9. This cost is not stationary, depending on conditions.

3. $9,423.72 in 1908-9, not including the salary and expenses of the inspector of fisheries, which are chargeable to the whole province.

4. $4,671, in 1908-9.

Note.—The year 1908-9 has been taken as the present one is not yet completed.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LIGHTHOUSES.

Mr. RALPH SMITH:

1. How many lighthouses are there in British Columbia?

2. What were the salaries of the light-keepers at the end of the financial year 1907-1908?
3. What are their salaries to-day?
4. Why have some salaries been reduced, and when did the changes of salaries take place?

Question allowed to stand as notice of motion.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES.

Mr. RALPH SMITH:

1. What is the revenue to date from the sale of Canadian government annuities?
2. How many persons are purchasing annuities?
3. What are the occupations of the persons purchasing?
4. What amount is represented in annuities applied for?
5. What is the average annuities applied for?
6. In what provinces are agents or representatives for explaining the features of the Act employed?
7. Have any manufacturers or other employers of labour been in communication with the department with a view to purchasing annuities for their employees?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. $337,634.56.
2. 426—Ontario 266
Quebec 46
Nova Scotia 32
Manitoba 21
British Columbia 20
Alberta 19
New Brunswick 13
Saskatchewan 6
Prince Edward Island 2
Yukon Territory 1

3. Accountants, Attorney General, bookkeepers, bank clerks, barristers, barbers, business managers, bakers, boiler makers, brick makers, clergymen, clerks, civil servants, carpenters, civil engineers, chemical engineers, cable operators, children, compositors, dressmakers, domestics, dentists, draughtsmen, druggists deaconesses, Dominion immigration inspector, excise officers, electricians, farmers, ferrymen, freight checkers, factory hands, freight agents, florists, geologists, gardeners, grocers, harness makers, insurance agents, lithographers, librarians, lumbermen, locomotive engineers, labourers, married women, merchants, mariners, music teachers, miners, Northwest Mounted Police, physicians, photographers, postmasters, property agents, printers, pedlars, port stewards, picture framers, polish maker, reporters, spinsters, students, stenographers, shipping clerks, shoemakers, solicitors, station agents, shantymen, school inspectors, superintendent of homes, teachers, trained nurses, travellers, tailors, trackmen, telegraphers.
4. $100,007.63.
5. $240.
6. Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia. Chief lecturer covering all provinces of the Dominion.
7. Yes.

VACANCIES IN SENATE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many vacancies now exist in the Nova Scotia representation in the Canadian Senate, and when did any such occur?
2. Have any names been submitted to the government by any person or persons for recommendation to His Excellency? If so, what names?
3. When will the vacancies be filled?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two vacancies in the Senate to-day in Nova Scotia. I am sorry I cannot give at this moment the dates at which they occurred. No names have been submitted to His Excellency for any appointment, but the vacancies will be filled in a very short time.

ORDNANCE STORE, OTTAWA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has any damage been recently caused by fire to the ordnance store building at Ottawa? If so, what is the approximate loss to building and stock?
2. What is the approximate value of stores held on ordnance charge at Ottawa?
3. What is the strength of Canadian Ordnance Corps at Ottawa, including attached officers, non-commissioned officers and men, and civilian employees?
4. Does the Canadian Ordnance Corps maintain a night guard or watchman at this building? If not, why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Approximate loss to building, including heating, electric wiring and elevators, $20,000.
(b) 2, 3, 4. To be answered by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (b) Yes. Approximate Public Works answers. Approximate loss of clothing through fire, $120,000; approximate damage to stock through smoke and water, $30,000.
2. Approximate value of stores and clothing, $900,000.
3. Officers 5; warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and men, 30; civilian armourers, 1; civilian labourers, 1; civilian transport driver, 1.
4. No. The duty of patrolling the building at night is performed by the Dominion Police.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to a letter from the Auditor General to the Secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, of the 18th of August, 1909, in which the Auditor

General points out that 64,192 cubic yards of excavation, classified at an average price of 83·06 cents, were subsequently reclassified at $1.10¼ per cubic yard, and the cost thereby increased by the sum of $17,433.80, and asking for an explanation. Has this letter been answered? If so, when?

2. What was the cause of the delay?

3. In any case, what is the explanation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Transcontinental Railway Commission answer as follows:

1. Yes, 8th and 10th November instant.

2. Matter was taken up with the engineers, and an order in council obtained in accordance with the advice of Justice Department.

3. The price referred to was the result of an agreement with the contractor by the late chief engineer of the commission and approved by his successor who reported that, 'In the interest of the economical construction of the road this price for rock borrow should stand.' The explanation is too long to incorporate in an answer to a question, and can be best furnished in the form of a return giving copies of the correspondence relating to the matter.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to a letter of the 18th August, 1909, from the Auditor General to the Secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, in which he calls the attention of the commission to 581 yards (cubic) of excavation returned and paid for at $10 per cubic yard, and other quantities at the same price, and asks for an explanation as to why the price should exceed $2.50 per cubic yard. Has this letter been answered? If so, when?

2. What caused the delay.

3. In any case, what is the explanation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Transcontinental Railway Commission answer as follows:

1. Yes, on the 10th November, instant.

2. Matter was taken up with engineers.

3. Price referred to was arranged between contractor and late chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, but was disallowed by his successor, as a result of an opinion given by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the letter of the Auditor General of the 16th December, 1908, to the Secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission re contractors in default in completing work, been answered? If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Transcontinental Railway Commission answer as follows:

1. Yes, on 12th November instant.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Is there any provision in the contracts for construction of the Transcontinental railway that the contractor shall pay or forfeit $5,000 for each calendar month during which he makes default in completing his contract?

2. If so, has this provision, in the opinion of the minister, a tendency to increase the price at which the work is tendered for?

3. Has this provision been enforced against any of the contractors? If so, against which of them, and with what result?

4. How many of the contractors are in default in this connection, what are their names, and for what period, respectively, have they been in default?

5. In what cases have extensions of time been formally granted, and upon what terms and for what cause in each case?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Transcontinental Railway Commission answer as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The following contractors have not finally completed the work covered by their contracts within the time limit fixed by their respective contracts: Hogan & MacDonell, 26 months beyond fixed date, contract covers work from north end of Quebec bridge to near La Tuque about 150 miles. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, 14 months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from 150 miles west of Quebec bridge to Waymontachene about 45 miles. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company about two months beyond fixed date, contract covers from 8 miles of Abitibi river, easterly about 150 miles. O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Brothers, about two months beyond fixed date. Contract covers about 24 miles easterly from Dog lake, Ontario. John D. McArthur. 26 months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from Winnipeg about 24 miles easterly.

5. No extensions of time have been granted, and enforcement of penalty clause is a matter for consideration before final payments have been made.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER moved:

For a copy of correspondence and papers, and any information possessed by the government relating to the formation and work of the secretariat decided upon by the imperial conference of 1907.

He said: I have two objects in view in moving this motion. One is to get such information as the government may be possessed of with reference to the formation of a secretarial staff, here called the secretariat, which was decided upon at the conference of 1907, and the work which, up to the present, they have done, or the system which may have been arranged upon which the work is to proceed. The other object I have in view is to make a short review of the work of the several conferences, the first of which was instituted in 1887. When we come to think of it, the initial step which was taken in 1887 has proved to be a very important one, and I am sure the developments have been far in excess of what the promoters of that con-

ference could possibly have had in mind. It is one of the characteristics of the British constitution and system that many institutions grow up and become, without force of statute, very important and operative parts of the general administration of the affairs of the empire, and this is one which probaly illustrates that feature of the British system as well as any other.

The conference of 1887 was probably born out of two ideas; the first was the necessity felt for a closer and more intimate union between all the parts of the British dominions, and the second was the dissatisfaction which had been felt at the formal and distant and tedious system of communication between the various colonies and the motherland, and the almost entire absence of any method of communication between the different colonies themselves. Correspondence undertaken several thousand miles away from the department to which you are writing is cold and formal and at the best inefficient. It probably for years had been felt that there was necessity for closer personal touch and more of the personal element in inter-communication. Any one knows that two gentlemen sitting down and talking over a question can come to a conclusion in shorter time and more satisfactory way than they can through the medium of long distance correspondence. In dealing with this matter, I shall, in my brief remarks, speak altogether from the non-partisan standpoint and in a non-partisan spirit. The conference of 1887 was called by Mr. Stanhope, but before it met he was succeeded by Sir Henry Holland, who, as Colonial Secretary, presided at the conference which lasted from April 4 to May 9. Ministers or delegates from all of the self-governing colonies were present, as well as Lord Salisbury and some of the other British ministers. In addition, prominent men from the different Crown colonies were invited to attend and to listen to the proceedings. It is characteristic of the extreme sensitiveness and delicacy and of the great wisdom which characterize so many of these innovations, that at this conference every step was avoided that could possibly lead to anything like a feeling of constraint or restraint, or anything that could be said to be binding and absolute in its nature. It was therefore laid down at the beginning that the discussions should be perfectly free and that no resolutions should be moved, it being supposed that the freest exchange of opinions would take place from the feeling that those present were not being bound by resolution It was distinctly stated that the conference should be entirely consultative and should have no executive functions of any kind. It is interesting to note the questions which were brought before that first conference—organization for defence, postal and telegraph communications, the sugar bounties and trade questions as affecting the different members of the empire, British trust fund investments in colonial stocks, and the stamp duties upon the transfer of inscribed stocks. The most important subjects were organization for defence and postal and telegraphic communications. The results obtained at this conference may be summed up briefly. The question of defence was largely with regard to naval defence, and the colonies chiefly concerned were the colonies in the southern Pacific and what may be called the Chinese waters, and the Cape of Good Hope. What was done as a result of that conference, afterwards ratified by the respective legislatures, was the strengthening and enlargement of the squadron for the Australasian colonies which was to be confined to Australian waters. To this New Zealand made a contribution of £20,000, and the Australasian colonies a contribution of £106,000. The squadron was to consist of five fast cruisers and two torpedo gunboats. A desultory exchange of views was had with reference to the protection of some of the outstanding portions of the empire. There was a very lengthy exchange of ideas with reference to postal and telegraphic communication based upon the cheapening of postage rates between the different parts of the empire and the establishment of better telegraphic facilities. In this discussion the representatives of Canada, Sir Alexander Campbell and Sir Sandford Fleming, dealt very thoroughly with the Canadian Pacific railway which had then been opened across this continent and pressed upon the members of the conference and the British government the importance of that great undertaking, by which a new empire route had been opened up. That led the way to impressing upon the members of the conference the advisability of a new line of telegraphic communication from Britain across the Atlantic over Canada and then across the Pacific. This was the first discussion of that question. This discussion which began in 1887 ultimately bore its fruit in much later years, but it did bear fruit.

Although, under the understanding of the conference there were to be no resolutions passed, yet so vivid was the interest created in the conference by the statements made by the Canadian delegates on the lines I have mentioned, that the conference broke through its rule in that respect, and these two resolutions, while not formally put, were assented to unanimously by the conference, and I think it well that they should be read and go on record:

First, that the connection recently formed through Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, by railway and telegraph, opens a new alternative line of imperial communi-

cation over the high seas and through British possessions, which promises to be of great value alike in naval, military, commercial and political aspects.

Second, that the connection of Canada with Australia by direct submarine telegraph across the Pacific is a project of high importance to the empire; and every doubt as to its practicability should without delay be set at rest by a thorough and exhaustive survey.

Before the conference finished its deliberations, very strong representations were made as to the advisability of having the British government undertake a survey of the under-sea-service across the Pacific in order to develop as far as possible the facts on which to base the ultimate building of the cable.

On trade matters there was the beginning of the discussions which have been continued and have grown in every succeeding conference. As a specialty, the question of sugar bounties was taken up and their continuance was deprecated. The trade discussion was commenced by Sir Samuel Griffith, of Australia, in a very temperate and moderate speech, which, as we read it now, would be called very tentative indeed. The shadow of the long extended and at that time unattacked free trade regime in Great Britain was over the whole discussion. The horizon was comparatively narrow and the vision did not extend very far; but the discussion was notable for an expression of opinion on the advisability of something being done by which, within the British empire, the kith and kin of the empire would have the privileges and advantages in the matter of trade which were not given to the foreigner and outsider. Mr. Hofmeyer, who later visited Canada and took part in a conference of 1894, also discussed his policy, which was this, that over and above all tariffs which were imposed in Great Britain or in the colonies, there should be a small percentage added—2 per cent he himself proposed—which should be collected from foreign imports, and should be earmarked as a fund to be used for the naval defence of the empire. He made calculations upon the existing trade at that time, and showed that 2 per cent would yield about £7,000,000 annually, and he argued for this on two grounds: first, that it would tend to strengthen the bonds of the empire, and, secondly, that it would give a much needed fund, and one which could be very wisely used for strengthening the general defence of the empire. The discussions at the first conference were, as I have said, very tentative. The horizon did not reach very far, and their vision was somewhat weak; but it was an initiation, a beginning, and out of that have grown the several conferences which have since taken place.

The second conference was held in the Dominion of Canada, at the city of Ottawa, in 1894. This conference was a little different from its predecessor, in that it was called by the government of Canada and not by the British government. It was called mainly for the purpose of discussing trade matters and intercolonial communications, both by steamship and by cable, between the colonies of the empire, and the British government gave it its sanction and its prestige by sending Earl Jersey, who attended the conference, and who made a very able and sympathetic report of it to the Home government, which is preserved in our blue-books. The Huddart steamship contract had been made, Mr. Mackenzie Bowell had visited the Australian colonies on the mission on which the government sent him, and a great deal of interest was manifested in the conference, especially with reference to Australia and Canada. The Cape of Good Hope was invited, and sent as its representatives Mr. Devilliers and Mr. Hofmeyer.

The discussions of the conference of 1894 were much wider and fuller, and certainly had a wider and stronger vision, than those of the preceding conference. The question of defence was naturally not taken up, owing to the circumstance that the British government had not called the conference, and it was not seemly or fitting for the colonies themselves to take up that question. What was discussed, and discussed with a great deal of freedom, and, as Earl Jersey himself said, with a great deal of strength and vigour, were the lines of communication and the development of trade. As a result of these discussions in a conference which lasted from June 28 until July 9, several resolutions were passed. That marks also a distinct step forward from the preceding and initiatory conference. This conference felt that it ought to have the courage of its opinions; and it put the results of its deliberations into the form of resolutions, thus giving point and force to its discussions. The resolutions that were passed were on these lines: that provision be made for imperial legislation enabling the dependencies of the empire to enter into agreements of commercial reciprocity, including power to make preferential tariffs with Great Britain and with one another, and that any provision of existing treaties preventing the above from taking place ought to be removed; and another resolution strongly in favour of imperial trade preference between Great Britain and the colonies, with the addition that until Great Britain should find it possible for her to take part in preferential treatment with the colonies, the colonies themselves should press the matter to a conclusion as between each

other. The Belgian and German treaties and the most favoured nation clauses came in for a very thorough review, and these resolutions I have read—the two former especially—were for the purpose of clearing away as far as possible the obstacles which existed in the way of preferential arrangements.

With reference to communications, strong ground was taken on two matters. One was an arrangement for fast lines of steamships on the Pacific beween British Columbia and the east, especially Australasia and New Zealand, and the principal of co-operation was invoked, namely, that as the scheme was for the benefit of the empire, it should be supported by the constituent parts of the empire between which these steamship lines were to ply. Strong ground was taken with reference to a Pacific cable, and a resolution passed asking the British government to have a survey made, subject to the condition that the expense of the survey should be shared mutually between the British government, the government of Canada and the government of Australasia; and in order to keep this resolution alive, another resolution was added giving into the hands of the Canadian government the pressing of this to a conclusion. I may say that this resolution followed on the assent of the Earl of Jersey to the British government undertaking the survey and paying a portion of the cost. Canada assented through her representative as did the representatives of the Australasian colonies. These, then, were the results of the conference of 1894, a conference which was characterized by great unanimity, great interest and a more hopeful feeling that the period of discussion would quickly merge into a period of more or less full developments along the lines that were then discussed.

The next conference held was that of 1897. It was called by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain on the 60th anniversary occasion of Her Majesty's ascension. It met in June, and continued for some days. The usual countries were represented. The Secretary of State presented a memorandum dealing with three matters, political, defence and commercial relations and incidentally with the Pacific cable. With reference to commercial relations it was resolved:

1. That an early denunciation of any treaties now hampering the commercial relations of Great Britain and the colonies is desirable.

Having special reference to the Belgian and German treaties which have since been denounced. The various colonial premiers undertook to confer with their colleagues as to a preference on the products which may be imported from the United Kingdom. With reference to political relations, a resolution was passed affirming that the present political situation and relations were satisfactory, to which Mr. Seddon and Mr. Braddon dissented. Another resolution was passed affirming:

That it is desirable whenever practicable to group into federal union colonies which are geographically united.

That has borne fruit in the subsequent union of different colonies into the commonwealth of Australia. A third resolution affirms that it is desirable to have periodical conferences at which matters of common interest may be discussed. The memorandum goes on to state that although a resolution was passed as to the present relations being satisfactory, it was the decided feeling of the conference that these could not last very much longer, that they could not continue indefinitely, that some means was desirable of giving the colonies a voice in the control and direction of questions of imperial interest, those more especially affecting the colonies. It was also felt that such control, or such voice in control, would bring its corresponding obligations of assistance and of help. With reference to defence, the Australian squadron was continued with some changes, and a resolution was passed in that sense. The premiers agreed that on their return they would examine into the practicability and possibility of interchange of military units beween the mother country and the colonies. With reference to penny postage, it was found to be impracticable on account of the revenue necessities of several of the colonies. With regard to the Pacific cable, it was discussed but little in that conference, the representatives feeling that they should make themselves better acquainted with the reports which had been obtained, and examine them before coming to any conclusions.

The next conference held was that of 1902. It was held in London and was called on the 23rd of January of that year, and the meetings extended from June until August. The occasion of the calling of the conference of 1887—the first one—was a ceremonial one. It was called on the 50th anniversary of Her Majesty's reign. The occasion of the calling of the conference of 1902 was also a ceremonial one, that of the King's coronation. Advantage was taken of that event to bring representatives of the different over-seas countries in communication with the British government. All the over-seas dominions were represented and many very able men brought together. Of course, I think myself, that the ceremonial part of the proceedings rather interfered with the business outcome, but at the same time opportunity was had for extended discussion. We have not, however, any report of the discussion, inasmuch as at the beginning of the conference of 1902 it was decided that the resolutions arrived at and a summary only of the proceedings should be

given, and that is all that has yet, as I understand, been brought down to the British parliament or that we have cognizance of. I am, however, assured that a full report of the discussions of the conference of 1902 was kept and is on record, and I cannot help but think that it would be well if those discussions were put into the form of a return and brought down. And I notice that in 1907 the right hon. the Prime Minister, who was there, gave it as his opinion that it would be well to have these brought down. It is advisable, I think, that our representatives from the different colonies and from the empire who met together on this great occasion should have the benefit—for I think it is a benefit—of having their views, their reasoned and matured views, preserved; and it is of even more importance that we who did not have the pleasure of listening to those discussions should have the benefit of reading the views of these prominent and representative men expressed by them on such occasions.

The matters which were taken up and dealt with in the opening address of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain were divided into three parts: the political relations of the empire, its commercial relations and the naval and military defence of the empire. We come back again to these primary and basic questions, which, from 1887 up, have formed the subject of discussion in these conferences. The Colonial Secretary, in his memorandum, gave a slight sketch of his views or the views of the government—some of them views of the government and others his own personal views—with reference to these three great divisions. He took for granted the general feeling that existed for the unity and preservation of the empire and for the strengthening of that empire by all possible, reasonable bonds. He however, was careful to state that no particular course was pressed by the home government which is noteworthy all through this conference, is the extreme courtesy and delicacy with which the home government approached these questions. Whilst having strong views, they were careful not to offend the susceptibilities of the outlying dominions and did not press any line of action upon the colonies. They invited them to a grave and serious discussion and consideration of these questions, and then left the way perfectly open for these different colonial representatives to take such action as they might deem wise in the premises. He gave expression to the sentiment of the heavy load that the British government was carrying for naval and military defence. He acknowledged in fitting terms the help which had been given by all the different outlying colonies in the Boer war, through which the country had lately passed. With reference to the trade within the empire, he acknowledged what had been done by Canada in the granting of a preference. He was inclined to question whether that preference had been as favourable in its outcome as had been expected, and ended with a question as to whether or not the different colonies could go any further in the way of preferential trade concessions than they had already gone.

The conference then entered upon its discussions. The first question that was taken up was that of naval defence. Mr. Seddon, who was then living and who represented New Zealand, had given notice of a motion and this was also placed, opened the discussion before the conference a very able series of communications and a state paper by Sir John Forrest, who was Minister for Defence in the Australian Commonwealth. That state paper took up the whole question of naval defence, and detailed what had been done by the Australians. On Mr. Seddon's motion, these papers were presented to the conference and a discussion took place upon them. In this paper of Sir John Forrest, which seems to me to be a very able and frank paper, the whole question of naval defence as regards the Australian Commonwealth and New Zealand was taken up and discussed. Some fault was found as to the ineffective training of their own naval cadets or naval reserve which the different states of the Commonwealth had previously arranged for and which had been taken over by the Commonwealth of Australia. On the principle of defence, some statements are made which I think are worthy of being read in the House, and if the House will allow me I shall place them on record. In regard to defence he says:

> We must altogether get rid of the idea that we have different interests to those of the rest of the empire, and we must look at the matter from a broad common standpoint. If the British nation is at war so are we; if it gains victories or suffers disasters, so do we; and therefore it is of the same vital interest to us as to the rest of the empire that our supremacy on the ocean shall be maintained. There is only one sea to be supreme over, and we want one fleet to be mistress over that sea. We are bound also to consider and to fully realize that we belong to a nation which for centuries has been mistress of the sea and that the position we occupy in Australia to-day in being in all British territory, and having always enjoyed peace and security, is absolutely attributable to the protection given to us by the British flag. We are accustomed to travel about the world for the purpose of trade or in pursuit of pleasure, and to feel when we visit foreign countries that our lives and property are secure, and in specially safe keeping. We then realize fully the great privilege and advantage of being a British subject, and feel proud when we see the flag of our motherland everywhere in evidence, ready, willing,

and able to protect us. Our aim and object should be to make the Royal Navy the Empire Navy, supported by the whole of the self-governing portions of the empire, and not solely supported by the people of the British isles, as is practically the case at the present time. It is, I think, our plain duty to take a part in the additional obligations cast upon the mother country by the expansion of the empire and the extra burdens cast upon her in maintaining our naval supremacy. If a proposal were adopted that the empire should have one fleet maintained by the whole nation, every part contributing to its support on some plan to be mutually arranged, probably on that of the comparative trade of each country, and not necessarily on a uniform basis of contribution, what a splendid idea would be consummated, and what a bulwark for peace throughout the world would be established! Besides which, we would be doing our duty to the mother country, which has been so generous to us during all our early years.

That is a fair expression of the spirit and sentiments which animated the Commonwealth at that time, as expressed in the statement laid before the conference by Sir John Forrest, its Minister of Defence. The first Lord of the Admiralty who I think at that time was the Right Hon. the Earl of Selborne, prepared a paper which was presented to the conference. The general line of his paper was that in the study of defence it is the best defence which is in a position to become aggressive when an emergency arises, that there was need not only of money but of man contribution; he would like to see each colony represented in the navy with vessels and with men from the colony. He thought the allocation in peace time would be easy, but all through his memorandum he stood unflinchingly for one control, absolute in case of war and in case of emergency. Some discussion took place but not very much at this stage and it was then decided that the conference should separate and that each colony should have its own conference with the admiralty and that then a report should be made to conference as to what had been agreed upon. This was in the line that I have spoken of that the greatest freedom should be allowed to each colony to meet the situation as it thought it best could, in view of its own peculiar conditions. The following is a summary of the result of these individual conferences:

New Zealand, which up to that time had been making a contribution of £20,000, a year agreed to raise its contribution to £40,000.

Cape Colony, which up to that time had been giving £30,000 a year, raised its contribution to £50,000 and placed no condition upon the expenditure of the money.

Australasia raised its contribution to £200,000 and imposed the condition of an Australian squadron and also the establishment or maintenance of a branch of the Royal Navy reserve.

Natal, which up to that time had given £12,000 per annum raised its contribution to £35,000, and attached no conditions.

Newfoundland, which had been giving £3,000. raised its contribution to £4,800 with the stipulation that a naval reserve of not less than 600 men having been established in part should be continued and maintained.

The attitude of these different colonies is shown in each of these contributions. The ratification of these proposals and of these understandings took place immediately as between the British government and the Colonial governments and they were afterwards fully endorsed by the different legislatures and were carried out. With reference to Canada, the report of the First Lord of the Admiralty is that:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed me that the government were contemplating the formation of a local naval force in the waters of Canada, but were not able to make any offer of assistance analogous to those enumerated above.

A certain part of Lord Selborne's statement seems to be worth repeating. I referred to it before; it is the expression of the admiralty at that date, and of their views. Ending up his memorandum, which was acknowledged by all to be a particularly able one, he says:

> The British empire owes its existence to the sea, and it can only continue to exist if all parts of it regard the sea as their material source of existence and strength. It is therefore desirable that our fellow subjects in the dominions beyond the seas should appreciate the importance of naval questions. If they will undertake a larger share of the naval burden, well and good, but I regard it as of even more importance that they should cultivate the maritime spirit; that their populations should become maritime as ours are, and that they should become convinced of the truth of the proposition that there is no possibility of the localization of naval force, and that the problem of the British empire is in no sense one of local defence.
>
> The sea is all one, and the British navy therefore must be all one; and its solitary task in war must be to seek out the ships of the enemy, wherever they are to be found and to destroy them. At whatever spot, in whatever sea, these ships are found and destroyed, there the whole empire will be simultaneously defended in its territory, its trade and its interests. If, on the contrary, the idea should unfortunately pervade that the problem is one of local defence, and that each part of the empire can be content to have its allotment of ships for the purpose of the separate protection of an individual spot, the only possible result would be that an enemy who had discarded this heresy, and combined his fleets, will attack in detail and destroy those separated British squadrons which, united, could have defied defeat.

The Canadian ministers presented a memorandum which I will also read and

which shows the position that was taken by Canada at that conference. It is found in the appendix, page 73 of the return for 1902:

The Canadian ministers regret that they have been unable to assent to the suggestions made by Lord Selborne respecting a navy, and by Mr. St. John Brodrick respecting the army. The ministers desire to point out that their objections arise, not so much from the expense involved, as from a belief that the acceptance of the proposals would entail an important departure from the principle of colonial government. Canada values highly the measure of local independence which has been granted her from time to time by the imperial authorities, and which has been so productive of beneficial results, both as respects the material progress of the country and the strengthening of the ties that bind it to the motherland. But while, for these reasons, the Canadian ministers are obliged to withhold their assent to the propositions of the admiralty and the war office, they fully appreciate the duty of the Dominion, as it advances in population and wealth, to make more liberal outlay for these necessary preparations of self defence which every country has to asume and bear.

Then follows a recapitulation, through four or five paragraphs, of what Canada has done in expenditure upon her militia and the militia pension law, and cites as a proof of the availability and effectiveness of that system that:

At the time of the Boer war a thousand men in the first contingent were drawn from every section of Canada embraced within 4,000 miles of territory, and was organized, fully equipped and embarked within a period of 14 days; and a second contingent composed of 1,200 men was shortly afterwards similarly organized, equipped and embarked within the space of three weeks.

Then it ends up with this part, which is of course the more important part of the memorandum:

At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval system of defence as well. On the sea coast of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early date a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

The House will note that, both with reference to the military and with reference to the naval side, this memorandum confines the effort and good will of Canada's representatives entirely to the lines of self-defence, the defence of Canada itself.

In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures should be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which she now bears; and have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of the experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

This, I think, sets forth the position of the different participants in that conference upon the question of naval defence. With reference to military defence, no definite conclusion was reached at this conference. The Secretary of State for War and New Zealand suggested an imperial reserve, that is a special body of troops ear-marked for imperial service, and held ready in the different colonies for emergencies when they arose. Cape Colony and Natal agreed to that principle; Canada and Australia thought it best to raise the standard of the training of the general body of the forces, leaving it for the colonies to determine the nature and the extent of the assistance when an emergency arose; and both argued that in that way you would avoid any jealousy that might arise from there being two kinds of militia, so to speak, one, a special reserve marked for a special purpose, and the other thrown alongside of them, the general militia of Canada. In that respect I am not at all saying that I do not think the position taken by Australia and Canada was a proper position. I am not here to comment on this to-day. but simply to make the review. Resolutions were passed with reference to government contracts, that is, favouring the colonies, the parts of the empire itself, in giving government contracts for the militia and military, and with reference to the nomination of cadetships; and I think the number of cadetships at that time was somewhat enlarged so as to open up a larger career to young men from the colonies. There was also a general agreement as to the bringing, as far as possible, the organization of the militia down to a common principle and a common system so that, as far as possible, the same general equipments and all that kind of thing might be standardized, as it were throughout the different parts of the empire, so that, if ever a time came that the forces of the empire were to be massed together for a supreme effort there would be no disparity and the different parts of the work in every direction could be carried on with the greatest possible effectiveness. So much with reference to defence matters at that conference.

Taking up the political relations, we find the following were the results: It was re-

solved that there should be quadrennial conferences and that if, within a period of four years, any special occasion arose subsidiary conferences, if necessary, might be called. It was also resolved that the views of the colonies affected upon foreign treaties be obtained before ratification of these treaties by Great Britain. An agreement was also reached between the different parties to the conference on an imperial court of appeals. When we come to commercial arrangements and relations, there was a longer discussion and there was some definite advance made. A general debate showed differences of opinion and conditions and here again the step was taken of having the conference dissolve itself into a system of conferences between individual colonies and the President of the Board of Trade. On the reassembling of these conferences the following were announced as the results: Canada, having given a 33⅓ per cent, expressed its willingness to make an additional concession in one or all of three ways—either by reducing the duties to Great Britain on her imports into this country, or by raising the duties on imports from foreign countries, or by imposing duties on foreign free imports. Australia promised a preference on imports from Great Britain but was not able to define at that conference just exactly what it would be. New Zealand promised a 10 per cent reduction all round on manufactured goods imported into New Zealand or an equivalent on the same lines as were stated with reference to Canada, upon either one or all of the three plans. Natal promised a 25 per cent preference on all dutiable goods, with the exception of some that were specially rated. Then there was a general resolution passed which is somewhat important. That general resolution recognized (a) the principle of mutual preferential trade, (b) that free trade is impossible within the empire, (c) that the colonies should give a substantial preference to Great Britain's products, (d) that Great Britain should give preferential treatment to the colonies, and (e) that the premiers present undertook to bring the matters before their legislatures on their return, and to submit to their respective governments measures to carry out these conclusions that were arrived at. That especially had reference to the legislatures carrying out, when they were assembled and received the reports from the premiers who were present at this conference, what the premiers all promised and which I have just detailed. Canada contended that Great Britain should give an exemption on Canadian food products from the recent duties imposed on certain food products coming into Great Britain. These were known as the war duties and it was contended that in right Canada should have that because of the preference she had given and the representatives of Canada stated that they were willing to make further concessions if the British government would grant that. For a wider preference they would go still further and presented a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade, the advisability of its adoption by the colonies generally and that Great Britain should reciprocate. That is the resolution which I just a moment before analysed. Then they made the statement that if that principle was not acceptable to the colonies and the mother country Canada would hold herself free to choose her own course thereafter.

With reference to other questions, there were discussions upon mail services, and shipping subsidies, patent protection, purchase of ocean cables, merchant shipping laws, stamp duties, wireless telegraphs, metric system, newspaper postage, naturalization and professional employment in South Africa. All of these were discussed. This in brief is the result of the conference of 1902.

The next conference was held in 1907. That was called and met from April 15, until the 14th May. The Earl of Elgin was in the chair, the colonies were all represented, I think, without any exception. India also was represented for the first time at a colonial conference, and the Prime Minister and other ministers of His Majesty's government were present and took part in the various discussions. The resolutions that were come to as a result of the conference are in brief these: a resolution for establishing, as it were, the permanency of the imperial conference, that it should be held every four years, that it should be a conference consisting of the Prime Ministers of the outside Dominions, of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, with other ministers attending the Prime Ministers and taking part in the discussions upon the various questions, more particularly those which were technical to the different departments, but that each colony or portion of the empire should have one vote, each premier could be assisted by two of his colleagues at any discussion and that no more than two persons should take part in that discussion. What was particularly important at this conference was the formation of a secretarial staff or secretariat as it was called. This was thought necessary to fill a long-felt want. The trouble with the old conferences was that, once the conference had ended and the resolutions had been passed, there did not seem to be any machinery to keep these resolutions alive, and, as regards a coming conference, there did not appear to be any machinery to prepare, collate and gather information. It was so arranged that this information should be presented not after the conference took place, when the delegates and representatives would be so busy that it would be

almost impossible for them to digest the information, but to have it prepared, at a sufficiently early period and put in the hands of the representatives so that reasoned judgments and opinions could be given upon the digestion and consideration of that information.

Very strong ground was taken by Mr. Deakin, Sir Joseph Ward, and the representatives of Cape Colony and Natal. The Canadian representation did not see quite the same necessity for a secretariat but Sir Wilfrid Laurier declared he had an open mind. The Australian delegates with the Cape and Natal were in favour of a secretariat which would be responsible to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and attached to his office as head of the conference, this secretariat to be the creation of the conference itself and to be paid by the conference. Sir Joseph Ward and the Canadian representatives took the ground that there must be a responsible head as the Colonial Secretary was the proper head and that argument triumphed when the Prime Minister stated that it was impossible for him to take on this added burden, and when Lord Elgin proposed to take charge if it in his own department, to separate absolutely the Crown colonies from the self-governing colonies and to secure a secretarial staff whose whole duty it would be to look after the affairs of the conference and perform the duties of the secretariat which had been urged as necessary. That idea was unanimously agreed to, and one object of my motion to-day is to find out, if I can, from the government what steps have been taken as regards the organization of that staff and what work has been done by it. There was a strong feeling in the conference that such a link was absolutely necessary in order to join conference to conference, to maintain continuity, and to contribute to the effectiveness of the work of each succeeding conference. There was some difference of opinion as to the name the conference should go by; it had been suggested by Australia that it should be called the imperial council, but on the suggestion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier it was unanimously decided to call it the imperial conference. There, however, was no difference of opinion as to its still being maintained as consultative only and not having in any way legislative or executive authority.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. By whom is the expense of the secretarial staff paid?

Mr. FOSTER. By the British government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I thought you said that all the colonies should join in its maintenance?

Mr. FOSTER. Had it been a secretariat responsible to the conference alone as was proposed, the expense would be paid by the different members to the conference, but as the other scheme was adopted, I understand it is regarded as one of the expenses of the Colonial Secretary's department.

On the question of military defence I read with extreme interest the two memoranda which were submitted from the naval and military point of view and though but a layman I should say they were very able state documents. The members of the conference may not have agreed with everything in these two memoranda but that they were able state papers there was a complete unanimity of opinion. In the memorandum upon military defence two ideas were brought out—that there should be a business management of the militia, that the Militia Department should have brains as well as body, and that therefore the prime requisite of any perfect system was an imperial staff whose duty it would be to study strategic war organization, the conditions of defence in every part of the empire, and to give their complete attention to that subject. That is the plan that largely contributed to the success of Germany; that is the plan which every great military power now puts into execution. The imperial staff which was to be an advisory board and nothing more, should, in the opinion of Mr. Haldane, the author of the memorandum be made really imperial and should take in every portion of the British empire which has a militia organization, and by way of advice, and of counsel, and of interchange of officers, and of information arrive at the best conclusion as to what should be done for the empire as a whole. The memorandum contemplated that if it were possible there should be two lines of defence the empire through. As Great Britain herself has an army which is kept ready to strike whilst she has also defensive forces, her militia, or at present her territorial army at home, it would be well if it could possibly be carried out, to have the same carried out in every one of the self-governing colonies; but Mr. Haldane expressed the difficulty he found in carrying that out in Great Britain itself, the territorial army there being a volunteer force, and the militia in all the British dominions being also, I think, a volunteer force, although I am not sure but Natal or the Cape has a compulsory system. However, the main idea that was promulgated in Mr. Haldane's memorandum was the necessity of having this imperial staff, which was acceded to unanimously by the conference. It was suggested that it would be well, if possible, to have a portion of the forces in every over-seas dominion, as well as in Great Britain, ear-marked for outside service when emergencies arose. That, however, was abandoned, as I have said. So that what was really contemplated by

Mr. Haldane was this striking force in Great Britain, a second line of defence in Great Britain and a second line of defence in every one of the self-governing dominions. These were the broad principles on which this memorandum was based, and these principles, I think, received the unanimous assent of the conference. Three basic facts were laid down in that memorandum as obligations upon all members of the empire (a) that each unit should provide for its local security; (b) arrangement for mutual assistance in cases of supreme need; and (c) the necessity of the maintenance of sea-supremacy. It was argued in the memorandum, and ably argued, that as far as possible the methods, the equipment, the arms, the ammunition, the units of force, all these technicalities of administration, should be in all parts of the empire standardized and on an equal basis. The resolution which was come to by the conference, and which will be found on page 5, was as follows:

That this conference welcomes and cordially approves the exposition of general principles embodied in the statement of the Secretary of State of War, and, without wishing to commit any of the governments represented, recognizes and affirms the need of developing for the service of the empire a general staff, selected from the forces of the empire as a whole, which shall study military science in all its branches, shall collect and disseminate to the various governments military information and intelligence, shall undertake the preparation of schemes of defence on a common principle, and, without in the least interfering in questions connected with command and administration, shall, at the request of the respective governments, advise as to the training, education, and war organization of the military forces of the Crown in every part of the empire.

Leaving the military side of the question, and coming to the naval side, we find an interesting discussion and interesting conclusions that were come to. Lord Tweedmouth was the exponent of the British government on naval defence. What he declared in the main was that they wanted the over-seas dominions to help them make more complete the naval defence of the empire. He held strongly to the necessity of the admiralty having the management, and without constraint, in the time of war. He was glad to get contributions in money, or, if not in money, in kind, and he welcomed the latter almost as heartily as the former. Unity of command and direction of the fleet, however, he maintained must be kept. He was in favour of help being given by the colonies in the way of smaller defence vessels for squadrons, in the way of docks, in the fitting up of establishments for receiving and repairing warships, in the initiation and maintenance of coaling vessels. All these are of great advantage in the defence of the empire, and if these are provided by the colonies, very substantial aid will be given in the general purpose of imperial defence. I think it well, to read this extract from Lord Tweedmouth's memorandum:

We welcome you, and we ask you to take some leading part in making more complete than it is at present the naval defence of the empire. I wish to recognize all that our cousins over the sea have done in consequence of decisions of former conferences. I know that you gave to the government and to the admiralty, with a free and unstinting hand, the help that you thought you could manage to give. Gentlemen, I have only one reservation to make, and in making it I ask that, as we have proved ourselves successful in the past, you should put your trust in us now. The only reservation that the admiralty desire to make is, that they claim to have the charge of these strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist attack and to defend the empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas. We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence. We want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time, if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

Upon this a discussion arose, participated in by the representatives of all the portions of the empire represented at the conference. Mr. Deakin, speaking for Australia, which is now contributing largely in money to the defence under certain conditions, made the statement that this contribution was not altogether satisfactory—that, as he read the spirit of his people, it was felt that something more must be done. The squadron furnished by Australia was at first to be confined to Australian waters, but afterwards could be extended to Chinese waters. The feeling to which Mr. Deakin gave expression was that although no very formidable fleet might break the first line of defence, it might be possible that marauders —two or three cruisers fitted out for a sharp descent—might break the lines and find the harbours of Australia entirely defenceless. So he thought something should be done by Australia at once towards putting her harbours into a state of defence and if possible at reasonable cost, go further and patrol the more valuable portions of the coast. Sir Jos. Ward, who represented New Zealand, came out straight for contribution and contribution alone. His dominion was too small to build a fleet, and they preferred to give what they had to give to the British admiralty to expend as the British admir-

alty thought fit. When Canada's turn came Mr. Brodeur spoke, and as what he said is somewhat important, I shall refer to it a little in detail:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Brodeur will speak for Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. Lord Elgin and gentlemen. In view of the remarks made by Mr. Deakin and Sir Jos. Ward, it will not be necessary for me to state to-day the position which Canada intends to take in regard to this question of naval defence. Our situation is a different one to that of the other colonies, and should be treated as such. I think, however, it would only be fair that I should state to-day that the position of Canada has not been properly represented as far as naval defence is concerned. I see by a document which has been laid before us that we are supposed not to have spent any money at all upon naval defence. That document shows what has been spent by the United Kingdom, by Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, Natal, and when it comes to speak of Canada, it is simply stated that the naval expenditures is none. I may say at the outset that in view of the treaty which was made in 1818 between the imperial government and the government of the United States, it was formally stipulated that the Americans should have the right to come in and fish on our shores, and that they should have the right also to come into our harbours when they are looking after their fishing. Outside of that, they have a right also, in virtue of that treaty, to go to some parts of Canada to fish on the same footing as the Canadian British subject. This particular situation, which was created in Canada by the treaty induced the British admiralty to look after the defence, or after the protection of Canada, against the poaching of these American fishermen. That duty was performed and that protection was given to our own people during many years by the British admiralty, but for some time, especially since 1885, absolutely nothing has been done by the British authorities.

He then goes on to say that after that time Canada provided her own protection vessels and protected her own fisheries and spent a more or less large sum, amounting to about $3,147,990 up to date, that she was called on to provide other vessels to protect the service, and that such expenditure should count as naval expenditure. He then called attention to the situation on the Great Lakes. He said:

We have to-day on the lakes a boat which is an armed boat, which is looking specially after the protection of our fisheries against the American fishermen, not only for the carrying out of the local regulations, but mostly and I may say almost exclusively for preventing the Americans from coming and fishing in our waters. We have on the Great Lakes (large seas, properly speaking) American states bordering these great lakes, and they are having navies of their own now. I think that three states bordering on the three great lakes, Ohio, Michigan and Illinois are spending not less than $15,000,000 themselves for keeping up a navy on these lakes, and are drilling their men on the shore of the lakes. Besides they have some ships which are not on—because it would be against the conclusions of the treaty—but built in order to be prepared in case of emergency. As far as Canada is concerned, one of the first duties we shall have to look after is our protection in connection with the great lakes. I may say that the wars we have had since 1763, since Canada has become part of the British empire, came from the United States. We had an invasion in 1775, we had an invasion in 1812, and we had the Fenian raids in the 60s. All those invasions came from the United States. So we have to look specially to protect ourselves in that direction, and I may say we have been doing it as far as the Great Lakes are concerned, not to a very large extent it is true, but to the extent of spending a sum of money which is quite important for a country of the size of ours.

Then he speaks of the naval militia, and that the cruiser 'Canada' is manned by Canadian seamen and that men are drilling on her every day. He also speaks of the wireless telegraph stations and the amount of money spent on them. He mentions that Canada has taken over the hydrographic survey as well, that she is going to take over the Halifax and the Esquimault dockyard, which will then be at the cost of Canada instead of Great Britain, and he ends by saying:

And so I think it will be only fair that in the statements published giving the money spent for naval expenditures, the amount spent by the Canadian government in connection with those of different services I have just mentioned should be included in such naval expenditures. I do not think for a moment it will be necessary for me to discuss the question further, because I understand the discussion will be taken up on some other day.

That shows fairly well the position taken by Canada with reference to the contribution towards the navy. Well, after still further discussion, Lord Tweedmouth, in a short reply, stated among other things that he made no reflection on Canada, that Canada was perfectly free to come to any resolution.

We hope to have their help, but still they are quite right to look after their own interests, in the full security that so far as the British government can be of use to them in their defence in time of need, they may depend in any circumstances on our giving that aid with the greatest joy and without any sort of drawback whatever.

In this respect the same method was taken as in the others. Individual conferences took place between the different colonies and the first Lord of the Admiralty and as a result the following was reported:

Australia continues her contributions of £200,000 per year, New Zealand hers of

£40,000, Cape Colony £50,000, Natal £35,000 and Newfoundland £3,000.

At page 480, the subject of naval defence is again taken up and Canada, in the person of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), again speaks. He said:

Lord Elgin and Gentlemen,—I have nothing to say except to thank heartily Lord Tweedmouth for having been good enough to recognize what Canada has been doing in regard to its defence. As I mentioned the last time we discussed this question at the conference, I think the situation of Canada has not been properly represented. I am very glad to see Lord Tweedmouth has actually acknowledged and recognized that we have been doing a great deal and are still doing a great deal by taking over the naval stations at Esquimalt and Halifax. There was a discussion in previous years to the effect that we should contribute something directly to the British navy. I may say with regard to that, there is only one mind in Canada on that question, and if it was necessary I should be able to quote the remarks made lately in an article published by Sir Charles Tupper, who is certainly one of the men best qualified to speak in Canada, upon the question. I think, perhaps, I might mention what he said in regard to that. He said: 'It is known that from the outset I have felt the interests of Canada and the true interests of the empire to be opposed to the demand for colonial contributions to the imperial navy,' and 'I maintain that Canada has discharged that duty in the manner most conducive to imperial interests.' So it shows that both sides of politics in Canada agree with the policy which has been going on for some years there. He adds, also, in that article, that 'Canada protects her fisheries by her own cruisers, and when the imperial government expressed a wish to be relieved of the expense of maintaining the strategic points at the harbours of Halifax and Esquimalt the Canadian government at once relieved them of that large expenditure, amounting to £185,000 per annum.' Negotiations are now going on for taking over the naval stations there. I do not know exactly what will be the amount by which the admiralty will be relieved, but I think it is a somewhat large amount.

Since the matter has been brought before this conference I may say that parliament has voted a large sum of money for the purpose of purchasing another cruiser and putting that cruiser on the Pacific coast for the protection of our fisheries.

We are very glad to see that Lord Tweedmouth has recognized that in this matter it should be left almost entirely to the colonies. I may say, in conclusion, that we will be very glad to work in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of an imperial officer, so far as it is consistent with self-government.

That is the whole presentation of the case thus far as far as Canada was concerned, in relation to imperial defence. But towards the latter part of the conference Mr. Smartt, who was the colleague of Dr. Jameson, moved the following resolution:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

To that resolution he spoke briefly and gave his reasons for moving it. Then we find Canada's voice again raised:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in our respect in that country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter, the disproportion is too great between the mother country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the mother country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

Dr. SMARTT. But the public works to which you refer are of a reproductive character which are vital to the interests of your Dominion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some of our railways have never paid a cent of interest or expenses.

Dr. SMARTT. Still, it is developing and opening up the country to an enormous extent. All the colonies are building developing railways of a character which may not be revenue producing for years. I thought the wording of this resolution would have specially met your views because towards the up-keep of the navy it may take the form either of a grant of money or the establishment of a local defence force or other services. I understand Canada suggested strongly the other day that some of their other services were in the nature of local defence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have said all I have to say on the subject.

Dr. SMARTT. I should like very much to hear the opinions of the representatives of the other portions of the empire.

Mr. DEAKIN. I have no hesitation in entering into the discussion if desired; but if we are not going to pass the resolution, is it worth while?

Dr. SMARTT. I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so

much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part I must vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH WARD. To do any good we would require to be unanimous about it.

Dr. SMARTT. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL. It is not much good to have a resolution at all if we cannot be unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better not proceed any further just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We, of the different dominions beyond the seas, have tried to be unanimous up to the present time. I am sorry to say this is a question upon which we could not be unanimous. Therefore, Dr. Smartt can move it if he chooses or withdraw it, but if he presses it I should have to vote against it.

Dr. SMARTT. I am absolutely in the hands of the conference. I do not want to press a resolution that is not likely to meet with the general approval of practically everybody on the conference, especially a resolution of this particular character. We might, perhaps, let it stand over until the next sitting. Between this and Tuesday I may be able to modify it in some way to meet Sir Wilfrid's view.

Nothing further was done and that represents the situation as far as naval defence is concerned.

Other questions of more or less importance were discussed, but I have not time to refer to any except the trade question With reference to the trade question, I will give the summary in the resolutions which after a debate were passed. I may say that the debate was an extended and a very able one, and all views were placed fully before the conference. The result was that the resolutions of 1902 were reaffirmed, with the representatives of the British government dissenting in so far as the implication that it is necessary or expedient to alter the fiscal system of the United Kingdom. Those resolutions I read in discussing the conference of 1902 and it is not necessary at this point to recapitulate them. The ground that was taken was ground that had been strongly affirmed in 1902 and the conference did not see that they could go beyond that although several members of the conference were strongly of the opinion that a forward step by resolution, if it could possibly be agreed upon, ought to be made. A resolution was passed providing:

> That all doubts should be removed as to the rights of the self-governing dependencies to make reciprocal and preferential fiscal agreements with each other and with the United Kingdom, and further, that such right should not be fettered by imperial treaties or conventions without their concurrence.

Among other subjects taken up were international penny postage and imperial cable communication, and then, towards the latter part of the conference, the All Red Route resolution which we have already had discussed in parliament and to which I need not further refer. Such, in brief, were the results of the conference of 1907.

Now to conclude: We have had conferences commenced in the way I have stated, begun in 1887, repeated in 1894, 1897, 1902 and 1907; and this latest conference in 1909, of which, as it is fresh before us, I should say nothing at the present time. No one will doubt, I think, that these conferences have grown in public commendation, and they have grown in their sphere of action, grown in their usefulness, grown in the greater knowledge which public men of the empire have been able to form of the different questions affecting others than their own countries, grown in that personal contact and sympathy which arises therefrom, and the mutually good understanding which takes place as a result of those conferences, that which is not by any means the least important of the benefits that have been conferred; until to-day they have taken a character of absolute permanency, with their own secretarial staff, the link being thus found for their continuity and their action. They constitute in fact the only imperial parliament that we have, and a regal and worthy imperial parliament it is, in its way—consultative simply and solely, advisory one with the other, without any functions, legislative or executive, but still a parliament composed of the empire's strongest and best men from the different portions of the empire, collected on the basis of popular selection, and so supposed to be representative in the very highest way. It is this quadrennial parliament, which may meet more frequently, which has grown up almost without our noticing it, which has gradually taken to itself power and influence without any legislative or executive character, but influencing the very centre, and from the very centre the very outside limits of the empire, a parliament which draws the great men, the chief men of the empire, together at stated times for the development of plans, the consideration of sentiments. Therefore it must have a tremendous effect in coming to wise decisions, in avoiding complications which otherwise would be sure to take place, and in leading in a general sense the empire along the lines of certitude and of reasonable safety. It may be that we shall never have any other imperial parliament. I cannot say. In the meantime I, for one, am content with this, and I hope that in the future as in the past, the same able contingents may form the delegates and representatives to these conferences, that the same unanimity and wisdom may

characterize their discussions and their conclusions. History not long in the future will write many pages about this new addition to the British constitution and the British system; and this history will not be written with the first pages that are made. I for my part look to it, however it may expand, gradually or more rapidly, as the one medium of the exposition of the best and strongest sentiments that prevail in the empire.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has presented the observations with which he has favoured the House in the manner that he promised us at the outset, that is to say, in no partizan spirit. If he will permit me to say so, I offer him my hearty commendation. The only observation I will make is that he has presented the conclusions of the different conferences that have taken place in a very fair and accurate manner.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Clerk of the House a certificate of the election and return of Duncan C. Ross, Esq., for the electoral district of West Middlesex.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Duncan Campbell Ross, member elect for the district of West Middlesex, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Mackenzie King.

REPRESENTATION OF OTTAWA AND QUEBEC EAST.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to ask the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has yet decided whether he will elect to sit for East Quebec or Ottawa?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I have not yet decided.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Railways was obliged to go away this afternoon and he asked me to allow these orders of mine to stand until to-morrow, which I am willing to do.

Order allowed to stand.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, orders, proceedings of courts of inquiry, or other documents or papers, in connection with charges of malfeasance of office made against the officer commanding No. 5 company, Canadian Army Service Corps, or the officer second in command of this company.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing the total number of incubators and brooders, respectively, imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, and the total cost of each.—Mr. White.

For a return showing approximately the amount of revenue collected by the government between the 1st January, 1908, and the 1st November, 1909, in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, on account of payments for coal lands, coal royalties, bonuses and rental on timber lands, timber dues, hay lands, grazing lands, irrigation areas, school lands, minerals, water powers, stone quarrying lands, Indian lands, or on account of any natural resources within each of the above provinces.—Mr. McCarthy.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence and complaints, or other papers, from Indians or others regarding the manner in which the St. Peter's Indians have been treated, relating to lands allotted to them by the government in consideration of the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the total amount paid by the government in each year since 1896, for all printing, advertising and lithographing done outside of the Government Printing Bureau; the total amount so paid by each department of the government for such purposes during each year; the names and addresses of each individual, firm or corporation to whom any such moneys have been so paid, and the total amount paid to each such individual, firm or corporation in each year since 1896. What portion of the said sums, if any, so paid since 1896 was expended after public advertisement, tender and contract, to whom such tenders were awarded, whether to the lowest tender in each case, what portion was expended otherwise than by public advertisement, tender and contract, and to whom it was paid in each instance.—Mr. Armstrong.

SUPPLY—COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if he has yet found the tracing that was to form a part of the report of the Committee on Forestry?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and instructions have been given to have it reproduced so that each member will have a copy as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Department Indian Affairs—salaries, $111,825.

Mr. BLAIN. I see a very large number of items for expenses in connection with

the payment of annuities to Indians. Would the minister give us a statement as to what the total amount of expenses is in connection with paying annuities to Indians?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The information asked by my hon. friend is of a character that is not compiled in that form in our records and will require a general search through the records in order to procure it. I will have to ask my hon. friend for time to prepare the information that he asks.

Mr. BLAIN. Every year we pay large amounts in travelling expenses, railway fares and pullman cars to distribute this money. Could this money not be sent to the local banks, without the necessity of a special messenger and the agents pay the annuities?

Mr. OLIVER. The course suggested by my hon. friend is followed so far as possible, but in connection with the treaties in northern Ontario, northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan, and the territory north of Manitoba, the treaty money must be carried by an officer whose duty it is to pay it out, and as he must be accompanied by a party the expense is very considerable.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister furnish a statement of the amount of money carried in this way and the total expense of distributing it.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but it will take some time to prepare.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Laird employed in the Indian Department here?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he a civil servant?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, in division A of the first division.

Roval Northwest Mounted Police—Salaries, $18,425.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are no changes in the staff; the increases are simply the statutory increases.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention to continue the Northwest Mounted Police at the present numerical strength?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the vote for civil government and that information would be given more properly on the vote for the Northwest Mounted Police, but I may say to my hon. friend that while we are diminishing the force in the Yukon, it is our intention to maintain the strength of the force as it is at present.

Department of Trade and Commerce—Salaries, $44,887.50.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are no increases with the exception of provision for two additional clerks in subdivision B of the third division at $500 each, and the appointment of an actuary in subdivision B of the first division at $2,100. These are for the annuities branch.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the superintendent of the branch?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Bastedo.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the actuary?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot tell my hon. friend just now.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us any reason why we should have an actuary?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give the information today. If my hon. friend wants it, I will let the item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this annuities branch will provoke some discussion. I would like to have a full explanation in regard to it.

Item allowed to stand.

Public works chargeable to Capital—Ottawa Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, etc., $11,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is asked to make provision for the completion of the residence for the chief astronomer, also two azimuth huts in connection with the observatory, applied for by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the residence, $17,000 and for the two azimuth huts, $6,000, making a total of $23,041.49. According to the chief architect's estimate, $1,291.71 additional will be required.

Mr. DANIEL. This is just for the building, not for any furniture in it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It includes the electric wiring and fixtures, heating and boiler, but not the furniture. I have made no provision for the furniture. I have no intimation from the Interior Department that we shall be asked to do the furnishing. I would think that would be done by the chief astronomer himself.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the building made of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a brick and stone building, two stories, with a wooden attic and a concrete and stone basement. Tenders were called for, and the lowest tender was $12,300, which was accepted.

Mr. FOSTER. How comes it to be $17,000 now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This figure of $12,300 does not include the cost of heating and boiler, electric wiring and fixtures, side-

walks, fencing, contingencies and superintendence.

Mr. CROCKET. Were tenders called for the works not covered by the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No tenders have yet been called for these.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is estimated for the installation of the heating apparatus?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500. Office fixtures and electric wiring $1,000, sidewalks and fencing $500, contingencies and superintendence, $1,700. According to the present practice of the department, tenders will be called for electric wiring and fixtures, also for heating and boiler.

Mr. DANIEL. That is just for the residence of the astronomer royal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for the chief astronomer.

Mr. DANIEL. Does it usually take as much as $1,000 to establish light and fixtures in an ordinary house of that sort?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the amount the architect estimates.

Mr. TURRIFF. What is the total cost of the building complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $17,041, including everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Who made the requisition for the house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of the Interior.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not intend to criticise the expenditure on that particular house because it is not very much out of the way, but I want to point out that very expensive buildings appear to have been put up for officers in connection with the Militia Department. There is not a minister living in a house which cost as much money as that, if you leave the site out of consideration. It would be well to go a little easier in expending public money on houses for government officials.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this a new departure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a special case and was fully explained last session. The chief astronomer is required to live close to the observatory, and there was no building close by that could be obtained.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. That is in the Interior Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely it is not intended that this will not be furnished for the astronomer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see why we should furnish it.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the experimental farm, are not the residences there furnished? And if they are, will not the chief astronomer expect the same treatment as other officials have received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The argument my hon. friend is urging in favour of furnishing it will be carefully considered; but as at present advised, I am not disposed to furnish it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not furnishing any argument. If the hon. minister chooses to be facetious, he should have some better grounds. I was asking for information which he is here to give. I wanted to know if he would not be called on to furnish that residence, and he did not give a definite answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My present view is not to furnish it. I did not intend to be facetious, but I understood my hon. friend to urge that the astronomer was as much entitled to have his house furnished as the officers at the experimental farm. If he did not intend to say that, I regret that I misunderstood him. I have informed the committee that I have not been asked to furnish the residence and see no reason why I should furnish it.

Mr. SPROULE. It was the hon. gentleman's indefinite answer which induced me to ask a further question. He said he was not aware the house was to be furnished, and I think it desirable that we should have now definitely the intention of the government, whether to furnish it or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I was as definite as I could be. The question of furnishing has not been brought before me and I do not see why the department should furnish it.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. minister not say to the committee last year that the government did not intend to furnish the house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember.

Mr. BOYCE. Were the estimates for this house prepared under the instructions of the minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were prepared by the chief architect in the usual way. There were no special instructions as to the exact form or detail.

Mr. BOYCE. Last session the minister got into a rather penitent frame of mind with regard to expenditure. I have recollections of his saying, almost with tears, that he was obliged to cut down some of the estimates for Public Works in order to keep them well within the revenue, which then was not as bounding as he would have liked to see it. It does seem now rather extraordinary that as high as $17,000 should be expended on a house for the astronomer. It is rather contradictory to find that the hon. minister, while deprecating extravagance, should agree to build so extravagant a house for a public servant. No doubt by the time it is completed it will cost $20,000 and possibly more.

Mr. FOSTER. I am surprised at the mildness of the criticism by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) but I was still more surprised that he should have given expression to any criticism. If we just had about once a week some gentleman on that side, who knows just as well as men on this side, who would get up and condemn these extravagancies, even as mildly as my hon. friend has done, we would have a change that would save the country millions of dollars. I invite my hon. friend to do this thing oftener and more strongly, and he will find that he will do his country extraordinary good service. This expenditure is simply outrageous. There is no possible justification for it. I go into the homes of people all through this city and find gentlemen and their families living in good homes, which cost from eight to ten thousand dollars and many less. What reason is there that this official should have a $20,000 house built for him by the government. He would not build such a house for himself. The minister says he is not going to furnish this house, but is the disposal of that in his own hands? He was simply asked by the Minister of the Interior to build this residence. I do not know whether responsibility for the extravagant sum rests on the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Public Works and his department but the sum is extravagant. Is it the intention of the government to furnish the house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the intention to furnish the house. In saying that, I am speaking for the government. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend as to the price at which suitable residences can be purchased in Ottawa. I looked around with a view to purchasing a residence, and although I am not extravagant in my tastes, I did not find that I could get a fairly good residence for less than $20,000, and the result has been that I have not felt myself able to purchase a residence so far in the city of Ottawa and I am living in somewhat humble apartments. A fairly good residence ranges from $15,000 to $30,000, some of them more than that. The chief astronomer is a high official of the government, and it having been decided to erect a residence for him, close to the observatory, it does not seem unreasonable that he should be given a residence suitable to the position which he occupies, and a residence of such style as he would be likely to live in if he were permitted to reside in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the salary of the chief astronomer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That rests with the Interior Department, and is to be found in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BOYCE. I understand the salary is $3,000. Is he to pay any rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. Was his salary increased in the general increases last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless he had reached the maximum of his class, I presume the increase would apply to him.

Mr. CROCKET. Has an estimate of the rental value of the property been made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it could be easily figured, I suppose, at six per cent on the cost.

Mr. CROCKET. So it amounts to another increase to his salary? I was amused at the minister's statement that he was not extravagant in his tastes. Of course, all we have to judge by is the minister's use of the public moneys of the country. I may call the attention of the House to the fact that on one occasion it cost the government $600 to maintain the minister here at Ottawa for one week.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One cannot help admiring the fertile imagination of my hon. friend. If his ability to present the facts were as great as his ability to draw on his imagination he certainly would be a wonderful man.

Mr. CROCKET. I may say that I am not drawing on my imagination at all. I have the documents at hand, and I can turn them up very readily, which will fully substantiate the statement I made that on one occasion he charged the province of New Brunswick $600, if it was not $800, as travelling expenses on a trip to Ottawa which did not extend beyond one week.

Mr. BOYCE. What would be the ordinary rental for a residence of this description?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not a very good judge of rentals in Ottawa, but I would suppose $1,000 a year would be a fair rental.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Would that amount to six per cent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very close to that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister considers six per cent a fair rate for the owners of property to get?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On a brick and stone building, where the wear and tear is not very great, yes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It is on that basis that the government pays rent on property throughout the city for their own use?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not rent on that basis, we rent by the superficial foot.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does that amount to more than six per cent on the value of the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to tell my hon. friend as to that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. But six per cent on the value of the property would, in the minister's opinion, be a fair value?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is that in my own city of St. John we consider six per cent rental on a stone or brick building as a very fair return.

Mr. BOYCE. Net rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, gross rental.

Mr. BOYCE. What would be the value of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are building it upon government land. I am not able to say what the value of the site would be.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister ought not to go to St. John when we are talking of rental values in Ottawa. The minister gave a statement of a fair value in Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think six per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Six per cent would be a good rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I would suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. What arrangement has been made as to this gentleman's salary? He gets a certain salary which we have voted to him. If we are to supply him with a house worth $1,000 to $1,200, then he is getting an increase in his salary of that amount. The whole thing is unfair, and we should have a full statement. Other officers of the same class do not receive these houses. It is not fair treatment as between man and man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say frankly that my understanding is that the chief astronomer will be furnished the use of this residence free in addition to his salary.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is it the intention to supply him with fuel and light for this residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He will have to pay for his own light and fuel.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the minister to say that he did not fix the value of this residence, that that was determined by the architect. That seems an odd way of disposing of the public moneys for the minister to absolve himself entirely as to the amount of money to be expended on any particular undertaking. Cases of this kind have come up repeatedly where architects have been instructed to erect buildings without instructions as to the cost. One notable example of that was in the case of the post office at Winnipeg, where the then Minister of Public Works stated distinctly in the House that he was not responsible for the character of the building, that he gave the architect carte blanche, and if there was anything wrong in the construction of the building the government was not to be held responsible for it, the department was not to be held responsible, the minister was not to be held responsible. If a mistake was made it was simply the mistake of an officer of the government. I distinctly understood the minister to say here that the architect had fixed the character of this building and consequently the cost of it. Now it does seem a strange thing that a minister presiding over a department should hand over to an officer of that department, who is not responsible to the people of this country, the control of the money to be expended in the erection of that building. I think the minister when he instructed the architect to go on and prepare plans and specifications for a building, should have limited him to a particular sum, say $10,000 or $12,000, and then let the architect work out a plan of a building where the cost would not exceed that sum. In that way the minister would hold some control over the expenditure of the country. But according to the plan that I understand is adopted, the head of the department practically has no control over the expenditure, neither has the House. We

are supposed to watch the expenditure of the country, but it turns out that it is an officer of the government in no way responsible to the people, a man who can do just as he pleases. We vote him his salary, and he determines what the cost of a public building shall be, he controls the expenditure of the country, and the House or the minister practically has nothing to say in the matter. I say the whole principle is wrong, and the sooner some other plan is adopted the better. If we are going to have an economical administration of the affairs of this country the minister himself should keep control of that expenditure, by giving more full directions to his officer as to what amount of money is to be expended on any particular undertaking. Now I think my statements are properly put, because I distinctly understood the minister to say that the architect alone was responsible for the cost of that building, that he determined the character of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember saying anything of the kind.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think 'Hansard' will report the minister as having made that statement. If I misunderstood the minister—I did not intend to make an unfair statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said in answer to the hon. member for Algoma, was that the details of the building were prepared by the chief architect. But I certainly did not intend to say that I gave up the absolute control of the cost of the building to him. What took place would be this: I would confer with him as to what kind of a building, in a general way, should be erected. His directions were to prepare plans for a building that would be a suitable residence, not a flimsy residence, but a building reasonably fire proof, reasonably substantial in its character, and suitable for a gentleman occupying the position that Dr. King occupies as chief astronomer.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that the hon. minister has made the matter much better in his latter statement. I do not think he has shown the House that he in any way restricted the architect as to the cost of this building. He has not told us that he directed him to construct a building that would cost any specific sum. Perhaps the minister will tell us if he did limit him in any way beyond the general way to which he has referred. We all know the disposition of architects to erect buildings of this kind on an elaborate scale. I remember years ago when the Hon. Mr. Tarte, then Minister of Public Works, determined to erect a number of post offices throughout the country on what might be called a cheaper scale, with the idea that smaller towns and villages throughout the country might obtain a public building at not a very large cost. I had year after year advocated in towns ranging from 1,500 to 2,000 population, the erection of post office buildings at a cost of about $6,000. I was supported on both sides in that contention. It was stated in the House that such could be done. After one or two years advocacy of a plan of that kind, in order that small towns and villages could participate in the public expenditure and get the advantage of a public building, the Hon. Mr. Tarte determined to try the plan. I was told in the case of the Clinton post office, the first one that the minister determined to erect on the plan we had spoken of, that when he found the cost running up, instead of to $6,000, to $15,000, the architect had said that he would not draw a plan of a building to cost less than $10,000. It was no matter what the minister wanted, the minister was only a side show in the matter, the architect was the man that decided what the cost of the building should be. I fear that has been the case in these expenditures, that the architect has been given a free hand, that he wanted to put up a building according to his own fancy, according to his own ideas, without regard to how the public money should be spent, and that he has erected this $17,000 building when, possibly, if the minister's better judgment had been exercised, and if the minister had controlled him along the lines that he says he believes in, a building quite suitable for the astronomer could have been erected at a cost of not more than $10,000 or $12,000. What I wish to draw to the minister's attention is that I think in every instance of the erection of a public building, he should restrict the architect to the ultimate cost, and if the architect is not able to draw plans and specifications of a building to come within the measure of the capacity of the country's finances, then some other man should be put in his place who would be willing and able to do so. There is a principle involved, and if we are going to see that the finances of this country are carefully conserved, then I think the minister should in all cases control this expenditure in some such manner as I have indicated. I had occasion in bygone years to refer to this matter time and again. I remember when the Hon. Mr. Sutherland was Minister of Public Works. In speaking with reference to a public building in London I explained to him what I thought should be the principle upon which he should proceed, that he should tell the architect exactly the amount of money he wanted to expend on that building, and then limit him to that expenditure, compel him to keep within that amount, and in that way he would have a control of the ex-

penditure of the country. The Hon. Mr. Sutherland, a very genial man, a man who never liked to quarrel with anybody in the House, found it always the easiest way to get his estimates through was to agree with those who were criticising them. He answered me by saying that he thought I was right, he thought that was the proper plan, and in fact gave us to understand that in future he was going to adopt that course. I am sorry to say that what was approved by the Hon. Mr. Sutherland when he was Minister of Public Works has not been carried out by his successor. I think the minister should weigh this matter well and put a firm hand upon the expenditure of the country, keeping control of that expenditure himself, and then we will certainly know who is to blame if we think too much is being expended in the erection of any building.

Mr. BURRELL. In this discussion the chief astronomer, whom I have not the pleasure of knowing, is almost put in the position of being the party who was blameable for the action which the government has taken. I should think there should be a fair line of division drawn as between the chief astronomer and the government We have been accustomed to think of people associated with scientific pursuits as being men of scientific minds given to plain living and high thinking, and here the government is trying to force upon a gentleman of simple tastes a wildly extravagant house perhaps contrary to his wishes and beyond his ability to maintain. They are not only putting upon a $3,000 civil servant a $20,000 house, but they are practically saying, according to the advising of the Minister of Public Works, that he will not only have to furnish it but that he will have to furnish his own fuel and light. It is tantamount to saying to a gentleman who is drawing $3,000 a year: You will have to give $2,000 a year in heating and warming yourself if we make you a present of this white elephant. It seems to me up to us on our side to take into consideration the view of the chief astronomer that he may not want a house of these regal dimensions. I suggest that his views be ascertained before he is called upon to pay these extravagant prices for furnishing, heating and lighting and not have forced upon him by the government this riotous and extravagant style of living which may not be in harmony with his own wishes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister has not definitely stated whether he places any limit upon buildings which are erected or whether he placed any limit upon this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it will be found that the amount which I stated to parliament when this vote was first asked for will not be materially exceeded. I think I then stated what would be the character of the house that it was proposed to build and what would be the cost. I may say that the residence is not of an extravagant character. The foundation is of concrete, it is a two story brick building and is to have a wooden attic. The design is very good. The house is somewhat large but still it is not what would be called an extravagant house.

Mr. CROCKET. What are the dimensions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 47 x 41. The basement partitions are of brick, it is a very substantial house and will be pretty nearly fireproof. I think it is desirable that all these buildings should be built in a substantial manner. It is desirable that they should be reasonably fireproof because the government is its own insurer. We have a great many buildings, we do not insure, and we try, as far as possible, to erect buildings of such character that the danger from fire will be as little as possible.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was the work let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, five tenders were received and the contract was awarded to Messrs. Doran & Devlin, of Ottawa, for $12,300. An hon. gentleman spoke of this as a $20,000 house. It does not amount to that. The contract was for $12,300 and then there is an additional amount for heating and boilers, electric wiring and fixtures, sidewalk in front of the house, fencing, contingencies and superintendence, making a total of $17,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not quite understand these items. The item under discussion refers to this building that I understand the minister is erecting for the astronomer royal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say astronomer royal. I said chief astronomer.

Mr. DANIEL. Oh, chief astronomer. I see that there is $14,000 down for 1909-10 and $11,000 for 1910-11 which makes $25,000. Then, I think the minister stated that there was $1,200 in addition not included so that that would be $26,200. Does that refer entirely to this building, or does it refer to other buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It includes two azimuth huts.

Mr. FOSTER. Is azimuth a building material?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is the name of the building.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why do you not get an easier one?

Mr. SPROULE. Does the chief astronomer take the rank of a deputy minister or does he rank as a technical officer?

Mr. OLIVER. The chief astronomer does not hold the rank of a deputy minister. He is at the head of a branch.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any specific salary provided under the Civil Service Act for that class of office, and if so, what is it?

Mr. OLIVER. The chief astronomer is in the highest division next the deputy minister.

Mr. SPROULE. What salary does that division command?

Mr. OLIVER. From $2,800 to $4,000. It is in class A of the first division.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you justify the provision of a house for this officer and the refusal of the same to another who is in an equally high class or in a higher class?

Mr. OLIVER. As the Department of Interior is responsible for the salary of the astronomer and also for this request, I may be privileged to answer. The most important work of the astronomer necessarily is done at the observatory and at night. That being the case it is considered to tend both to economy and efficiency that he should reside at his place of work. The condition is not paralleled in the case of any other officer of the Department of the Interior, and it is not with the view of giving the astronomer an advantage over any other officer of the department, but merely of putting him in a position whereby he can give the best and most work for the salary that he receives that this residence is being provided. It is not with a view of favouring the chief astronomer over any other officer, but merely to put him in a position whereby he can do the best and most work for his salary.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The chief astronomer receives a salary of $3,000 which will gradually go up to $4,000, and the Minister of Public Works tells us that this house will be worth an additional thousand a year to him. Does not the Minister of the Interior see that if the reasons given by him are sound, then the three assistants should also be supplied with houses?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Are we to understand that these asimuth huts are to cost $6,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will cost $6,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What is their purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are intended for the purpose of testing the steel tapes, a work which is essential in connection with the observatory, and considering the size of the building and the manner in which it is to be built, $6,000 does not appear to be out of the way.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why do you call them huts? Is it because they are only one story and will cost $6,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the technical name by which they are known. The building is only one story but it is 177 feet long.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I beg to move that this item be reduced by $5,000, the reduction to apply to the astronomer's residence.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that matter——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Vote.

Mr. FOSTER. You are obstructing now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not obstructing. As my department is responsible for the request to build this residence, I may be permitted to say something.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Let us vote.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter has been under consideration for some years and it would appear that there is just as much necessity for the residence of the chief astronomer to be convenient to the observatory as there is to have an observatory at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) has asked why residences should not be built for the assistant astronomers; but that is not a fair comparison. The time and talent of the gentleman who has charge of the responsibility of making astronomical investigations may be of much more value than the time and talent of his assistants. Therefore it is advisable from every point of view that his time should be conserved as thoroughly as possible.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would not that apply to his assistants as well?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand my hon. friend's point of view. If a gentleman is placed in charge of a certain work and receives a salary proportionate to his responsibility, it is presumed that he is burdened with the responsibility and receives the salary because his talent is greater, and therefore his time is more valuable than that of his assistants.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the minister trying to argue for a $20,000 house for this astronomer?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I understand that I am trying to argue for a $17,000 house lo-

cated convenient to the observatory, and that this is not an improper expenditure of public money, but on the contrary——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot allow the committee to continue work after 6 o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be convenient to have the usual motion that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, and I would ask my hon. friend opposite to withdraw his motion in order that I may make the usual motion, and he can renew his motion on a future occasion.

Motion of Mr. Meighen withdrawn.

Item allowed to stand.

Some resolutions reported.

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 25, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the committee ordered by this House on the subject of proportional representation be composed of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, and Messrs. Monk, Turcotte (Quebec County), Burrell, Magrath, Wilson (Laval), and Kyte.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. FISHER. This is a Bill which has been handed to me by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as it comes under his administration. It involves an amendment by which the words 'no cargo' and 'cargo or cargoes' are struck out. The effect of this is to provide that the weighing of cargoes shall not be continued. They have found it impracticable after a year or two of trial and they desire it to cease. The second clause in the Bill is simply to give representation to Alberta and Saskatchewan upon the grain survey board. The third clause is to correct a mistake by which this Act was put under the control and administration of the Department of Trade and Commerce instead of the Department of Inland Revenue. The last clause defines the weight of a barrel of potatoes when potatoes are sold by the barrel.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—COPYRIGHT.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) to amend the Criminal Code.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain, please.

Mr. LENNOX. Briefly, this Bill is intended to protect the owners of copyrights. It has been frequently said in this House and in Canada that our copyright law is defective, but it will be sufficient for me to say that last session, when the Minister of Justice was amending the Criminal Code, I presented an amendment in the form that the Bill now takes. The Minister of Justice took time to consider the matter and the Minister of Agriculture who was also interested was in the House. The amendment passed this House unanimously but it was rejected with other amendments re musical compositions by the Minister of Justice by the Senate. I, therefore, beg leave to introduce this amendment to the law.

Mr. FISHER. Is this amendment with regard to copyright in music?

Mr. LENNOX. No, the amendment with reference to music was introduced by the Minister of Justice. The amendment I propose is to protect the owners of dramatic copyrights.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SALE OF WATER LOTS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK:

1. Are the two water lots on the St. Charles river situate in front cadastral lots Nos. 582A and 583B, of the parish of St. Roch, in the county of Quebec, the property of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, under the statutes governing that body?

2. Have the said two water lots above described, been sold by the Quebec government

to private individuals within the past four years? If so, to what persons have the said lots been sold, and for what price?

3. Who are to-day the registered owners of said two water lots, and in what proportion for each person?

4. What is the superficial area of said water lots, in arpents and in foot measure?

5. Has the conveyance of said water lots been ratified by the Governor General in Council pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 20 of chapter 34, of 62-63 Victoria?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Mr. MONK. This question was put on the 12th November. One of the questions could have been answered on that very day. I was told that the question had been referred to Quebec for information on the 12th. It seems to me that the delay is unduly long unless a messenger has been sent down to Quebec on foot to get the information.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not in the department any information in regard to it. Just to please my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) we wrote to the harbour commissioners in Quebec asking them whether they could supply us with the information. We have not received that information from them so far. I am very sorry I cannot give any information to my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. This is a body that is under the control of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss it at this point.

REPORTED EMIGRATION TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Is the government aware that Col Van Sant, American Consul at Kingston, Ontario, has made the following report to his government:—

Kingston, November 18—(Special)—Col Van Sant, American Consul for this district, in a report to his government, states that this city during nine months ended September 30, has lost nearly 800 of its population through its citizens emigrating to the United States. He bases his calculations on the fact that during the nine months 110 invoices for emigrants effects were issued at Kingston and continues:

As each settler's effects' certificate usually represents a family averaging four, the gain in population to the United States for the past nine months from this city and vicinity will reach 400. Add to this number moving to the States without household effects, and the loss to Kingston would be nearly double, or 800. This condition largely prevails in other towns and cities of eastern Ontario.

2. If so, what action does the government intend to take to put a stop to such emigration from Canada to the United States?

Hon. F. OLIVER:

1. The government has no information on the subject, beyond the statement referred to, appearing in the public press.

2. Inquiry will be made as to the facts.

I would like to add the contents of a telegram which has been received from Kingston as follows:

Consul Van Sant says press statement that 800 people from Kingston have emigrated to United States this year is false.

INTEREST ON PRE-EMPTION PAYMENTS.

Mr. LAKE:

1. Is the government calling upon all persons who hold receipts for pre-emption fees to pay interest at rate of 5 per cent on the amount payable for their pre-emption at the close of each year from the date of their receipt?

2. Was specific notice given to applicants for pre-emption at the time they made their entries, or subsequently, that they would be called upon to pay interest at the expiration of every twelve months?

3. Does the government consider that the average entrant for a pre-emption is likely to be in a position to pay the annual interest of $24 per annum for the outset, and does it intend to insist upon such payment? If so, what means does it propose to take to enforce the payments?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. No, it was not necessary to give such specific notice as the statute provides that interest shall be payable at the rate of five per cent per annum at the end of each year from the date of entry.

3. When an application is made for a pre-emption entry it must necessarily be presumed that the entrant will be in a position to carry out all the conditions prescribed by the statute in that behalf. His failure to do so renders his entry liable to cancellation.

SALE OF SCHOOL LAND AT REGINA.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. What amount of school land was sold at the last sale at Regina, Saskatchewan?

2. What amount was spent in advertising this sale, and where and how was it spent?

3 Who was the auctioneer and what is his address?

4. What amount was he paid for his services?

5. Who were the purchasers of the land sold, and what prices were paid?

6. How much land has the government sold to the Saskatoon and Western Land Company, and at what prices?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The area of school lands disposed of at the last auction sale at Regina, May 20, 1903, was 46,940·99 acres, and the price realized was $457,324.42, being an average of $9.74 per acre.

2. The cost of advertising this sale cannot be given separately, as the advertisements and posters covered the following sales held in the month of May, 1903, namely: Regina, Moosejaw, Qu'Appelle, Wolseley, Whitewood, Moosomin, Carlyle, Carnduff, Alameda, and Yellow Grass, at which sales 136,002·24 acres were sold for $1,306,091.92.

The total cost of advertising and printing in connection with the above sales was $997.17. Of this sum $498.97 was in payment for the advertisements in the following newspapers, as approved by the King's Printer, namely:

Qu'Appelle 'Progress'	$ 46 20
Regina 'Leader'	46 20
Indian Head 'Prairie Witness'	46 20
Moosomin 'Spectator'	46 20
Yorkton 'Enterprise'	40 04
Regina 'Standard'	46 20
Wolseley 'News'	46 20
Regina 'Rundschau'	44 66
Brandon 'Western Publishing Company'	46 20
Winnipeg 'Free Press'	40 05
Arcola 'Moose Mountain Star'	27 72
Winnipeg 'Der Nordwesten'	23 10
Total	$498 97

The balance of $498.20 was for the printing of the sales list and posters by the Printing Bureau.

3. Mr. W. B. Underhill, of Melita, Manitoba, now deceased.

4. $800. This amount covers his services for the sales before-mentioned, all of which were conducted by him.

5. The names of the purchasers at the Regina sale and the prices paid are shown on the accompanying list.

6. No school lands have been purchased from the government by the company mentioned.

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, on May 20, 1903.

Part of Section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per Acre Realized.	Name of Purchaser.
						$ cts.	
S.W. ¼	11	14	17	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
N.W. ¼	11	14	17	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	17	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.W. ¼	29	14	17	2	160·	7 25	Donald Andrew Macdonald.
N.E. ¼	29	14	17	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
N.W. ¼	29	14	17	2	160·	7 25	Donald Andrew Macdonald.
S.E. ¼	11	15	17	2	160·	8 00	Frank Judson Pearson.
S.W. ¼	11	15	17	2	160·	8 75	Patrick Henry Hughes.
N.E. ¼	11	15	17	2	160·	8 00	Frank Judson Pearson.
N.W. ¼	11	15	17	2	160·	8 00	Michael Joseph Hughes.
S.E. ¼	29	5	17	2	160·	8 50	Flora J. Brenner, wife of Joseph Alson Brenner.
S.W. ¼	29	15	17	2	160·	9 00	Samuel Landis Overholser.
N.E. ¼	29	15	17	2	160·	9 25	" "
N.W. ¼	29	15	17	2	160·	8 00	Walter Joseph Cummings.
S.E. ¼	29	17	17	2	160·	8 00	William Henry Kalbfleisch.
N.E. ¼	29	17	17	2	160·	8 00	Valentine Krause.
S.E. ¼	11	18	17	2	160·	7 00	William Henry Kalbfleisch.
S.W. ¼	11	18	17	2	160·	10 50	" "
N.E. ¼	11	18	17	2	160·	8 50	Balzar Wagmann.
N.W. ¼	11	18	17	2	160·	9 50	William Henry Kalbfleisch.
S.E. ¼	29	18	17	2	160·	7 00	Fred Be ker.
S.W. ¼	29	18	17	2	160·	7 00	Frederick Gentner.
N.E ¼	29	18	17	2	160·	7 00	Charles Schlievert.
N.W	29	18	17	2	160·	7 00	Herman Siebert.

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, &c.—*Continued.*

Part of Section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per acre realized.	Name of Purchaser.
						$ cts.	
S.E. ¼	29	13	18	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	13	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	13	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	13	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.W. ¼	11	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.W. ¼	29	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	14	18	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	14	18	2	160·	7 25	Donald Andrew Macdonald.
S.E. ¼	11	15	18	2	160·	8 25	" "
S.W. ¼	11	15	18	2	160·	8 25	" "
N.E. ¼	11	15	18	2	160·	8 00	John Edward Martin.
N.W. ¼	11	15	18	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	15	18	2	160·	8 25	Frank Judson Pearson.
S.W. ¼	29	15	18	2	160·	8 25	" "
N.E. ¼	29	15	18	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	15	18	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	16	18	2	160·	8 25	Eliza Weeks.
S.W. ¼	11	16	18	2	160·	8 00	Walter Joseph Cummings.
N.E. ¼	11	16	18	2	160·	8 00	Eliza Weeks.
N.W. ¼	11	16	18	2	160·	8 00	Walter Joseph Cummings.
S.E. ¼	29	16	18	2	160·	9 00	" "
S.W. ¼	29	16	18	2	160·	11 00	John Dobbin.
N.E. ¼	29	16	18	2	160·	9 00	Walter Joseph Cummings.
N.W. ¼	29	16	18	2	160·	8 75	Robert Hamilton Moore.
S.E. ¼	11	17	18	2	160·	8 25	James Harvey.
S.W. ¼	11	17	18	2	160·	8 00	"
N.E. ¼	11	17	18	2	160·	8 25	James Trimble Westgate.
N.W. ¼	11	17	18	2	160·	7 00	James Harvey.
Pt. N.E. ¼	29	17	18	2	158·	10 00	Nicklai Tanberg.
Pt. N.E. ¼	29	17	18	2	2·	8 00	Trustees Pilot Butte School District No. 207.
S.W. ¼	29	17	18	2	160·	10 25	Adam Kapall.
S.E. ¼	29	17	18	2	160·	10 50	Conrad Wiesbrod.
N.W. ¼	29	17	18	2	160·	10 50	Andrew Martin.
S.E. ¼	11	18	18	2	160·	7 00	Gottleib Kalk.
S.W. ¼	11	18	18	2	160·	7 00	Fred. Rust.
N.W. ¼	11	18	18	2	160·	8 00	Daniel Wiesbrod.
S.E. ¼	11	19	18	2	160·	7 00	Konrad Brodt.
S.E. ¼	29	13	19	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	13	19	2	160·	7 00	James Louis Keough.
N.E. ¼	29	13	19	2	160·	7 00	Donald Andrew MacDonald.
N.W. ¼	29	13	19	2	160·	7 25	" "
S.E. ¼	11	14	19	2	160·	7 25	James Harvey.
Fr. S.W. ¼	11	14	19	2	143·50	7 00	"
Fr. N.E. ¼	11	14	19	2	66·	7 00	"
Fr. N.W. ¼	11	14	19	2	5·50	10 50	"
S.E. ¼	29	14	19	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	14	19	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	14	19	2	160·	7 00	John Wesley Connell.
N.W. ¼	29	14	19	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	15	19	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	11	15	19	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	15	19	2	160·	7 00	Ernestine Roberta Whiteside.
N.W. ¼	11	15	19	2	160·	7 00	John Wesley Connell.
S.E. ¼	29	15	19	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	15	19	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	15	19	2	160·	7 00	Frank Judson Pearson.
N.W. ¼	29	15	19	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	16	19	2	160·	8 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	11	16	19	2	160·	8 00	Maughan McCausland.
N.E. ¼	11	16	19	2	160·	8 00	John Edward Martin.
N.W. ¼	11	16	19	2	160·	8 00	Frank Judson Pearson.

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, &c.—*Continued.*

Part of Section.	Section,	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per Acre realized.	Name of Purchaser.
						$ cts.	
S.E. ¼	29	16	19	2	160·	8 50	John Alexander McLachlin, Hector Lachlan Beeton.
S.W. ¼	29	16	19	2	160·	10 25	Robert J. Mutrie and James Thos. Mutrie.
N.E. ¼	29	16	19	2	160·	9 25	John Alexander McLachlin.
N.W. ¼	29	16	19	2	160·	9 25	Robert J. Mutrie and James Thos. Mutrie.
S.E. ¼	11	17	19	2	160·	9 25	James Harvey.
S W. ¼	11	17	19	2	160·	11 50	George Ferry March.
N.E. ¼	11	17	19	2	160·	12 75	Walter Joseph Cummings.
N.W. ¼	11	17	19	2	160·	11 75	" "
Pt. S.E. ¼	29	17	19	2	77·	25 00	John Kenneth McInnis.
Pt. S.W. ¼	29	17	19	2	122·	30 50	" "
N.E. ¼	29	17	19	2	160·	25 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	17	19	2	160·	31 50	" "
Part of	29	17	19	2	95·74	37 50	" "
S.E. ¼	11	18	19	2	160·	10 50	Wilbert Skene.
S.W. ¼	11	18	19	2	160·	12 25	Emilie Agobsowicz.
N.E. ¼	11	18	19	2	160·	9 00	James Harvey.
N.W. ¼	11	18	19	2	160·	11 25	Alexander Ursaki.
S.E. ¼	29	18	19	2	160·	10 25	Edward McCarthy.
S.W. ¼	29	18	19	2	160·	11 25	James Balfour.
N.E. ¼	29	18	19	2	160·	12 00	William James Davis.
N.W. ¼	29	18	19	2	160·	11 00	Charles Simpson.
Pt. N.E. ¼	11	19	19	2	158·	8 00	Manasseh Hamilton Westgate.
Pt. N.E. ¼	11	19	19	2	2·	8 00	Trustees Sterling School District No. 5
S.E. ¼	29	19	19	2	160·	10 00	James Harvey.
S.W. ¼	29	19	19	2	160·	11 25	John Wesley Atcheson.
N.E. ¼	29	19	19	2	160·	12 50	Robert Rolston.
N.W. ¼	29	19	19	2	160·	11 25	James McDougald.
S. E. ¼	11	13	20	2	160·	8 00	James Louis Keough.
S.W. ¼	11	13	20	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	13	20	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	13	20	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E ¼	29	13	20	2	160·	10 00	James Harvey.
S.W. ¼	29	13	20	2	160·	10 00	"
N.E. ¼	29	13	20	2	160·	10 00	"
N.W. ¼	29	13	20	2	160·	10 00	"
S.E. ¼	11	14	20	2	160·	7 00	John Wesley Connell.
S.W. ¼	11	14	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	14	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	14	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	20	2	160·	7 00	John Edward Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	14	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	14	20	2	160·	7 50	Willison Andrew Lambert.
N.W. ¼	29	14	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E ¼	11	15	20	2	160·	7 00	John Wesley Connell.
S.W ¼	11	15	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	15	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	15	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	15	20	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.W. ¼	29	15	20	2	160·	7 00	Joseph Lathen Boyd.
N.E. ¼	29	15	20	2	160·	7 00	John Wesley Connell.
N.W. ¼	29	15	20	2	160·	7 00	William Elliott,
N.E. ¼	11	16	20	2	160·	8 00	Herbert Bret.
S.E. ¼	29	16	20	2	160·	8 25	Walter Joseph Cummings.
S.W. ¼	29	16	20	2	160·	11 00	Isaac Jackson.
N.E. ¼	29	16	20	2	160·	10 75	George Cook and James William Smith Eddy.
N.W. ¼	29	16	20	2	160·	11 75	" " " "
S.E. ¼	11	17	20	2	160·	14 00	Thomas Elliott.
S.W. ¼	11	17	20	2	160·	13 25	William D. Grant.
N.E. ¼	11	17	20	2	160·	15 00	Nelson Boyd.
N.W. ¼	11	17	20	2	160·	13 50	" "
S.E. ¼	18	17	20	2	160·	12 00	George Cook and James W. S. Eddy.
S.W. ¼	18	17	20	2	160·	12 00	" " "
Pt. N.E. ¼	18	17	20	2	147·78	12 00	" " "
Pt. N.W. ¼	18	17	20	2	147·78	12 00	" " "

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, &c.—*Continued.*

Part of Section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per Acre Realized.	Name of Purchaser.
						$ cts.	
S.E. ¼	11	18	20	2	160·	17 25	Daniel McCusker.
Pt. S.W. ¼	11	18	20	2	153·42	15 25	Alexander H. Brown.
N.E. ¼	11	18	20	2	160·	18 50	Benjamin F. Marshall.
N.W. ¼	11	18	20	2	160·	21 75	" "
Pt. S.E. ¼	29	18	20	2	154·49	17 00	Matthew Henderson.
Pt. S.W. ¼	29	18	20	2	154·66	17 00	William A. Lambert.
N.E. ¼	29	18	20	2	160·	30 00	Matthew Henderson.
Pt. N.W. ¼	29	18	20	2	158·27	24 50	John Dougan.
S.E. ¼	11	19	20	2	156·	12 00	Thomas R. Brown.
Pt. S.W. ¼	11	19	20	2	157·50	13 00	" "
Pt. S.W. ¼	11	19	20	2	2·50	12 00	Trustees Rose Plain S. D.
N.E. ¼	11	19	20	2	160·	12 00	James D. Traynor.
N.W. ¼	11	19	20	2	160·	12 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	19	20	2	160·	18 50	George W. A. McNeice.
S.W. ¼	29	19	20	2	160·	15 50	" "
Pt. N.E. ¼	29	19	20	2	155·22	8 00	Charles Binnie.
N.W. ¼	29	19	20	2	160·	8 00	Robert Sinton.
S.E. ¼	11	20	20	2	160·	12 25	Oliver Wylie.
S.W. ¼	11	20	20	2	160·	10 50	Geo. Mollard.
N.E. ¼	11	20	20	2	160	8 25	Moses Seed.
S.E. ¼	11	13	21	2	160·	8 00	John H. Murphy.
S.W. ¼	11	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	13	21	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	13	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	14	21	2	160·	8 00	John Marshall Young.
S.W. ¼	11	14	21	2	160·	8 75	James Balfour.
N.E. ¼	11	14	21	2	160·	8 00	James D. Traynor.
N.W. ¼	11	14	21	2	160·	9 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	21	2	160·	8 50	William S. Calderwood.
S.W. ¼	29	14	21	2	160·	8 75	William H. Johnston.
N.E. ¼	29	14	21	2	160·	8 25	William S. Calderwood.
N.W. ¼	29	14	21	2	160·	8 75	William H. Johnston.
S.E. ¼	11	15	21	2	160·	7 25	James Wallace Norton.
S.W. ¼	11	15	21	2	160.	7 25	" "
N.E. ¼	11	15	21	2	160·	7 00	John E. Martin.
N.W. ¼	11	15	21	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	15	21	2	160·	7 25	Noah T. Selby.
S.W ¼	29	15	21	2	160·	7 25	" "
N.E. ¼	29	15	21	2	160·	7 00	" "
N W. ¼	29	15	21	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	16	21	2	160·	9 50	Walter J. Cummings.
S.W. ¼	11	16	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	16	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	16	21	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	16	21	2	160·	10 00	Frank J. Pearson.
S.W. ¼	29	16	21	2	160·	10 25	Albert Hammond.
N.E. ¼	29	16	21	2	160·	11 00	Joseph Lube.
N.W ¼	29	16	21	2	160·	8 00	Frank J. Pearson.
S.E. ¼	11	17	21	2	160·	12 00	James Harvey.
S.W. ¼	11	17	21	2	160·	12 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	17	21	2	160·	12 50	Norman K. Hoffman.
N.W. ¼	11	17	21	2	160·	13 00	Edward McDonagh.
S.E. ¼	29	17	21	2	160·	15 00	William J. Moore.
S.W. ¼	29	17	21	2	160·	13 25	William Donald.
N.E. ¼	29	17	21	2	160·	14 50	" "
N.W. ¼	29	17	21	2	160·	12 00	Elmer Shaw.
S.E. ¼	11	18	21	2	160·	10 00	Edward Gleisser.
N.E. ¼	11	18	21	2	160·	10 00	Verna J. Callender.
N.W. ¼	11	18	21	2	160·	10 00	Albert Mullen.
S.E. ¼	29	18	21	2	160·	10 00	Frederick H. Cochrane.
S.W. ¼	29	18	21	2	160·	10 00	" "

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, &c.—*Continued.*

Part of Section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per Acre Realized.	Name of Purchaser.
						$ cts.	
N.E. ¼	29	18	21	2	160·	10 00	Hubert J. Peacey.
N.W. ¼	29	18	21	2	160·	12 00	" "
Pt. S.E. ¼	11	19	21	2	152·78	10 00	Matilda M. Bredin.
S.W. ¼	11	19	21	2	160·	15 25	" "
N.E. ¼	11	19	21	2	157·38	10 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	19	21	2	155·	10 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	19	21	2	160·	17 25	Charles Keith.
S.W. ¼	29	19	21	2	160·	13 00	William F. Carse.
Pt. N.E. ¼	29	19	21	2	153·50	17 75	Charles Keith.
Pt. N.W. ¼	29	19	21	2	153·50	12 25	James G. Mutch.
Pt. S.E. ¼	11	20	21	2	150·	8 00	James Grover.
S.E. ¼	11	14	22	2	160·	9 00	James Harvey.
S.W. ¼	11	14	22	2	160·	9 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	14	22	2	160·	9 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	14	22	2	160·	9 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	22	2	160·	9 00	William R. F. Richmond.
S.W. ¼	29	14	22	2	160·	9 00	Edward McCarthy.
N.E. ¼	29	14	22	2	160·	10 00	William R. F. Richmond.
N.W. ¼	29	14	22	2	160·	9 75	Edward McCarthy.
S.E. ¼	11	15	22	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
S.W. ¼	11	15	22	2	160·	8 25	Peter Traynor.
N.E. ¼	11	15	22	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
N.W. ¼	11	15	22	2	160·	8 25	Peter Traynor.
S.E. ¼	29	15	22	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
S.W. ¼	29	15	22	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	15	22	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	15	22	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	16	22	2	160	9 00	Dan Donald and John Ford.
S.W. ¼	11	16	22	2	160·	8 25	" "
N.E. ¼	11	16	22	2	160·	8 25	" "
N.W. ¼	11	16	22	2	160·	13 25	Edward Badley.
S.E. ¼	29	16	22	2	160·	8 00	Frank J. Pearson.
S.W. ¼	29	16	22	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	16	22	2	160·	8 00	Walter J. Cummings.
N.W. ¼	29	16	22	2	160·	8 00	" "
Part N.E. ¼	11	17	22	2	147·72	10 00	Duncan J. McGillivray and August W. Vanstone.
Part N.W. ¼	11	17	22	2	152·20	10 00	
S.E. ¼	29	17	22	2	160·	11 00	Geo. W. Harvie.
S.W. ¼	29	17	22	2	160·	12 00	"
N.E. ¼	29	17	22	2	160·	11 75	John F. Smith.
N.W. ¼	29	17	22	2	160·	15 25	" "
S.W. ¼	11	18	22	2	160·	10 00	Stephen F. Callender and James Balfour.
N.W. ¼	11	18	22	2	160·	10 00	" " " "
S.E. ¼	29	18	22	2	160	10 50	Thomas E. Hind.
S.W. ¼	29	18	22	2	160·	10 00	John Smith.
N.E. ¼	29	18	22	2	160·	10 00	George Kinnon.
N.W. ¼	29	18	22	2	160·	10 00	Geo. W. Harvie.
S.E. ¼	11	19	22	2	160·	16 50	John McAdam Campbell.
S.W. ¼	11	19	22	2	160·	13 00	Charles Sherriffs.
N.E. ¼	11	19	22	2	160·	16 00	Zachary M. Hamilton.
N.W. ¼	11	19	22	2	160·	13 25	Charles Sherriffs.
S.E. ¼	11	14	23	2	160·	7 25	John W. Connell.
S.W. ¼	11	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.W. ¼	29	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.E. ¼	29	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	14	23	2	160·	7 00	" "
S.E. ¼	11	15	23	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
S.W. ¼	11	15	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼	11	15	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	11	15	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼	29	15	23	2	160·	9 50	Andrew Sipes, David W. Coventry, Frank Marshall.
S.W. ¼	29	15	23	2	160·	10 25	" " "

SCHEDULE of School Lands sold by public auction at Regina, &c.—*Concluded.*

Part of Section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	Area in Acres.	Price per Acre Realized.	Name of Purchaser.
Pt.N.E. ¼....	29	15	23	2	152·92	20 00	G. H. V. Bulyea.
Pt.N.W. ¼....	29	15	23	2	156·63	25 25	Andrew Sikes, David W. Coventry, Frank Marshall.
S.E. ¼.	11	16	23	2	160·	8 00	John E. Martin.
S.W. ¼.....	11	16	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼.	11	16	23	2	160·	8 75	Donald A. McDonald.
N.W. ¼.....	11	16	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼..... ..	29	16	23	2	160·	9 50	Walter J. Cummings.
S.W. ¼.....	29	16	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.E. ¼.....	29	16	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
N.W. ¼	29	16	23	2	160·	8 00	" "
S.E. ¼.	11	18	23	2	160·	10·00	Nicholas R. Read.
S.W. ¼.	11	18	23	2	160·	10 00	" "
N.E. ¼.	11	18	23	2	160·	10 00	" "
N.W. ¼.....	11	18	23	2	160·	10 00	" "
Pt. S.E. ¼....	11	19	23	2	156·	9 00	Donald Wilkie, Sr.
Pt. S.W. ¼....	11	19	23	2	156·	9 00	John Martin.
N.E. ¼..	11	19	23	2	160·	9 00	" "
N.W. ¼.....	11	19	23	2	160·	9 00	" "

DR. McCONNELL, OF MORDEN.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Is Dr. McConnell, of Morden, Manitoba, in the employ of the government in any way?
2. Has he been employed by the government during the past five years? If so, how much money has he drawn each year?

Mr. OLIVER:

As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:

1. No.
2. No.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. So far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, no.

DR. ARMSTRONG, OF GLADSTONE.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Is Dr. Armstrong, of Gladstone, Manitoba, in the employ of the government in any way?
2. Has he been employed by the government during the past five years? If so, how much money has he drawn each year?

Mr. OLIVER:

So far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned:

1. Yes, as medical officer to the Indians of Manitowapah agency.
2. Yes. 1904-05, $11; 1905-06, $27; 1906-07, $56; 1907-08, $169; 1908-09, $97.50.

As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:

1. No.
2. Yes. 1905-06, Nil; 1906-07, Nil; 1907-08, $37; 1908-09, Nil; 1909-10, $19.

WRECKING PLANTS.

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. From what persons or corporations have tenders been received for the establishment or maintenance of any wrecking plant, whether on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts or in the River or Gulf of St. Lawrence, and what was the subsidy in each case?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

Tenders for the maintenance of a wrecking plant on the Atlantic coast were received from the following: Dominion Coal Co., Glace Bay, N.S.; St. Lawrence Floating and Wrecking Co., of Montreal, P.Q.; Maritime Newfoundland Shipping Co., of Halifax, N.S.; J. E. Moore, St. John, N.B.; Messrs. Larder Bros., North Sydney, N.S.; William Leslie, Kingston, Ont.; J. A. Farquhart, Halifax, N.S.

Only one tender was received for the maintenance of a wrecking plant on the Pacific caost. This tender was from the British Columbia Salvage Company.

In the year 1901, an agreement was entered into with Messrs. Geo. T. Davie & Son to maintain a wrecking plant in the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence.

The subsidy granted for maintaining a wrecking plant on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the River St. Lawrence is $10,000 per annum in each case.

SHIPPING STATISTICS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Distinguishing between sail and steam, how many tons of shipping were added to the Canadian register during the year ending 31st March, 1909?

2. How many tons of shipping were removed from the said register during the year ending 31st March, 1909, by loss of the ships so removed, and by transfer to the shipping register of some other colony or country, respectively?

Mr. BRODEUR:

The statistical year as regards registration of shipping is defined in section 31, chapter 113, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to be the calendar year. Statistics to the end of the fiscal year are not kept in the department. The figures given are therefore for the last statistical period, viz., the year ending December 31, 1908.

1.

	Vessels.	Tons.
Steam	162	16,303
Sail	180	23,448
Total	342	39,751

2.

	Vessels.	Tons.
Sold foreigners	12	6,080
Wrecked	33	4,601
Stranded	9	2,115
Lost	16	2,684
Broken up	126	7,331
Abandoned	6	3,178
Collisions	2	512
Missing	4	374
Registry surrendered	1	5
Foundered	5	410
Burnt	17	1,653
Condemned	6	1,475
Transferred St. John's, Nfld	14	2,964
Transferred Barbados	13	3,095
Out of existence	17	667
Total	281	37,144

GRAIN TRADE, 1908.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What quantity of grain was received during the season of 1908 at the following points: Depot Harbour, Midland, Tiffin, Collingwood, Owen Sound and Goderich?

2. What quantity of grain was shipped from Port Arthur and from Fort William to Canadian ports and to American ports, respectively?

3. How much grain was transhipped at Kingston and Prescott during 1908?

4. What quantity of grain was received at the Port of Montreal during 1908, from Port Arthur and Fort William by water from American ports?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Trade and Commerce):

	Bushels.
1. Depot Harbour	2,624,622
Midland	1,849,851
Tiffin	8,440,136
Collingwood	1,082,634
Owen Sound	3,245,549
Goderich	7,769,343
2. To Canadian ports	48,319,113
To American ports	19,875,187
3. At Kingston	13,922,525
At Prescott	2,120,000
4. From Fort William and Port Arthur	19,157,905
From American ports	11,613,416

AIR NAVIGATION.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM:

Has the government given to Messrs. McCurdy, Baldwin or Dr. Graham Bell any financial or other aid to encourage them in their efforts to navigate the air?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Department of Militia and Defence placed the Petewawa camp grounds at the disposal of Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin during the past summer, for the purpose of carrying out trials with their aerodromes, and lent the services of one or two engineer officers and men to assist them when required.

The Department also erected a shed for the temporary housing of Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin's machines while at Petewawa.

No financial assistance was given.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. OWEN:

1. What is the estimated cost of sections, 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 on the Trent Valley Canal when completed?

2. How much money has been expended on each of these sections up to November 1, this year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. Superintending engineer's estimates for the following sections, of the Ontario-Rice Lake Division of the Trent Valley Canal, are as follows, viz.:

Section No. 1	$1,074,313 00
Section No. 2	733,482 00
Section No. 3	304,196 00
Section No. 5	527,239 00
Section No. 7	458,227 00

2. The expenditure on the different sections on contract work, is as follows:

Section No. 1—	
Larkin & Sangster	$472,940 00
Section No. 2—	
Dennon & Rogers	126,830 00
Section No. 3—	
Canadian General Development Co.	149,030 00
Section No. 5—	
Brown & Aylmer	288,290 00
Section No. 7—	
Randolph McDonald Co.	20,940 00
	1,058,030 00
Cement on above sections	136,987 50
	1,195,017 50

VETERAN LAND GRANTS.

Mr. DANIEL:

How many land grants have been taken up by veterans, and how many assignments approved?

Mr. OLIVER. 433 land grants have been taken up by veterans up to the latest returns from the various Land Agencies of the department.

2,588 assignments have been approved.

POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

1. In what constituencies were the following post offices established, viz: Cedar Croft, Kawartha Park, Midlothian Wharf, Ojibway Island and Rigaud sur le Lac?

2. What is the number of persons that the department estimate is being served by each of these post offices?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: (for the Postmaster General):

Cedar Croft, in Parry Sound, Ont. Population served—15 families with cottages and 75 boarders.

Kawartha Park, in Peterborough, W.R., Ont. Population served—A boarding house accommodating 25 guests, 15 cottages with from 75 to 100 occupants; also several new cottages, together with the Y.M.C.A. camp of Peterborough, and other camps in the vicinity.

Midlothian Wharf, in Parry Sound, Ont. Population served—A number of summer cottages, 8 families and about 50 single people.

Ojibway Island, in Parry Sound, Ont. Population served—25 families and 100 single people.

Rigaud sur le Lac, in Vaudreuil, Que. Population served—30 to 40 families.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an addition to the answers given yesterday to question No. 19, asked by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). By some error, a portion of the answer to paragraph 4 was detached, and it is as follows:—

4. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, about fifteen months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from city of Moncton westerly for about 50 miles.

The John W. McManus Company, Limited, about sixteen months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from Chipman easterly a distance of about 8 miles.

Lyons & White, about fifteen months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from near Grand Falls westerly, a distance of about 62 miles.

M. P. & J. T. Davis, about three months beyond fixed date. Contract covers from Quebec bridge easterly for about 150 miles.

THE APPROACH TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Before the orders of the day are called, might I draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that during the last two sessions on the approach of winter, cocoa matting was laid on the steps leading to the parliament buildings. The painted boards now on the steps are slipperv and dangerous, and I would recommend the minister to have the matting laid down at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to give the matter attention.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—RESIGNATION OF MR. LUMSDEN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any document to be added to those brought down in connection with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend suggested that there was some correspondence from Mr. Lumsden to me and a letter from me to him. I asked my secretary to look for this letter, and he has not found it yet.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act. He said: this Bill, as I explained briefly in introducing it, is I think required by virtue of an unanimous decision of the Ontario Court of Appeals, given in a well-considered judgment, placing a construction on section 340 of the Railway Act as it at present stands. That is a section dealing, not with the question whether a railway company is liable or not, but with the question of the amount that a company should pay in the event of its admitted or proved liability for negligence in the carrying of goods. It might not be amiss to state that previous to 1903 the law, as settled by the decisions of the courts, was in an unsatisfactory state. We thought in this House in 1903 that we had made it clear and distinct, and before this debate is over, I think the House will agree with me that the construction put on this section by the Ontario Court of Appeals is not the construction we intended that should be placed up on it when we passed it in 1903. The section permits a railway company, under certain conditions, to limit and restrict its liability to less than it would be at common law or ordinarily, when it injures or

destroys goods through its negligence in carrying. It is not a question whether the company shall be liable or not, but whether its liability shall be reduced or impaired by any contract which it makes with the shipper or owner of the goods as a condition of carrying them. The courts held previous to 1903 that a company could not contract itself out of the total liability; but they afterwards held that it could contract itself out of a part of the liability by virtue of giving the shipper a special rate under a contract by which the shipper agreed that he would take only a part of the damages, if entitled to damages at all, for the loss of his goods. That was the state of the law in 1903. In 1903, we left to the Railway Commission, the question as to what should be a fair contract to be made. We provided in the statute that these contracts, before they should be held to be good, should have the sanction of the Railway Commission. I had better, perhaps, read the exact words of section 340, which I am seeking to amend, as it now stands in the revised statutes of 1906. It reads as follows:

No contract, condition, by-law, regulation, declaration or notice made or given by the company, impairing, restricting or limiting its liability in respect of the carriage of any traffic, shall, except as hereinafter provided, relieve the company from such liability, unless such class of contract, condition, by-law, regulation, declaration or notice shall have been first authorized or approved by order or regulation of the board.

Now, the trouble turns upon these words, 'class of' in that section. I think parliament meant in these words a form of contract, and not that any court should say that a contract which was not the one authorized by the commission should be held to be good and binding on the shipper. That is what the court says could be done, and it is that which I object to, and which the House should amend. The case decided by the Ontario Court of Appeals last year, Sutherland vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company, is to be found in volume xviii of the Ontario Law Reports, beginning at page 139. It was decided by Chief Justice Sir Glenholme Falconbridge in April of last year, and his decision was upheld by the whole Court of Appeals in November of last year. Mr. Sutherland shipped from Brocton, Massachusetts, to Grimsby, Ontario, $16,000 worth of valuable horses, which the chief justice held were fully proved to be worth that much money.

That was his loss when the Grand Trunk railway were negligent at Trenton and in consequence of the collision his horses were destroyed. He, however, was unable to ship those horses from Brockton, Massachusetts, unless he signed a contract, not authorized by the Railway Commission, but something like it, under which he bound himself to accept $1,200 for a carload of horses worth some $16,000 in case any loss occurred through the company's negligence. He had no option, no other rate was offered him, he could not ship those horses unless he signed that contract. They were taken by the Grand Trunk railway from a point near the Vermont line and were destroyed at Trenton, Ontario. Mr. Sutherland, having obtained on opinion that this contract had never been authorized by the board, thought he was entitled to his full amount of damages. He was given no option when he made the shipment, he had no chance to ship at any other rate, he had signed no contract which the Railway Board had sanctioned, and consequently thought he was entitled to recover his full amount of damages, but the judges held that the words ' unless such class of contract ' entitled them to rule that although the contract was not authorized by the Railway Board it was in that class, and therefore was just as binding as if it had been authorized by the Railway Commission. That ruling is contrary to the spirit of our legislation. We appointed the Railway Board to deal with questions of this kind. We did not want the ordinary judge of the land to decide what should be considered a fair contract. We appointed a board, specially selected for their knowledge, ability and acumen in railway matters to decide what shall be a fair contract, and the moment we agree that any judge, no matter how able, can in any sense usurp the functions of the board, we do a highly dangerous thing and a thing against the principle of the Railway Act. The Railway Board has declared that a certain contract, and no other, shall be the one the Grand Trunk railway must use in cases of the kind, but here we have a different contract, one which would be binding over the route in a foreign country, but which the Grand Trunk railway made apply to Canadian territory, and the company succeeded in convincing the court that because the words ' such class of contract ' are in the Act, they let in any other contract besides the one the Railway Commission adopts.

That is the chief point I make, but I go further and I say that as those contracts are based on the understanding that a man has to give up his common law rights, that he has to give up a part of what he is entitled to, he should at least have the option of paying a higher rate in order to be fully indemnified in case of loss or pay a lower rate should he agree to lesser indemnification. It is evidently manifestly unfair that if a man is willing to pay a higher rate and get his full common law indemnity, he should not have the right to do so before being compelled to ship at a lesser rate with a reduced liability on the part of the company. I might point out that we have already dealt with this matter in another

connection in the same Railway Act. When we brought in the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission and gave the commission power to fix the rates and the form of contract, we left out the words 'such class of contract.' That will be found in section 353. In section 340, the one I am moving to amend, the words, 'such class of contract' are contained, and these have been judged in the way I have pointed out. In section 353, however, the contract itself is not valid unless approved by order or regulation of the Board of Railway Commissioners. We are therefore in this position that, if we do not amend the law, we shall have two lines of decisions —the one with regard to express company's contracts and the other with regard to the railway company's contracts for carrying ordinary freight. That surely must be the actual effect, but I think the intention no doubt was that the same principle should govern both.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The reasons adduced by my hon. friend in support of his Bill certainly have some merit. I have had representations made to me in the last few hours to the contrary effect but I think on the whole the House would be wise to give the Bill a second reading and let it go before the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that this Bill be referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. As I have said many times before, I do not believe on principle in public Bills going to the Select Committees of this House; I think this is the proper place to debate them, where the whole House deals with them. They are public Bills, and the rule of the House indicates that they should be dealt with here. However, I do not wish to be factious about the matter, and if the minister thinks he can give better consideration to this Bill by sending it to the Railway Committee, I would suggest that it be done by appointing a small sub-committee of the Railway Committee. I would agree to that if he will assure us that even if the government shall have taken all days when the Bill returns from the Railway Committee an opportunity will be given for discussing this Bill in Committee of the Whole House. I have not found the Railway Committee to be much more than a cul de sac in regard to public Bills. Unless we can have some specific assurance I think this Bill should go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I indicated, I have had a number of representations during the last few hours on several of these Bills, and as the members of the Railway Committee are conversant with matters affecting railways and with legislation of this kind, it seemed to me that that committee would be the best place to deal with this Bill, and any one who is opposed to it could there say what he had to say. I have no desire to retard the Bill or prevent it from getting through all stages.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the minister should give some such assurance as I requested, otherwise I shall have to divide the House. I have observed during the last ten years that although there may be merit in a Bill, and a majority desire to get it through the House, it is almost impossible to send it to the Senate, because it cannot be called when it comes back from the committee. I do not suppose that the minister, who is usually fair, wants to put me in that position, and so I think we should be assured that after the Railway Committee deal with this measure there will be an opportunity of discussing it in a Committee of the Whole House, otherwise I will have to divide the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am astounded at the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Certainly there is no desire to retard the Bill, but rather to get it in the place where we can discuss it properly. I thought my hon. friend understood my position.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did understand that he wanted it to go to the Railway Committee, but I also understood that he would take care it would come back to this House after the Railway Committee dealt with it. If it was a private Bill it would have precedence on Mondays and could always be reached, but a public Bill or order can never be called in this House after the government take all the days.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may observe that if the Bill comes back from the Railway Committee within a month or six weeks it is sure to have its turn on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is a Bill which seeks to put some limit upon appeals in matters that come before the Board of Railway Commissioners. The statute at present does not limit those appeals; it allows the Railway Commissioners to grant leave to appeal to the Supreme Court upon any matter that is before them if they see fit to do so. It is being found in the country that the commissioners construe that to mean that they should be liberal in

granting these appeals, and this acts very harshly and unfairly upon people having grievances against railways. The House will see that unless immediate relief is given in matters that are brought before the board, it is useless for anybody to apply to that board. We do not recognize the Railway Commission as a court in the ordinary sense, because it is a place where laymen are supposed to go and air their grievances and obtain redress in an informal way from the board. The minute it becomes known that a man who applies to the Railway Commission runs the risk of being brought before the Supreme Court on an appeal, and that is beginning to be known now, applications to the board for relief will be avoided, as men will feel that they cannot afford to run the risk of a Supreme Court suit, and the whole object in appointing the Railway Commission is practically annulled, the whole benefit that parliament intended to give to the country is lost. We have a Railway Commission that in many ways is doing good work, but they are annulling the benefit of their work by allowing people to go before the Supreme Court, even in cases where there is no question of law involved, but only a question of the merits which the board is competent to decide. I contend that there should be some reasonable restriction on these appeals. Section 56 of the present Railway Act provides:

> An appeal shall lie from the board to the Supreme Court of Canada upon a question of jurisdiction, but such appeal shall not lie unless the same is allowed by a judge of the court.

That is on the question of jurisdiction. Then we have:

> An appeal shall also lie from the board to such court (the Supreme Court) upon any question which, in the opinion of the board, is a question of law, upon leave therefor being obtained from the board.

There is no restriction on the time within which leave shall be applied for. There is no restriction or guide as to the sort of appeals to be allowed by the board. When a man gets relief against the railway company ordered by the board or the railway company gets an order of importance in carrying on their traffic, unless there is a serious question involved there should be no appeal, else the whole object of the appointment of the commission is frustrated and annulled.

Again there should be some finality even if an appeal is granted, on which a man or a company may reckon. If we are going to have the country understand that an applicant may get into a law suit on any application to the Railway Commission, that they may be dragged to the Supreme Court at the will of the opposite party, whether a railway or another company or an individual, then 99 out of 100 of the benefits of the Railway Commission will be lost to the country, and people will not apply for relief in the very cases the board was appointed to deal with. The whole intent in the appointing of the board was to afford immediate relief. In fact the board does not grant an order unless the relief is immediately necessary. Relief may be necessary next year, and the board says: Make your application next year upon better material; in the meantime we dismiss your application. If the case does not require immediate attention, the board does not make an order at all, and therefore no order is made unless immediate redress must be made in order to carry on the affairs of the country properly. So I move to amend this section in order to limit the time for applying for that relief to one month from the time the order is made, so if anybody is going to ask the board to allow him to appeal to the Supreme Court from the decision, he must apply within one month. I think that is reasonable. We have that very thing in nearly all the courts, and we have it generally in the statute constituting the courts. I think we ought to put that in this statute as a principle to be followed by the Railway Commission. Then they will understand that parliament says to them: You must not grant leave to appeal in any case unless it is applied for within one month; and if people do not choose within one month to apply for leave to appeal, they must make up their minds to consent to the judgment. I also seek to add:

> But such leave shall not be granted unless, in the opinion of the board, doubtful questions of law are involved and serious injury or loss will result from immediate compliance with the order sought to be appealed from; and after notice to the opposite party stating the grounds of appeal.

I am not wedded to the actual language of that section as I have drawn it, and if any hon. gentleman can see any better way by which the object may be accomplished, I will accept his amendment. Whether we agree or not upon the method of the remedy to be applied, we must all agree that there is an evil in regard to the application under the statute as it stands at present. We must not contemplate that this Railway Act is to be administered by these Railway Commissioners in such a way that anybody may be able to hold over the aggrieved party a threat that no matter how just his cause may be he may never know when he is going to get redress. The board have made rules which practically leave it open for an application to be made at any time. Under the present rules the individual must apply within fourteen days or afterwards and the statute allows him to do that,

but the companies are not limited to any particular number of days. The board have practically said, and I do not blame them only as the statute is, that a man can apply any time that they, in their discretion see fit to allow. It is not proper legislation as it stands, and some amendment must be made. We should settle on certain permanent principles and lay them before the board, with instructions to the board to follow them. As the law stands to-day an appeal can be brought on ten years afterwards. I do not say the board would give leave ten years afterwards, but they can legally give leave to appeal ten years after the case has been decided, as the law stands to-day. I do not think we can have this Act properly administered unless the people have faith in the Railway Commission. We must establish a belief among the people in this country that the Railway Commission will give them redress when they have a well-founded grievance; but the minute they think, as they are beginning to think now, that they are just launching out into a law suit in which they may lose a lot of money and perhaps ruin themselves, the minute we allow that idea to get abroad in this country, we are losing the whole benefit of the appointment of the Railway Commission, because people will be loath to avail themselves of the remedies which the board is supposed to give them. Now, this is not one-sided; the railway may get an order and the case may be tried out. On all these grounds, therefore, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill, because it contains these provisions simply to limit appeals within a reasonable period, and to allow the Act to be administered in such a way that people may have some faith in it, and may apply in the ordinary way for the relief to which they are entitled and get it in reasonable time.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to say any thing on the merits of my hon. friend's Bill, other than that I am of the opinion that there are altogether too many appeals to the higher courts in respect to legislation of this kind. I believe there is a growing feeling in Canada that instead of allowing more appeals, there should be fewer appeals from the lower to the higher courts. My hon. friend's Bill no doubt has a great deal of merit in it, when there is to be an appeal at all from the decision of the Railway Board. For myself, I think that the decision of the Railway Board should be final in all cases. My hon. friend has well said that the Railway Board was created for the purpose of giving the ordinary man an opportunity to lay his case before that tribunal, and when that case has been presented, as we have had a great many cases presented, and a great deal of good work has been accomplished, in my opinion the decision should be final, and there should be no appeal whatever in any case from the decision of the Railway Board.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who advocated for many years the establishment of a Railway Commission Board, I have always held that one of the important requirements in all these disputes was some court of finality, from which there could be no appeal. When this Railway Board was established, the people all over the country were told by both parties that it was a good thing, and one of the reasons why it was a good thing was because, when a difficulty arose between an individual and a railway company, it was to be tried by a court where the individual could go and be sure of getting justice, and that when the Commission made a finding that finding was finality. It had been held, and generally believed by the public, that there was little use in an individual trying to get his rights from a railway company, because the railway companies were all powerful financially, and that an individual, no matter what might be the determination of the first court, could not contend with the railway company, because the company could always carry the case up, and up, and up. Under these circumstances people who were aggrieved felt that it was better to suffer loss in the first instance than to impoverish themselves by going to a court when they had no assurance that the decision of that court would be final. It was held that this Railway Commission would obviate that difficulty, and that the case would be settled quickly—that was one of the merits of this court—that the case would be settled at once, without much cost or waste of time, and settled finally. I am sure if the people ever believed that there was the latitude which there appears to be in the findings of this Commission, that there was some latitude remaining whereby litigants, if you call them such, could appeal to another court, they would never have endorsed the Railway Commission. That was one of the strongest grounds in the judgment of the common people why the Railway Commission would be practically useful. Now, if it turns out that it is going to be of little more value in that regard than an ordinary court, then I can only say that there are many people who would appeal to the Railway Commission from the understanding that they have had heretofore who will never appeal to it in future because they will regard themselves as unable to get justice for the simple reason that they have not the means to prosecute a suit against a railway company. There may be other grounds where there would be a justifiable right of appeal. As my hon. friend from Lincoln says, they could have the right to appeal upon a ques-

tion of jurisdiction or of law. I think that would be proper. It seems to me that that should cover the whole ground but if we are to widen it beyond that we will make what otherwise would be a valuable court for the common people of the country a court that would be practically useless to them.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I think there is a general impression that lawyers favour numbers of appeals, and that, ordinarily speaking, the average practising lawyer is better satisfied the more appeals he can find open to his clients who may not be pleased with the results of litigation with which he is concerned. Although I am a lawyer I do not share that view. I entirely agree with the sentiments which have been expressed by hon. gentlemen that we ought not to facilitate or to increase the facilities for repeated appeals and I think that, ordinarily speaking, at any rate, decisions that have been subjected to the canvassing which even one appeal will necessarily involve, are likely to be correct as if they are further dragged through a course of repeated appeals. But while that is so, I do not suppose that many of us would favour abolition of the appellate court which has been carrying on its work in Canada now for the last thirty years—the Supreme Court of Canada. The propriety and advantage of establishing that court were debated and it was a matter in regard to which there was not perhaps agreement of opinion years ago, but experience, I think, has demonstrated the value of that court to the people of this country. Whether or not there is any question of abolishing the court, or putting an end to the right of resort to the court, the proposition which is before the House in this Bill does not concern anything so advanced or so far reaching as what I am suggesting. There is this, I think, to be borne in mind, that the existence of the right of appeal, whether it is exercised or not, and the knowledge on the part of the court which is deciding that if it goes wrong there is a place where it can be set right is something of very great consequence and of very great importance to the parties interested. We have in Ontario, and, I have no doubt, in other provinces as well, courts for the collection of small debts from which no right of appeal exists and very possibly no one would favour the giving of the right of appeal to a dissatisfied litigant where the amount involved was comparatively trifling. But, I am sure it is the experience of lawyers and, I think, it is the experience of litigants, that the same judge who is sitting in a court for the trial of small claims, where he knows that he is absolute, is very likely to be a much more arbitrary man and very likely to pronounce decisions of a very different character from those which the same man under the same circumstances would pronounce if the amount involved were a little larger so that his decision would be liable to review. Just so long as it is impossible to procure a perfect man, an infallible man for a judge, just that long there will be, I think, value in the right of appeal whether that right is, in a particular case, exercised by the dissatisfied litigant or not.

Now, with regard to this particular court —I term it a court because I think it possesses all the essential features of a court —the Board of Railway Commissioners—my understanding is that when that board was established and given the jurisdiction which it possesses it was with the idea that while it should have the power and authority of a court for many purposes it was not to be exactly the formal and certainly not the technical body which often our courts become. The right of appeal which is given from that body is of a very special character. The board, it will be remembered, was a substitute for a committee of the Privy Council which previously dealt with such matters as now come to the board, and the only appeal upon questions of fact or of policy which the statute permits from this tribunal is an appeal to the whole body of which its predecessor was a part, namely, to the Governor in Council. That right of appeal seems a necessity when you remember the constitution of the board and the purpose for which it was given being. The only other right of appeal which exists from the decisions of the board is upon questions of law or of the jurisdiction of the board. Upon questions of law a limited right of appeal exists to the Supreme Court by leave of the board itself. Upon questions of jurisdiction an equally limited right of appeal to the Supreme Court exists after leave so to appeal is given by a judge of the Supreme Court. The facility for appealing therefore from this board is peculiarly limited and parliament, in constituting the board, seems to have taken special care that there should not probably be numerous appeals from the decision of the board and that in the main these decisions, once pronounced, should be liable to correction if erroneous only by the board itself, because hon. gentlemen will remember that this board is given a very special power in that regard, that its judgments or decrees are not like those of a court which, when once pronounced are gone from the court and beyond control, but are liable to be altered, and modified from time to time by the board itself as justice may seem to require. In conferring upon a dissatisfied litigant any right of appeal from this board I fully concede an advantage is given to the rich as against the poor but that, after all, is only the advantage which, in every walk of life, the man of wealth has, by reason of his

wealth, over the man who is without resources. No matter what piece of business a man may desire to enter into, if he is possessed of large means it is a great advantage to him, and I venture to question whether it would be right to take that advantage from him. But, however, that may be, let me remind hon. gentleman that very generally—I do not know that I can say in the majority of instances—but very generally, at all events, the questions which come before this board are questions between possibly two contending railway companies or between a railway company and some municipal or other corporation and that very likely honours will be evenly divided as far as the possession of ample means to carry on appeals is concerned.

The discussion upon the propriety of the general right of appeal has gone a little afield, because while the Bill proposes certain restrictions upon the exercise of the right of appeal there is no proposal to cut down the existing right of appeal in the three cases—upon a question of fact to the Governor General in Council; upon a question of jurisdiction to the Supreme Court by leave of the court; upon a question of law of the Supreme Court by leave of the board. These three measures of appeal are left untouched, but the Bill proposes three limitations upon the exercise of the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The most important of the three is that which will provide that leave to appeal upon a question of law should be given by the board only when in the opinion of the board doubtful questions of law are involved and serious injury or loss would result from immediate compliance with the order sought to be appealed from. The law as it stands leaves it to the discretion of the board whether or not they will grant leave to appeal upon a question of law. An appeal lies under the Railway Act as it now stands to the Supreme Court upon any question which in the opinion of the board is a question of law upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board and the granting of such leave shall be in the discretion of the board. Would there be any object in saying to the board: You must not grant this leave unless the question of law is doubtful. I would suppose that no such body of men as the Railway Board, no men clothed with the powers of a court and the wide jurisdiction in the matters of railway dispute which is given to this board, would dream of exercising their judical discretion to permit an appeal upon a question of law unless that question were a doubtful one.

Mr. LANCASTER. May I tell the hon. gentleman that not later than last August this board granted leave to appeal in a case where the very terms of their order prevented the point of law arising which the railway sought to appeal on. They put a condition in their order which absolutely made factious the very point of law which the railway asked leave to appeal on, and yet they granted that leave to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I was going on to say that if this board was to be trusted with the discretion which the present legislation confers upon them to determine whether or not the case was a proper one for appeal, it would seem to me that it would not advance the object aimed at in the Bill that we should say to the board on the face of a statute: You must not grant this leave unless the case is doubtful. It goes without saying that unless they feel there is some room for argument and unless they feel there is some point upon which the opinion of the Supreme Court is desired, they will not exercise the discretion the statute vests in them in favour of granting an appeal. I see no special objection to the limitation which is proposed by this Bill, but I would certainly have thought unless some cases have arisen of which I am not aware in which the necessity for this amendment has appeared that there was no need to give any direction to the board as to the manner in which or the style of cases in which the judicial discretion which is vested in them should be exercised. Generally speaking it certainly is better not to fetter the discretion of a court and to leave that discretion free to be exercised in such cases as the court may think proper. In regard to the other two points in the Bill, just a word. The Bill proposes that an appeal must be taken within two months after the decision complained of, and in the second section that unless such an appeal is entered in the Supreme Court within sixty days from the decision complained of, the appeal shall not lie. With great respect I should have thought that provision not necessary because the general practice of the Supreme Court must apply unless some special enactment such as this is substituted for the general practice. Under the Supreme Court Act, by section 69 chap. 139 R. S. C. every appeal to the court must be brought within 60 days unless a special order to the contrary is obtained and provision is made for the obtaining of such a special order. But, as to the general run of appeals unless they are brought within 60 days of the decision complained of the time for appeal has gone and the decision has become by lapse of time perfectly final. It is proposed to vary that in the case of an appeal from this board, to 30 days. Is there any object in doing so? It is not desirable to have a different period for different kinds of appeal.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman misunderstands. The Bill is that the leave must be applied for within 30 days and

the case must be entered in the Supreme Court within 60 days. The reason for that is that one of the judges of the Supreme Court has expressed a doubt, and has allowed an appeal to be entered, holding that it is not clear that the Supreme Court Act applies to the Railway Act and he invites us to say so in order to make it clear.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think I am acquainted with the circumstance to which the hon. gentleman refers when he mentions that there may be a doubt in the mind of one of the judges of the Supreme Court, but I do not understand it applies in any degree to the point I am discussing. The point I was at the moment speaking of was the principle of substituting a period of thirty days for the ordinary period of sixty days in regard to this particular kind of appeal. I cannot see any object in that, and I think it is not desirable to have a different period for one class of appeals from that prescribed for another class. The more variety you have in that respect, the more confusion you introduce. On the third point, by which this Bill provides that an appeal from the board shall not lie unless it is entered in the Supreme Court within sixty days from the making of the decision, under the general law as laid down in the Supreme Court Act, notwithstanding the omission to bring the appeal within sixty days, the court appealed from, or any judge of it, may under special circumstances allow an appeal after the prescribed period. Now, that is a very useful provision, and it would not be interfered with by the present Bill if it became law. It would still be competent to a judge of the court appealed from, under section 71 of the Supreme Court Act, to extend the statutory period in a special case under special circumstances; and unless you repeal that provision of the general Act, or in terms declare that it shall not be applicable to an appeal from the Railway Board, I would think it abundantly clear that it would have such application and that the power to extend the time would still remain. That is a very valuable power. Every practising lawyer knows of many a case in which some slip or accident has occurred, and in which it is desirable to bring an appeal after the prescribed time has gone by. It does not at all follow that it will be permitted; but the power to permit it, under special circumstances, in the way the exercise of that power is now safeguarded by the Supreme Court of Canada, appears to me to be a very valuable power to give to the court. It is in this connection, as I understand it, that the question alluded to is now before the Supreme Court for adjudication. I understand that at the present sitting of the court a case involving that question will come up for consideration and determination, and it will require to be decided by the court, whether or not section 71 of the general Act has application to the decisions of the Railway Board. If the decision given in that case by the Supreme Court does not commend itself, it will be easy enough to amend the statute after such decision is given; but until the court has pronounced on the subject, and until we see whether or not there is any necessity for special legislation in that regard, my view would be that we had better leave the statute alone.

Mr. LANCASTER. If no one else intends to say anything, I wish to say one word in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to reply.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think that under the present rules, as amended three years ago, it is distinctly provided that a member moving the second reading of a Bill has a right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 21, subsection 2, says:

> A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an order of the day, not being a second reading of a Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the reading of the rule would show that the hon. gentleman would be in order in making a reply on the motion for a second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the rule otherwise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is not allowed a reply on an order of the day unless it is the second reading of a Bill; but inasmuch as this is the second reading of a Bill, the hon. member for Lincoln is entitled to make a reply.

Mr. LANCASTER. I just wish to point out that the hon. gentleman has, I think, misapprehended the effect of my language. I am moving to amend section 56, the section dealing with appeals, by inserting in the fourth line, after the word 'board,' in subsection 3, the words 'within one month after the making of the order or decision sought to be appealed from.' That is, leave must be applied for within thirty days. That in no way conflicts or has anything to do with the sixty days within which the appeal must be made to the Supreme Court. In regard to the other matter which the hon. gentleman mentioned, I wish to point out that we are dealing here, not with ordinary courts. The Supreme Court Act deals with appeals from ordinary courts, in which they protect the litigant against all the consequences of an appeal, in case the decision of the court appealed from is affirmed and it is found that the appeal should never have been entered. This distinction between appeals from ordinary

courts and those from the Railway Board should always be borne in mind.

The Board of Railway Commissioners do not make an order unless the applicant is entitled to remedy or redress at that particular time. But the moment that order is taken to appeal, the board cannot order that any damages be allowed for the delay. Take the case of an ordinary farm crossing, the board decides that it shall be given. Its decision is taken to appeal, and the farmer has to wait a year until he gets judgment from the Supreme Court deciding whether the crossing shall be allowed him as a matter of law. In an ordinary suit, on an appeal being taken from the lower court, the plaintiff would be entitled to indemnity for damages during the delay caused by the appeal; but the Board of Railway Commissioners have not the power to make any order to that effect. There is, therefore, the greater necessity for our being careful about allowing appeal. The hon. gentleman has said that he does not see any difference between the words I use in this Bill and those in the statute giving the board discretion to grant an appeal. Well, this has happened. Notwithstanding the board may have no doubt about the law, they still allow appeals simply because they are asked for. We should put a stop to that. We should provide that the board must have doubts before allowing an appeal. Otherwise every case will be open to appeal. The Minister of Justice, although he thinks my Bill is not necessary, is of the opinion that it will do no harm. Consequently he should not object to the House going into committee on it. Then if the language used in the Bill be not the best adapted to express its intentions, the wording can be changed.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. LANCASTER. I wish simply to state that the same objection applies to this motion as I applied to a similar motion on the previous Bill. However, if the majority of the House insist, this measure will have to go to the Railway Committee, where I hope it will be discussed without delay and sent back to this House.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that in this particular instance the House would be a better tribunal than the Railway Committee. We have here a number of eminent lawyers on both sides well fitted to deal with a question of this kind. I do not think that the argument advanced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is one that will appeal to the common people. Speaking of the advantage which a railway corporation has against an ordinary individual, he said it was only the advantage which the rich have against the poor, and we ought not to deprive the rich of that right. Well, in my opinion, parliament should apply itself to carrying out the principle of protecting as far as possible the weak and helpless. That was one of the reasons which induced parliament to create this Board of Railway Commissioners. The contention was made in its behalf that poor people, who are not able to prosecute a case from court to court, should be given access to a tribunal where they could obtain their rights at a minimum of a cost. That was one of the strong grounds for appointing a Railway Commission. The hon. minister said that, as a matter of law, he regarded the right to appeal as a sacred one, and that was why we established the Supreme Court. Well, I remember that when an effort was made to abolish the Supreme Court, the strongest argument then used in support of that effort was that the establishment of the court, instead of limiting the number of appeals, had increased them. It was thought that when we had a Supreme Court there would be scarcely any appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but experience has not proved that to be the case. Even Mr. Blake himself said he was rather disappointed in the Supreme Court. The Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald pleaded for the continuance of that court on the ground that it had not been tried long enough to give sufficient evidence of its value. Let us try it longer, he said, and if the people continue to be of the opinion that it is not as valuable as they expected, then will be time enough to abolish it. Since then no one has moved to abolish it, but it would have taken very little then to induce this House to abolish that court, if it had the power to do so. The consensus of the opinion of parliament then was really against the usefulness of that court; and the chief reason for that opinion was that it simply gave another appeal and another disadvantage to litigants who could not afford to carry a case from court to court until they could get a final verdict.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that this Bill be referred to the Railway Committee for the sole purpose of getting a better understanding of the measure. However interesting the discussion in this House may be, I think we could get at the kernel of the matter much better at close range in committee or in a subcommittee and work out the best results. What my hon. friend from Grey expected would be the result, has been the result of the establishment of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That board was appointed to give a ready and quick road to justice in the smaller cases as well as larger ones. As a matter of fact thousands of ordinary cases have been disposed of almost without a formal hearing and the parties have been satisfied. Larger cases

have been dealt with to the general satisfaction all over the country, and there have been very few appeals from the findings of this board.

Mr. SPROULE. Has an appeal been allowed recently that it was generally expected would not be allowed?

Mr. GRAHAM. There must be a discretionary power somewhere, and merely because some person did not expect there would be an appeal, we are surely not called on to amend the law. One can easily imagine cases where an appeal ought to be allowed, but the right of appeal has been so safeguarded that as a matter of fact we have had very few appeals. I do not think we have had an appeal in cases where the poor are on one side and the rich on the other. The appeal just referred to is an appeal of a province against the Grand Trunk Railway Company. These are not poor people, they are two very wealthy corporations, one on each side, contending as to the right of the board to give an order for a station.

Mr. SPROULE. But by the same reasoning there would be a right of appeal in the case of poor persons.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is where the discretion of good, sensible men like the chairman and members of the Board of Railway Commission comes in. The present board have so exercised their discretion that no injustice has been done to any one.

Mr. LANCASTER. They are granting a great many appeals.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a question of opinion, and I prefer to take the opinion of the Board of Railway Commissioners. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court under only two conditions, first by consent of the Supreme Court itself. The judges of that court, the highest court in the land, surely have some discretion as to when an appeal ought to lie. The second case is when leave to appeal is granted by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and they would grant an appeal only when they had some doubt as to a decision which had been rendered. There is also an appeal to the Governor in Council, but in my time there has not been a single appeal from the Board of Commissioners to the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. Neither party seems to respect that court.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend now seems to think it would be a token of respect if there were a lot of appeals to somebody. A moment ago he was arguing against appeals. I point out that the result of the action of the Board of Railway Commissioners has been that the number of appeals has been practically nil, and the good accomplished by that board is acknowledged by every one. It is recognized that they afford justice to all people in small and large things. The only appeal that has even been suggested in my time to the Governor in Council and it never got there—was the appeal of a railway company against a decision which it thought was in favour of another railway company, and the appeals that will be made will be largely in cases of dispute between railway companies themselves as to the right or priority of possession of certain pieces of right of way which would involve the question of payment of the cost of crossings, terminal rights, &c. There should be some right of appeal when these large companies clash, and the board is called on to give a decision. However, we want to get the very best result we can from this Board of Railway Commissioners. We have been getting excellent results. I have moved that this Bill be referred to the Railway Committee so that we can discuss it at close range, and if there is merit in the Bill thresh it out and get what there is in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Justice have simply been beating the air, getting as far away from the question as possible. This court is said to be a layman's court. The whole procedure should be as simple as possible so that the simple layman could understand it. What does the farmer or business man know about references to the Supreme Court or the Governor in Council or the time that should be allowed for such references? They know nothing about it, they do not pretend to read up the law in regard to these matters. If an ordinary layman obtains a judgment from the Board of Railway Commissioners favourable to himself, he does not want to remain in suspense five or ten years without knowing whether that judgment can be attacked or not. This Bill simply provides that after thirty days no appeal shall lie, so that the ordinary layman would know, having obtained a judgment of that board, that that judgment could not be attacked for any reason after the expiration of thirty days. Surely that is a fair and proper position and one which will add to the usefulness of the board's decisions. I fail to see why there should be any opposition to this Bill; it does not abolish the right of appeal, it simply limits the time in which an appeal shall lie to a reasonable period. Any one feeling aggrieved by a judgment of the board should know within thirty days that he had not received justice. I think the Bill is a very proper one, and I fail to see any reason for sending it to the Railway Committee. Sometimes we say, and I am

not going to impugn the motives of the Minister of Railways in making this motion—that Bills are sent to the Railway Committee for the purpose of being slaughtered. I do not think that is his intention. He has stated his intention, and I must give him credit for being perfectly fair in the matter. The Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Railways in introducing a Bill dealing with matters connected with his department, does not think of sending that Bill to one of the committees of this House. This seems to be a new departure, and there must be something behind it. I think that the old procedure is the better one. There is no reason, to my mind, why this parliament should go beyond this House for aid in this matter. If there is, then it should be plainly stated, and the House should be convinced that its jurisdiction is not sufficient, that somebody else must be called in to give advice to parliament on the simple matter of what a layman's rights are in this court, whether they are to be clear, or whether they are to remain uncertain for ten, twenty or thirty years, and that he is always to stand in jeopardy of what might be sprung upon him some day without notice. I hope the House will consent to deal with the Bill at once, to put it through committee, if it is believed to be a fair Bill, and give the laymen of this country that protection to which they are entitled, without any technical attempt being made to destroy the legislation which the hon. gentleman is trying to get passed.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act, he said: This Bill, as I explained, on the first reading, is to correct what I think is a manifest injustice arising out of the amendments made to the Railway Act last year. When I was introducing the Bill I understood the Minister of Railways to say that he considered it an interference with the principle that had been adopted by this House last session in regard to his amendments. I wish to say that I think the hon. gentleman misapprehends the Bill entirely, though it may have been my fault in not sufficiently explaining the Bill. I understood the hon. gentleman then to say that I was violating the principle which he had got the House to adopt last year, namely, that there should be a contribution from the railways, the municipalities and the Dominion government to protect all crossings where highways are crossed by railways. But the section which I propose to amend here does not deal with that, but with the exceptions the hon. gentleman put through the House last session in regard to that matter. The section I propose to amend is the very opposite of what the hon. gentleman had in his mind when I introduced the Bill. I will read the legislation passed by this House last year on this question, which is to be found in chapter 32 of the Acts of last session.

238a. In any case where a railway is constructed after the passing of this Act, the company shall, at its own cost and expense (unless and except as otherwise provided by agreement, approved of by the board, between the company and a municipal or other corporation or person), provide, subject to the order of the board, all protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of any crossing of a highway by the railway.

That is the section of the Act I am amending, and that section puts the whole cost upon the railway if it is a railway that is constructed after the passing of that Act. The Bill is now printed, and by it I am seeking to amend that section by adding these words:

And where the railway has been constructed before the passing of this Act,——

The converse of the case put by the hon. gentleman in his section last session.

—and is permitted by the board to pass over any highway crossing at rail level, the municipality shall not be ordered to pay any portion of the cost or expense of protecting such crossing unless and except it is otherwise provided by agreement, approved of by the board, between the company and the municipal corporation.

As the law stands to-day, a railway that is incorporated since last session has to bear the whole expense of protecting these crossings, no matter how well they may protect it, no matter what they may do in the shape of bridging or subterranean passages, no matter what works the board may order them to do, no matter how ideal the protection may be which they afford, they have to pay the whole expense if their railway was constructed after the passing of this Act of last session. Now, I am not saying that it is not always right to discriminate between railways, but we are certainly making a great discrimination here. We are saying that any railway that wishes to come into competition with the railways that were in operation last session shall have it up against them to bear the enormous expense of protecting a crossing, an expense to which neither the Dominion nor the municipality contributes, and no matter how good a protection they may afford. That is further than I would have gone, although I have been accused of being a radical in these matters. I would not have said that any corporation must do something that other railways constructed before it did not have to do. That is a discrimination against the later railway, and is calculated to discourage the construction of competing railways. But

when we say that railways which are constructed since the passing of the Act of last session must, no matter what ideal condition they may create for the perfect safety of the people, pay all the expenses of such protection, and that the board has no power to apportion those expenses upon anybody else, we should at least say that where these old railways which are using the King's highway refuse to create the ideal condition which the board might order them to create, or object to doing so, in that case we should at least say that no portion of such protection as the board finds necessary over a dangerous crossing, should be borne by the municipality. I never could see why they should. The board will order such contribution if we put the principle up to them, they will not order it if we say that the proper principle prevents them from doing so. Now, what should we do? I think that when we find the board going wrong we should step in and set them right. We are here to see that the Board of Railway Commissioners does what we think the people want them to do, and that they properly administer the affairs that we send to them to be administered.

The board holds as a matter of course, that the municipality shall always contribute. They are entitled to hold that. I am not finding fault with their power. If they choose to do so, they have the power to so hold unless you say, as a parliament, that there must be a distinction made. The Minister of Railways and Canals made the distinction last session in the law which I am now seeking to amend and he said that the board shall not be allowed to put upon the municipal or the Dominion fund, which was created for the purpose, any portion of the expense for protecting any highway from danger by a railway if the railway was not constructed before last year. But, these are not the railways that we are dealing with They do not exist. They are not killing people because they are not being operated. They are only in people's minds at the present time. There is no harm being done by them. They have not been constructed yet and they are unable to hurt anybody because they do not exist. But, we have before us the condition of affairs in which the railways that were constructed before last session of this parliament continue to kill people upon highway crossings where the highway and the railway track are upon the same level, and you cannot go upon the highway without running the risk of being hit by a train. Who creates the danger? What principle are you going to go by? There is the danger in running across the King's highway. They are persisting in running their trains across the highway instead of protecting the crossing, persisting in saying that they do not think it fair to require them to erect overhead or underground structures so that they cannot hit anybody because it will cost a lot of money and persisting in saying that they are going to run across the highway and create the danger rather than incur the expense which the commission may think they ought to incur in creating a better condition. The first question that we must ask is: Who creates the danger? It is the railway. I have heard it said—I never heard the Railway Commission decide it myself—but I have heard it said that the Railway Commissioners have said that they think that the public should help to protect these crossings because the public helped to create the danger. If that is the position of the Railway Commission, I think that parliament should condemn it. It is said that if a man owning a piece of property which the railway company did not expropriate erects a building upon that land which obscures the view of the railway he is doing something to create a danger and that therefore he and the municipality in which he lives should contribute towards the protection of the crossing. He has a perfect right to build upon his own land. The fact that the railway runs near it is no reason why he should not build upon that land if he wants to. I understand the commission holds that because he does construct that building which may obscure a view of the railway he and the municipality should contribute towards the protection of the crossing. That is confiscation. We have heard hon. gentlemen on behalf of the railway companies in this House—hon. gentlemen who might be trying to do their duty in the public interest—speaking of confiscation. Might not this be said to be confiscation of a private owner's property? You are putting a limitation upon his right of ownership. The railways say to him: If you erect a building upon your own land near the railway track which may obscure a view of the train coming down to this level crossing, you are helping us to create a dangerous condition there and, although we are the ones who run the trains and kill the people, you have placed your building so that they cannot see our track or the danger and you must tear your building down or you and the municipality in which you live must pay a tax to create a fund for the purpose of protecting that crossing. These are the special arguments put forward by the railways before the commission, more or less appealing to the commission, but when you scan them you find that there is no merit in them. The man who owns land outside of railway control has a perfect right to build upon it as much as he would if he were ten miles away, and he should not be prevented from building because he is going to be accused of obscuring the level crossing and the train coming down the

track to it. Now, the danger is entirely created by the railway and the protection should be at their expense as long as they persist in running upon the highway.

There is another question involved here and some fine day somebody will find it out, at a good deal of expense and disappointment perhaps to those concerned. I do not believe that this House, or, at all events, the government, in passing this legislation last year, gave anything like the consideration it should have had to what their power is to say that municipalities shall pay the cost of protecting the highway crossings assessed by a Dominion board. When had this parliament power to create any board to tax any municipality? Under the British North America Act who does control municipal government? Where did parliament ever get and how has it any vires or right whatever to deal with this question of municipalities protecting highway crossings under the orders of a creature created entirely by the Dominion parliament and having nothing whatever to do with the local legislatures which have the power to tax for municipal purposes? You are asking your board to say that the municipalities must contribute a certain proportion of the cost of protection of their own crossings which costs are to be put upon them by the Board of Railway Commissioners under the authority of a Dominion Act of parliament. You will find it some day decided, I am satisfied, that you have no power to do anything of the kind, and if a municipality against whom the board levied laughed in the face of the chairman and said: Go on and let us see, you collect this tax for crossings, the Board of Railway Commissioners could not collect it. They cannot do anything about it. If you bring an action how are you going to collect the tax? Who is going to impose the tax? Who is going to levy the assessment? This Dominion parliament cannot enforce the payment of anything of the sort unless perhaps they brought suit in the Exchequer Court against a municipality and seized a safe or a road roller. They cannot collect damages whatever they might be unless they could find some loose property of that kind that perhaps they might seize upon. You have not the power to levy any taxation upon any municipality for any such purpose and the right of the matter is probably as consistent as the right generally is with regard to technical powers. The reason that you were not given power by the framers of the British North America Act was because of the very great injustice of your attempting to exercise such a right. The municipalities control the highways, the highways are built by the municipalities with the aid of taxation levied by themselves, they are kept in repair for the convenience of the business of the country and if a railway crosses a highway upon a

Mr. LANCASTER.

rail level and this Board of Railway Commissioners undertake to say that the municipality must pay a part of the tax it is a matter ultra vires of this parliament and besides that it is unmeritorious and not fair that it should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. The highways belong to the Crown.

Mr. LANCASTER. The highways, as the hon. gentleman says, are the property of the Crown and are administered under the provincial legislatures. The provincial legislatures control the highways, they have passed this control on to the municipalities, the Dominion parliament has no power to tax the municipalities for anything done upon the highways and some day they will learn it to their cost. Orders made by the Railway Commission will have to be upset and you will have all sorts of confusion in regard to it.

But, the merits of the matter, outside of the technical question as to whether we are ultra or intra vires in passing such legislation is what appeals to me. Here is a railway constructed since last session trying to get into competition for the good of the country with railways that were constructed before last session and it is required to pay the whole expense. Not only is the municipality not to be charged but the Dominion fund is not to be drawn upon. But the railways which have done the harm, the railways that were constructed before last year, the railways that refused to protect these crossings, if the Board of Railway Commissioners find it necessary to protect them, are to be allowed to pay a portion of the expense only while they are running upon the highway and the municipality is to be ordered to pay part of the expense also. The effect of my proposed legislation is that where they do insist upon running upon the King's highway where they are likely to come in contact with people upon that highway the municipality must not be ordered to pay any portion of the cost. The board shall not have power to order them to unless they agree to it by some agreement which the board may sanction as fair and reasonable. That means that they cannot tax them without their consent. The board can still appropriate part of the Dominion fund to assist the railway, but they must keep their hands off the municipalities so long as the highways are being used by the railways for their own purposes. I move the second reading.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a very important and a somewhat large question, but as I discussed the matter fully last session, and as when certain statistics I have asked for are brought down I shall direct my attention to it again, I do not purpose going very fully in to the question now. I entirely agree with the object my hon. friend

(Mr. Lancaster) has in view and with the principle that underlies his Bill, and I want to add that the only objection I have to his Bill is that it does not go far enough.

Mr. LANCASTER. Take what you can get.

Mr. LENNOX. It is well enough to take what we can get, but I have not very much faith that we will get anything this session, I prophesy, however, that sooner or later the minister will have to adopt the principle which this Bill propounds. What I contended last session and what I repeat this session is, that wherever a railway sees fit—whether it is a new railway or an old railway—to occupy a highway, then there should be no public contribution for protection. If the railway will increase the public safety by separating its line from the highway then I am in favour, under certain circumstances, of making contribution at the public expense. But in absolutely no case—whether it is the case of an existing railway or a new railway—am I in favour of giving one dollar out of the funds of the Dominion, and much less out of the funds of the municipalities, towards the construction of safety appliances so long as the railway endangers the public safety by occupying the public highway. The legislation passed by the minister last session was a step in the right direction and a fairly good step, but I then called his attention to the fact and that he should limit the assistance to cases in which the separation of the railway grade from the highway is effected. At first we understood that the minister would adopt that suggestion. Afterwards it was intimated that, at the suggestion of the chairman of the railway board, the minister concluded that he would allow the public funds to be diverted not only in the case of separation of highways from railways, but in the case of the erection of simple appliances such as gates, or bells, or other devices which afforded some remedy but not an adequate one. If the minister had confined the contribution of the public money to cases in which the railway company agreed to absolutely separate the railway from the highway then a great benefit to the public would have accrued and we would have had an incentive to the railway companies to pursue that course; but as it is, the public funds are contributed to the railway when they agree to erect some temporary appliance which does not afford a complete remedy, and against that I protest. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill introduced by my hon. friend, and I hope it will not be very long before we will have legislation which will have the effect of saving not only the municipalities from having to contribute but which will prevent any contribution of any public moneys, to any purpose other than the separation of grades. There is absolutely no justification for contributing one dollar of the public funds, whether of the municipality or of the Dominion government, unless the railway separates the grades and thus for ever removes the danger to the public. I have asked certain information to be brought down on this matter. It is a question which will bear discussion from time to time. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) with his usual energy and his great interest in questions which are for the benefit of the public has brought the matter forward. I hope he shall pursue his course until we at last attain to better conditions with regard to the crossings of highways by railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are hundreds of railway crossings in Canada the separation of which from the level is impracticable, and in respect to which the public can be well protected by a gate or some other device. And, if the public is protected then the object we all have in view is attained and there is no need for discussing technicalities. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) forgets that the chief expense is not in the construction of a gate but in its maintenance afterwards, and no part of the government fund goes towards that maintenance.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the municipality has to pay.

Mr. GRAHAM. I should think that if our object is the protection of the public then so long as the public are protected it makes no difference how that end is attained whether it is by the erection of a gate, or of a subway or of an overhead crossing. Now, the innocent way in which my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) words his clause will compel me to read this subsection to the House: He told us that he was amending subsection 238A, but it would occur to me as a layman that in amending 238A my hon. friend is amending the whole legislation of last session, although if one had not the Act before him his Bill would not appear to mean so much as it really does. Now let me read subsection of 238A, and apply it to the Bill:

> Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the board may, subject to the provisions of sec. 238a, &c.

When you amend sec. 238a, you amend the whole power of the board.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what I intend.

Mr. GRAHAM. This interferes with the principle of the Act passed last year. At that time we had a good deal of discussion on the question of why the municipalities or the government should participate at all. I could argue as strongly against the government participating as my hon. friend does against the municipalities participat-

ing. The argument, which has prevailed in the various states of the union, which prevailed in this House last year, and against which I have not heard one note of objection from a municipality in the province of Ontario, or anywhere else, was this, that conditions now exist which did not exist in the early days of railway building. There must come a time when the line of demarcation must be drawn between existing roads and roads which are to come into existence. That line we drew last year, and the argument for it was this. In the early days of railway building, every municipality was so anxious to have a railway that it was willing to give railways level crossings wherever they liked to have them without restriction, property for stations and terminals and often large bonuses. The country was anxious to have railways, and the crossings were not supervised as they are now. The railway companies were building in a new country and had to do all the experimenting as to whether the lines would pay or not. There were three parties contributing—the railway company itself, the government, in not more closely scrutinizing, and the municipalities, in giving the railway companies any privileges they wanted. These three parties contributed to the establishment of level crossings all over the country. When a measure was proposed for the purpose of getting rid of the danger of level crossings, it was argued that the three parties who had contributed to this state of affairs might reasonably be asked to contribute in a proper measure to the removal of the evil. Now, Canada is not alone in that. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who has given this matter a great deal of attention, knows that in the various states of the union the municipalities are asked to contribute, and to contribute very largely, and the larger municipalities are always prepared to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. They have always a fixed rate.

Mr. GRAHAM. The rate fixed by the commission has been very small; but that does not interfere with my argument. The hon. member for Lincoln contends that municipalities should not be asked to contribute at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. When the railway runs on the highway.

Mr. GRAHAM. His argument was that municipalities should not be asked to pay at all. I am pointing out that every state in the union that has dealt with this question has asked the municipalities to contribute a certain amount, which is usually specified, but a comparatively small amount; but the principle has been accepted that the municipalities should be asked to contribute something. Now, I am not prepared to argue the legal point, but I have been told by eminent legal gentlemen that although an Act might apparently be beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament, or that of any provincial legislature, anything that is incidental to the enforcing of that Act comes within the jurisdiction of this parliament or of the legislature, as the case may be. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) stated that very clearly last session, giving as his authority the late Sir John Thompson. I have it on fairly good legal authority that the parliament of Canada can enforce against a municipality anything that it can enforce against an individual. But my hon. friend should not raise that point, because, if his argument be sound, he disposed of his apprehensions about our taxing municipalities. If we cannot tax municipalities, then his Bill would not be at all necessary, because we could not get anything out of them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did not the hon. gentleman understand me to say that there were two objections—one the technical and the other the meritorious one. Why does he mix them up?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have dealt with the meritorious one; now I am dealing with the other. On the meritorious one, I do not think he has any argument on his side at all. On the technical one, there is possibly a difference between legal gentlemen, but I have given the opinion of more than one legal man, including some of my hon. friend's own friends. I say again, if my hon. friend's argument be founded on good logic and good law, then his Bill is not necessary. But that he does not really place much confidence in his own statement of the law is evidenced by the fact that he brings in a Bill to protect the municipalities against a power which he says does not exist. Now, last year we agreed that railways in the future, knowing the Act as it has been placed on the statute-book, ought to be held responsible if the commissioners found that an evil existed. In the city of Ottawa, just a few weeks ago, although the municipality and the railway company did practically agree on a certain level crossing, the commission refused to allow the crossing to be made in the way proposed. It shows the trend of public opinion and the wish of the commission to compel railway companies in the future to be very careful about creating a dangerous condition by means of level crossings. I say that is not injurious to or a discrimination against railways. The railways that have been constructed under the old conditions are now being compelled to suit themselves to the new requirements, and as we have been a party, to a certain extent, to the old conditions, in having al-

lowed them to create those crossings, we are prepared to assist them to a small degree in removing them, but we give them notice that in the future, if they create such crossings, we shall not help them to remedy any evil that may exist in consequence. I do not think that is unfair to the railway companies or to the people. Should we allow this Bill to pass? I say no. We passed the Act of last year after a lot of consideration and debate. Both sides of the House spent hour after hour on it, and we got what we thought was a good Bill, and one which I think would not be improved, but would be injured, by this amendment. We should at least allow the Act which we passed last session to have a chance to go into operation before we begin tinkering with it in one direction or another. Make this amendment this session, and next session we shall have amendments asking for a relief in some contrary direction. I believe that the Act passed last year, if we give it a fair trial, will remove in a measure at least the great evil that exists, and believing that to be the case, I cannot accept this Bill and must ask the House to vote down its second reading.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I overlooked a phase of the question when discussing the Bill before six o'clock. In hundreds of instances the railways were in possession before there was a highway. Under the old Railway Committee of the Privy Council, a very marked distinction was always made in regard to priority of occupation. In a case where a railway had run through a portion of country before a highway was constructed, that fact was always taken into consideration in a decision by the Railway Committee as to the method and apportionment of the cost of a crossing. In order to express what I wish to in reference to this Bill, I think the proper procedure would be for my motion to take the form that the Bill be not now read a second time, but be read this day six months, and I beg leave to move accordingly.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like the minister's opinion upon the case of a crossing which originally was a level crossing, but at which the railway, in order to reduce a grade, depressed the track by six or seven feet. In such a case would the municipality be called upon to pay their proportion of the cost of erecting an overhead bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would be a case for the Railway Commission and the facts my hon. friend has adduced would afford a strong ground for the municipality to ask exemption from contributing to the cost of such a bridge.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not agree with the Minister of Railways that the conditions to-day are the same as the conditions at the time of which he spoke, years and years ago, when in their anxiety to secure railways the people of Canada were willing to allow them to run on the level of the highway and when many municipalities granted bonuses to secure railways within their borders. Those are by no means the conditions for which we have to legislate to-day. In those days every train stopped at every station and the fastest train did not run 25 miles an hour. The fatalities that occur to-day are caused by the fast through trains running 50 or 60 miles an hour that do not in any way serve the municipalities that are asked to bear the cost of protecting the lives of their people at these deadly level crossings. In the days of which the minister spoke there were no trains of this character, no train passed through a town or village at such a rate of speed that accidents could not easily be avoided at level crossings. There would not be the same objection to the expenditure of this money by the municipalities if the result would be to absolutely safeguard the lives of people within the municipalities by the entire elimination of level crossings. My Bill does not apply to the conditions mentioned by the minister. This Bill applies only so long as the trains continue to run on the King's highway.

As to the hundreds of instances which the minister has just mentioned, I fancy that is a little bit of imagination too, when he says there were hundreds of cases where the railways were in possession before the highway was constructed. In some large cities new crossings have been opened up, and those are always dealt with as they arise, that is a matter of new construction. But in the great majority of cases where the trouble arises to-day, the highways existed before the railway was built, in villages and towns where the railway stopped, and where they did not have the fast running trains we have to-day and which can hardly avoid killing people. To corroborate that statement you have only to look at the statistics, and you will find that in every case where these accidents have happened, they have occurred by trains running fifty or sixty miles an hour through villages and towns where they did not stop.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Graham).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth,	McKenzie,
Beauparlant,	McLean (Huron),
Brown,	McMillan,

Bureau,
Carrier,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Congdon,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Templeman,
Tobin,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turgeon,
Verville,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta.)—87.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Beattie,
Blain,
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
McCall,
Maddin,
Marshall,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Perley,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox & Addington).—53.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Low,	Smyth,
Clark (Red Deer),	Barnard,
Black,	Crosby,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Rivet,	Doherty,
Beland,	Hughes,
King,	Borden,
Brodeur,	Foster,
Borden Sir. F.	Haggart (Lanark),
Clarke (Essex),	MacLean (York),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Macdonell,
Fielding,	Osler,
Lemieux,	Barker,
Conmee,	Porter,
Harris,	McCarthy,
Gordon (Kent),	Wright,
Bickerdike,	Ames,
Emmerson,	Daniel,
Hunt,	Worthington,
German,	Bristol,
Ethier,	Lortie,
Lapointe,	Paquet,
Gervais,	Forget,
Law,	Lalor,
Schell,	Owen,
Turriff,	Lewis,
Wilson (Laval),	Thorburn,
Sifton,	Magrath,
Devlin,	Blondin,
Carvell,	Rhodes,
Martin (Regina),	Meighen,
Pardee,	Taylor (Leeds).

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. NORTHRUP moved the second readinf of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think this is the same Bill that received the attention of the House some few years ago and was rejected. It was on the Order Paper last year, but, if I remember correctly, it was not reached. This Bill proposes an amendment to the present Railway Act, not so much, as I understand, to meet general cases as to meet a specific case. I do not care to go into the details as the House has heard the argument time and again from the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) as to a contract that was made some years ago between the railway company in the county of Hastings which he contends was never carried out by the company. Instead, the railway was transferred to another company. If I remember my hon. friend correctly, speaking last year, he said that a certain amount of money, paid by the late Conservative government, was caused to be paid through error and accepted fraudulently by the company. This Bill, if I understand it, is intended to be retroactive, to give the commission power to deal with the whole matter which had its

origin nineteen or twenty years ago. The matter was thoroughly discussed on a previous occasion. I do not care to detain the House, but I do not think that the government can see its way clear to accept the Bill, and as sending it to the committee will only be postponing the evil day, I beg to move in amendment that the Bill be not now read the second time but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, the only regret I have is that this Bill, which I have introduced, will not come into operation within the next few months because it certainly must come into operation after the next session of this House for there is no other point to which the minister can move but that one, he having been on every side of the compass with that exception. The minister objects to this Bill on what he regards as sufficient grounds. The first ground is that the Bill has already been rejected by this House. If this Bill had been rejected by the House that might be an argument, though certainly not a conclusive argument, against the present motion but, unfortunately, the minister is wrong. I am obliged, speaking in the parliamentary sense, to accept his statement, but I can assure you that it was the greatest surprise of my life to learn that this Bill had been rejected by this House, because it certainly was not my Bill, it was not during the time I was in the House that the Bill was rejected and therefore I cannot help having some kind of suspicion that the minister, when he gave that as a reason for not allowing this Bill to pass, was not stating the reason that was, at all events, uppermost in his mind. Then there was another reason, and that was that this Bill was introduced to meet a particular case. The minister is just as accurate in that statement as he was in the preceding one and not one bit more so. But it does seem rather an insult to a member of this House, when he introduces a Bill that he believes to be in the interests of the country, that a minister will deliberately oppose that Bill and give two reasons for the throwing out of that Bill on the strength of which two reasons there is not the slightest doubt in the world that this intelligent body will throw that Bill out, and yet there is not the slightest shadow of a ground of excuse for either of the reasons he gave. One would hardly believe it possible that there could be such ingratitude in this world. I remember a time, only a couple of years ago, when this very same matter was brought by myself before the House, and at that time the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, the same gentleman who to-day fills the position and moves so sensibly and on such meritorious grounds that this Bill should be thrown out, almost with tears in his eyes, regretted the lamentable state of affairs that existed and declared that he was looking for a remedy therefor. Let me tell the House what the minister thought of this same Bill two or three years ago when the Bill was first brought in and when, whatever may have occurred since, there had been no opportunity for any railway corporation to influence the minister or express its opinion in regard to this Bill. In those early days, when perhaps the minister's conscience was more sensitive, as he had been in office but a short time, speaking of this very measure, the minister thus expressed himself. I had laid before the House the grounds upon which I complained that the people of this country were suffering a grievance. The minister says that it is not necessary to repeat all the details, and I will not weary the House by repeating the full details of the story I told, but the story I told was of the manner in which this country had been robbed of $21,000 by a railway corporation, and after I had pointed out that the case was not met by existing law and asked if there was no remedy, the minister spoke of this lamentable state of affairs and said:

> We are anxious to find a remedy so that this will not occur again. The people have a grievance not only on account of the subsidies voted by this House, but on account of the votes by municipalities throughout Ontario and in other provinces. . . There is a weakness in the law somewhere that ought to be remedied, and I assure the House that I am trying to find out the method to remedy this grievance. If possible I shall have something further to say a little later on so that the Railway Commission or some authority may be given power to deal with such cases and compel companies to carry out their contracts with the people of Canada. . . I will say further that I will not be satisfied until I do find some way. I do not believe that a railway company has a right to take the money of the people of Canada and then not carry out its contract any more than it would have a right to take my money and not carry out a contract entered into with me.

Mr. LANCASTER. That was not this Minister of Railways.

Mr. NORTHRUP. 'Twas he. As I said a few moments ago about another matter, does it not almost seem to be a farce for hon. members of this House to waste their time preparing legislation in order to assist a minister to relieve himself of anxiety that is wearing him out and bringing him perhaps to an early grave through worry? And, when I found a remedy for him last year, the House did not reject the Bill but when it came up the first time it could not be moved because it had not been printed in both languages, and another unfortunate Bill was ahead of it—whether it was that Bill the government did not wish to

have read or my Bill I know not—but at all events no further opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the merits of this Bill was given. So Sir, I say that practically at the request of the Minister of of Railways I introduce this measure, because, when he informed this House that there was a grievance, that this grievance ought to be remedied and that he would not rest until he had found a remedy, I felt I was conferring a favour on the hon. gentleman when, in discharging my duty to my constituents and the people of this country I offered him a remedy which he himself was not able to discover. If we find the minister speaking the truth, as of course he did speak the truth when he admitted there was a grievance; if we find the minister speaking the truth in all conscientiousness which of course he did when he said he desired to find a remedy; and if we find him speaking the truth, as I admit he did when he declared he would not rest until he found a remedy, then when the remedy is offered and the minister declines to accept it, what are we to think? This House has heard the objections made to the present measure but not one word dropped from the lips of the minister to show that the Bill did not meet the desire of his heart to furnish him with the remedy he sought. But, merely, because, first, it had been rejected which it had not, and secondly, because it is to meet an isolated case which it is not, he asked the House to reject the Bill. The minister can hardly be surprised to find that I and other members of this House have their strong suspicions that there is some other reason actuating the minister than the two most unfounded reasons which he has given to the House. Now Sir, what other reasons can possibly exist? The minister says this is an isolated case and therefore, possibly because I happen to sit on the opposite of the House from him, he thinks my constituents are not entitled to redress. But there sits on my left the member for Missisquoi (Mr. Meigs) a more faithful supporter of the government than whom does not sit in this House and he requested me to push the Bill because in his constituency there are some cases precisely similar to the one in my own constituency. An hon. gentleman sits behind the minister, the gentleman from the county of Perth who, whether or not he himself is aware of the fact, his predecessor was aware of it and was prepared to assist me in carrying this Bill because in the county of Perth there are illustrations precisely similar to the one in the county of Hastings. Other members of this House have in their own constituencies precisely similar conditions, and therefore when the minister objects to this legislation on the ground that it is only to meet an isolated case there is no more reason for that excuse than there is for the others he gave. Is it possible that in the parliament of Canada in the twentieth century a minister would dare occupy a seat in this House, and without denying the facts in this case refuse to remedy the grievance? These facts are that the Crown had been robbed of $21,000 by a railway company which made an application for it to the Crown under the name of another company which did not exist; that it obtained a cheque from the government payable to the order of a railway company that had ceased to exist years before; that it endorsed that cheque in the name of a company which had no longer any existence and deposited that cheque to its own credit in the bank and was wrongfully the beneficiary of over $21,000 of the money of the people of this country; that a contract was entered into in the name of a non-existant company by one of the great corporations of Canada to-day; that that contract expressly recited and agreed that the recipient of the money, the bogus non-existing company was to continuously and perpetually operate this line of railway seven miles only in length, would it be believed that in the face of these facts and when it is pointed out that unfortunately under the wording of the Railway Act no relief lies at present, because that great corporation if it was brought into court would say that it did not make the contract and that the company that did make the contract does not exist, any more than it did when the money was paid over in its name; would it be believed that when under these circumstances I ask the government to do something to recover for the people of this country the $21,000 which have been most improperly taken from their pockets, the minister while admitting this state of affairs, while regretting the scandal that the law should be as it is, while declaring in this House that he deplored that state of affairs and never would rest until he found a remedy, now deliberately stands before this House and refuses to accept the remedy which is offered to him, and refuses on grounds which I do not think he would venture to state before me on a public platform in the county of Hastings where I could use language that the rules of this House unhappily prevent me from using here. Now, it has been said by the minister that this legislation is only to meet a state of affairs that arose in the past, that it is ex post facto legislation. Why, Sir, when the very board to which I wish to appeal was created, was there a single solitary shred of jurisdiction given to that Railway Board which did not stand on exactly the same footing that this case stands on which I to-day wish to bring before the board.

Mr. SPROULE. They are dealing with retroactive matters all the time.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly, they all stand on the same footing. There was no Railway Board until the Act created it and gave it jurisdiction to deal with matters that had occurred up to that time as well as with matters that might occur in the future. And when, unhappily, it was found from time to time, as it has been found in many cases, that the Act constituting the Railway Board unfortunately did not go far enough and that a grievance had arisen for which there was no remedy, the government itself, led by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, has come to this House again and again and again and amended the Railway Act to give to the Railway Commissioners the power that they thought was necessary to do justice to the people of this country. And, when to-day, I ask him to do precisely what has been done again and again and again; when I ask him to give to the board power—not to compel them to take any steps but merely to give jurisdiction to the board—that when certain facts are brought before them, the fact that the people have been deprived of their money and the contract not carried out, that the board may have jurisdiction to make such orders as may seem reasonable in the premises. I do not even provide that if the matter is brought before the board they must make any particular order. I merely ask that in such a case the board may give such an order as is reasonable in the premises. The hon. minister has so little confidence in his own board, or so little confidence in the honesty of the people he is defending, that he is not willing to allow this matter to come before the board and give them jurisdiction to make such an order as they may think reasonable and fair. Now, I would like the minister to be honest in this respect and to tell me which it is he distrusts: the honesty of those—I can hardly call them his clients —the honesty of those recipients of the $21,000 whom he is protecting, or the integrity of the broad which he will not trust with such a matter as this. There is no escape from the dilemma. The hon. gentleman admits the grievance. He has declared it publicly on the floor of this House and therefore he cannot deny it. He has declared that a grievance existed and he wished to find a remedy for it, and now when a remedy is offered he refuses to accept it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? He has repeated that so often that he may possibly come himself to believe that it is founded on fact. If he will just read carefully the wording of my language which he himself has read, he will see that my observations were addressed to a remedy for future cases which might arise.

He had described this case as he has to-night, only at more length. I fear the hon. gentleman is not quoting exactly what I said, but if the hon. gentleman consults 'Hansard', he will find that at that time there was a division taken and that my contention was upheld on practically the same Bill which he has before the House to-night. I was speaking in general terms and for the future, while my hon. friend tries to make out that I was discussing his own case.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I do not wish to have any question of veracity between the hon. gentleman and myself. I asked a question in the House the other day as to the accuracy of these words, which were taken from 'Hansard', copied by myself; and even at the risk of being charged by the hon. gentleman with repeating the words once more, I will read from 'Hansard' exactly what he said. While the hon. gentleman the other day, in answering my question, said very astutely that the sentences were taken from different parts of his speech, which was perfecly true, yet it is also true that there is in the context not one word to modify the statement made by the hon. gentleman at that time. In fact, so eloquent and convincing was the hon. gentleman that his leader assented, and said there was a grievance that should be remedied. Therefore I thought the remedy was at hand. That there may be no doubt as to what the hon. gentleman did say, I will read his exact words, as found in 'Hansard' of 1907-8, at pages 2815 and 2816:

> We are anxious to find a remedy so that this will not occur again. The people have a grievance not only on account of the subsidies voted by this House, but on account of the votes by municipalities throughout Ontario and in other provinces.
>
> There is a weakness in the law somewhere that ought to be remedied, and I assure the House that I am trying to find out the method to remedy this grievance.
>
> I will say further that I will not be satisfied until I do find some way. I do not believe a company has a right to take the money of the people of Canada and then not carry out its contract any more than it would have a right to take my money and not carry out a contract entered into with me.

Does the hon. gentleman think to night that a railway company has the right to use the name of a non-existing railway company to obtain $21,000 of the money of the people of Canada, to execute a contract in the name of a non-existing railway company, to get the money, to endorse a cheque in the name of a non-existing railway company, and deposit it in a

bank to its own credit, and then decline to carry out one of the conditions under which the money was paid? Does the hon. gentleman think that he and his colleagues have no responsibility to the people of Canada in a case of this kind? Has the day come when the principle can be laid down, probably to be quoted as a precedent in other cases, that if once money can be filched from the public treasury and be placed in the pocket of any one not entitled to it, although you may prove that the money was improperly obtained, and although you may show the very pocket in which it still rests, nothing can be done by this House, because the money having been obtained, it would not be fair to pass ex post facto legislation, and make the recipient pay the money back, but we will see that in future no one catches us in the same way? Is that to be the highest type of political foresight that we are to find in this House? Now, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House, because I assume that, the government having committed themselves against the Bill, it will not pass. I am perfectly willing, if they insist, that the Bill will be thrown out on a division without taking time to call in the members and have the vote recorded; but at all events, I will insist on this, that if the Bill is not accepted by the government, every year that I occupy a seat in this House, I will make them vote as they did last year, and as they apparently intend to vote to-night, that it is not right to give the Railway Commission an opportunity to make a railway company pay back money which it is admitted it improperly received. If the government and their supporters are satisfied with this public exhibition of the ideas entertained by this government of the standard of right and wrong that should prevail with regard to the handling of public funds, I can only hope that the day is not far distant when the people of this country, estimating these hon. gentlemen at their true value, will place in office gentlemen from this side of the House who, whatever their faults, will not fail in this respect, but will be prepared to stand up, not for the rights of a defaulting corporation, but for the rights of the people of this country.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I should have to take up the time of the House by returning upon the path that we travelled over, not once, not twice, not even three times only, but I think no less than four times in the session before last with reference to this railway which my hon. friend from Hastings is so interested in. I might say that I am not much concerned in defending the transaction which he has so vigorously attacked, for the simple reason that it occurred over twenty years ago, in the golden days when the late lamented government of which my hon. friend was so well known a supporter, was in charge of the affairs of this country. In those days, somewhere between 1885 and 1888, the riding of North Hastings was represented in this House by an hon. gentleman whose name is well known in the political history of this country, who had his residence in the city of Belleville, and who was, I venture to say, thoroughly well acquainted with all the circumstances of this case as they happened from day to day and from year to year during the whole of that period. The building of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, the aid it received from the municipalities through which it ran, the subsidies it got from the provincial legisture, and the subsidy which afterwards was granted to it by the Dominion government of that day, of which the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was a prominent member—all these matters that hon. member and the government were not at all unacquainted with. The railway line was built. It was on at least two different occasions made the object of subsidies granted by the parliament of Canada—in the year 1886-7 and the year 1887-8. These subsidies were to be earned by compliance with the conditions of the statutes under which they were granted. The railway line having been built, it was examined by the officials whose duty it was to certify to the Department of Railways and Canals that the subsidy had been earned.

That report was made, that certificate was given, and the amount mentioned, the sum of $21,000, certified to have been earned by the company, was paid over in January, 1889. My hon. friend says that money was filched from the treasury. Well, I give the government of that day, I give the Minister of Railways of that day, I give the member of that government and for that constituency of that day, who must have had personal knowledge of all the facts of the case quite as well as my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup)—I give to these gentlemen the credit of supposing that whatever they paid out of the treasury of this country as a subsidy to that company, was paid to that company after all the conditions surrounding that subsidy had been complied with. But if my hon. friend believes that his friends of that day were utterly remiss in their duty, that they allowed themselves to be hoodwinked, and voted to pay to some fictitious company money which had never been earned, I think he is labouring under an entire misconception of affairs. The company was legally brought into existence, it was incorporated regularly and properly, it carried on its business, it acquired property and complied with all the statutory requirements to give it a valid existence. What has put it out of existence,

which is the phrase my hon. friend continually uses? He alludes to the legislation of the province of Ontario which took that company and another company and fused the two into one. Did the other company go out of existence? Did the Grand Trunk Railway Company go out of existence by the fusion? If the Grand Trunk Railway Company, after the fusion, represented the Grand Trunk Railway Company which existed before the fusion, why does the hon. gentleman deny that it represented the other companies which by Act of parliament were merged into one?

Mr. NORTHRUP. What railways is the hon. minister talking about as having been fused at all?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The various amalgamations as detailed in the debates of the House the session before last. There were several pieces of legislation which the hon. gentleman himself narrated and which appear in 'Hansard.' If I recollect correctly, the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company was originally fused with the Grand Junction Company. Thus a company was formed which fused with the Midland railway. Then immediately afterwards that new company was fused with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. So just as the first two fused companies represented both the Belleville and North Hastings Company and the Grand Junction Company, the new company formed when the Midland was fused with that first one, represented the three companies which had gone into the amalgamation together, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which existed after the final piece of legislation, represented all four. The provincial legislature was careful, by the Acts which effected these fusions to provide that the liabilities, debts and obligations of each of the companies, dealt with and formed into one, were to be carried on as liabilities, debts and obligations of the new cmpany. Therefore I am quite unable to understand on what principle it is my hon. friend continually represents the company which had earned this subsidy as one which had no existence at the time the money was paid it. I would have thought that my hon. friend, as a lawyer, if he had been advising the government of 1888 and had been told by that government that there was a certain railway company which had earned its subsidy and was entitled to the money, but that the government were a little uncertain how they should make out the cheque for that subsidy and wanted his advice—I would have thought that he would have advised the government to make their check payable to the company with which they had a contract and which had done the work and earned the money and presented its certificate showing that it was entitled to be paid. My hon. friend says that the payment was a fraud on the public, that the money was filched from the treasury. All I can say is that the company to which the cheque was payable received the money, as shown by its endorsement of the cheque, I am speaking of facts which my hon. friend himself put before the House the session before last. The cheque shows the endorsement by the payees, the properly constituted officials of this very company, but the endorsement upon the cheque was for deposit to the credit of the Grand Trunk railway, and my hon. friend says that makes it all wrong. I remember two years ago asking my hon friend to explain what would have been the difference if this company, having earned the money, had, instead, of a cheque, received the money in current coin of the realm and handed that coin over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I have never heard any explanation of what wrong there would have been in that. The money was earned, the company had complied with the conditions of the statute governing the subsidy, there was nothing in the statute about operating the railway, and I am unable to see what difference it would make whether the company paid the money to the Grand Trunk railway or deposited it in the bank to its own credit or threw it into Lake Ontario.

My hon. friend says there has been great wrong done the people of his county because that line has not been operated during the last twenty-one years, and he presented that circumstance as a grievance when addressing the House on the subject two years ago. The Minister of Railways then told the House that if a repetition of such a state of things, as my hon. friend from Hastings had described, could be prevented, if there was any way of preventing it, he would take that way. The extracts which the hon. gentleman made from the remarks on that date of the Minister of Railways, as pointed out in the answer given the other day to the interrogatories on the subject, were not continuous extracts. Sentences between were omitted and the quotations which the hon. gentleman put into the question he framed, were not given in the order of the sentences as uttered by the Minister of Railways. I venture to say that any one who reads the speech of the minister, as reported in 'Hansard,' will plainly see that every reference he made in that case was not to the individual grievance of which my hon. friend from Hastings was speaking but to the general question, and that he was pledging himself to the House upon that occasion that he would take the earliest means in his power to put on our statute-book, if he could find it, some remedy that would prevent any repetition of such circumstances

The pages to which the hon. gentleman has referred are incorrectly given in the citation from which he was just reading. They are correctly given in the answer to the question of the hon. minister a week or ten days ago, as 2815 and 2816 of 'Hansard,' 1907-8 in the report of the proceedings of February 10, 1908. What followed? During the course of that session the Minister of Railways thought he had succeeded in finding a remedy and he prepared and presented to this House his Bill amending the Railway Act, empowering the Board of Railway Commissioners to consider any future case of this character which should arise and conferring upon that board a new power by giving to any person entitled to apply to that board the new remedy of compelling all railway companies specifically to carry out every obligation into which they had entered. That was a vast step in advance in the legal history of this country. Up to that time, a railway company which might have entered into a contract that it would maintain a station, that it would operate a road or that it would do some other continuous piece of work, enjoyed this position of advantage not peculiar to a railway company, but which would apply and would exist in favour of any similar organization; the courts which have the power to compel people to carry out their contracts specifically have for a long series of years both in this country and in England, refused to pronounce any decree which the officers of those courts would not be in a position to see enforced. They had refused to pronounce a decree which would in terms order a railway company, for instance, to operate its road. How was such a decree to be enforced? It would need the sheriff or some other officer of the court to stand day by day through week after week or month after month over the company to see that it complied with the order of the court and because it was a task of that continuous character, which would involve the taking control of the railway and administering its affairs, the courts had long refused to pronounce any such decree, or judgment of that character as against a railway company or any other company which might have entered into such a contract. Under this legislation, which the Minister of Railways introduced and carried through the House during the session before last, the Board of Railway Commissioners is given precisely that power and for the first time in the history of this Dominion a court has been specifically empowered to take hold of a railway company, and compel it to live up to its obligations and to carry out specifically any contract of this character into which it may have entered.

When that legislation was under consideration in this House my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) was not satisfied with it, he thought it would not cover this particular case which lay so near his heart and he urged that its language should be so widened that it would not merely include and cover cases which might arise in the future and which the hon. minister, by his Bill, was seeking to guard against; but that the legislation should be so worded that it would cover this old outlawed claim of his of twenty odd years ago. He pressed that upon the House, the matter was fully discussed in Committee of the Whole House, the committee was against him but he was not content. On the motion for the third reading of the Bill he proposed by way of amendment that there should be added to the Bill a clause in the very words, word for word and line for line, of this Bill now printed and now under the consideration of the House. He pressed his argument to the utmost and after a full discussion divided the House and on June 30, 1908, by a vote of 77 against 36, the House declined to accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman and accepted instead the Bill as framed by the Minister of Railways. My hon. friend is not content with that. He brings this Bill before the House and seeks to insist that it must be passed and that this duty which in 1908, only eighteen months ago, this House declined to put upon the Railway Board, should now be added to it.

We must in fairness to the hon. gentleman's Bill meet it not with reference to the particular facts of the special case which he described but with reference to its provisions and we must see in what way it would change the existing law. The existing law is to be found in the amending or substituted section of last session. On May 19 last the Royal Assent was given to the Bill of last session which empowers the Railway Board to deal in the way the hon. gentleman desires with all future cases of this character and the one point of substantial difference—there are verbal differences but they are matters of detail—between the Act as it now stands upon our statute-book and the Bill now under consideration is to be found in lines 21 and 22, and in lines 31 and 32 of the present Bill. That is simply a provision including the obligations of either the contracting company or any person or corporation which has acquired or owns or is in possession or occupation of or is operating the railway. Bear in mind that the present law imposes this obligation to carry out its contract to the full upon the contracting party but that will not suit the case of my hon. friend. He wants Paul to pay Peter's debt. He is not content with the present law which would make the company which contracted to do a certain thing do that thing, but he wants to make some other company do it and accordingly he frames this Bill to cover not only the case of the company which enters

into the contract but, in terms, to extend to and cover the case of any person or corporation which has acquired or owns, or is in possession or occupation of or is operating the railway. Now is that right? Ought that to be the law? If I buy a house and there is a mortgage on that house, I know that I must pay that mortgage before I can own that house free of encumbrance. But when I buy a house which is free of encumbrance, I hope I do not undertake to pay the coal bill of the former owner, I hope that I am not entering upon an obligation to pay any and all of the debts which the man who sold that house to me has contracted. And yet, that is identically and exactly the principle which my hon. friend wants to incorporate into this Bill now before the House and to enforce against the company which has purchased the property of the company that he says is in default. I think that principle needs only to be stated, needs only to be understood to justify every one in supporting the amendment which seeks to postpone for six months the consideration of this measure.

I, Sir, am not prepared by any vote I give in this House to enable some person who has a debt against one man to collect that debt from another man simply because that other man may have come into possession of the property of the man who owes the debt. That, stating it in plain English, is the position which this Bill seeks to put any railway company, or other person, or company, in, if such railway company, or other person, or company, has acquired or is operating a railway line. It seems to me that such legislation is wrong in principle. That was the view in which the proposition of my hon. friend was opposed from this side of the House during the previous session. The matter was then very fully discussed and debated, the matter was then pressed to the ultimate extreme of dividing the House on the subject, and I for my part certainly see no reason whatever to depart from the course which was taken then in rejecting the proposition of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the last reason which the minister has given for his course to-day, in my judgment it does not hold good, because parliament has already done the same thing once or twice, or more, with regard to roads that had been purchased by other companies than the original owners. I can cite one or two instances where the labour was paid, and parliament compelled the new company to pay the cost of the labour that went into the construction of the road long before it was sold. We have done this several times in parliament. We did it with the old Northwest Central railway, we did it with the railway extending south from Hamilton, and we have done it in one or two other instances, I think one in the province of Quebec many years ago. So there is more than one precedent for it; and the argument which the Minister of Justice addressed to the House as the strongest reason why it should not be done, has in my judgment very little force in it, because parliament has already done it.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Graham).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McGiverin,
Aylesworth,	McIntyre,
Beauparlant,	McKenzie,
Béland,	McLean (Huron),
Borden (Sir F.),	McLean (Sunbury),
Brodeur,	McMillan,
Brown,	Major,
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carrier,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Carvell,	Martin (Regina),
Cash,	Martin (Wellington),
Champagne,	Mayrand,
Chew,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Miller,
Congdon,	Molloy,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Murphy,
Delisle,	Nesbitt,
Demers,	Neely,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Dubeau,	Papineau,
Ecrement,	Parent,
Ethier,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Pickup,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fortier,	Prowse,
Fowke,	Pugsley,
Geoffrion,	Rankin,
German,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gervais,	Richards,
Girard,	Robb,
Gladu,	Ross (Middlesex),
Graham,	Ross (Rimouski),
Guthrie,	Roy (Dorchester),
Harris,	Rutan,
Harty,	Savoie,
Hodgins,	Schell,
Knowles,	Sealey,
Kyte,	Seguin,
Lachance,	Sifton,
Lafortune,	Sinclair,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Smith (Stormont),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Templeman,
Lavergne,	Tobin,
Law,	Todd,
LeBlanc,	Tolmie,
Loggie,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lovell,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Macdonald,	Turgeon,
MacNutt,	Turriff,
McAllister,	Verville,
McCoig,	Warburton,
McColl,	White (Victoria, Alta.)—107.
McCraney,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	McCall,
Arthurs,	McCarthy,
Barker,	Magrath,
Beattie,	Marshall,
Blain,	Meigs,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Monk,
Broder,	Nantel,
Burrell,	Northrup,
Campbell,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Clare,	Price,
Cowan,	Reid (Grenville),
Crocket,	Roche,
Crothers,	Russell,
Currie (Simcoe),	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Sexsmith,
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Edwards,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Elson,	Sproule,
Fraser,	Stanfield,
Goodeve,	Staples,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Stewart,
Henderson,	Taylor (Leeds),
Herron,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Jameson,	Thornton,
Kidd,	Wallace,
Lake,	White (Renfrew),
Lancaster,	Worthington.—60.
Lennox,	
Lewis,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Low,	Smyth,
Clark (Red Deer),	Barnard,
Black,	Crosby,
Stratton,	Gordon,
Rivet,	Doherty,
Gordon (Kent),	Hughes,
King,	Borden, R. L.,
Clarke (Essex),	Foster,
Lemieux,	Haggart (Lanark),
Conmee,	Macdonell,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Osler,
Wilson (Laval),	Wilson (Lennox),
Devlin,	Lalor,
Talbot,	Bristol,
Gauvreau,	Lortie,
Rivet,	Paquet,
Emmerson,	Rhodes,
Pardee,	Thoburn,
Lapointe,	Blondin,
Smith (Middlesex),	Owen,
Boyer,	Maddin,
Hunt,	Meighen,
Bickerdike,	Forget,

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, if I was somewhat surprised at the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), I must frankly admit I was utterly astounded by the speech made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). I do not know that I can blame hon. gentlemen opposite for voting as they did in view of the statements, the illustrations and the propositions of law laid down by the Minister of Justice. There are some points on which there is room for argument. There are many questions upon which a man has a perfect right to hold an opinion on either side. But there are some questions on which it is inadmissable for any person to hold other than one opinion. I venture to say that if it were possible to entirely eliminate political considerations from this question there is not one single gentleman on the other side of the House, or a supporter of the government, sitting on this side, who would have by his vote signified his approval of the remarks made by the Minister of Justice. Let me proceed to give two or three illustrations. I might occupy considerable time in illuminating 'Hansard' by calling attention to his felicitous remarks, but the hour is late, the question is practically decided, and I merely call attention to the speech made by the Minister of Justice in order that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House can see, and the country may understand how questions are decided here. The Minister of Justice, as an objection to the measure which I had the honour to move, said that when amalgamations were made by various roads, as had been the case with the Belleville and North Hastings, the road which was the result of the junction of a couple of other roads assumed the obligations of the roads which were so fused. That, I believe, as a general rule is the fact. I say that it is a fact that when the Belleville and North Hastings and the Grand Junction were amalgamated the new road, called the Grand Junction, assumed the debts of the Belleville and North Hastings. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in that. I quite agree that when the Grand Junction and Midland railway were fused the Midland railway assumed the obligations then existing of the Midland railway and the Grand Junction railway. But, I would like to know what application that very proper principle of law has to the case, where, after a railway has ceased to exist, after the Belleville and North Hastings and the Grand Junction have been fused and the Grand Junction has assumed the debts of the two, and after the Grand Junction and Midland are fused and the Midland assumes the debts of the Grand Junction, somebody comes along with a promissory note upon which he had written the name of the Belleville and North Hastings years after the company had ceased to exist and put that note in circulation. Would anybody be more surprised than the Midland Railway Company if told: 'You must pay that debt years and years after the Belleville and North Hastings had ceased to exist because the name of the Belleville and North Hastings is there, and ten years before they had assumed the obligations which were contracted by the Belleville and North Hastings.' That is the case we

have before this House. There was no road which could assume the obligations which the Belleville and North Hastings company had undertaken with the people of Hastings and of this country, because there was no Belleville and North Hastings to make good the obligations although the name of that company appeared upon the document. The Minister of Justice, with a great flourish of trumpets and as a conclusive argument, said: You might as well expect a man who had bought a house to be called upon to pay the coal bill of the former owner. It might be a proper thing to make him pay the bill of the former owner. If he had bought a house requiring coal, if he had sent an order for coal in the name of the deceased owner, if that coal were delivered and he used it, I would like to know why he should not pay the coal bill? I would challenge the Minister of Justice to show the distinction between the case of a man ordering a ton of coal in the name of a party deceased, using the ton of coal and refusing to pay for it, and a railway company, one of the large corporations of this country, using the name of a defunct corporation which had been defunct for years obtaining money on the endorsement of that name, pocketing that money and refusing to carry out the obligation that the money was paid for. When the Minister of Justice stated that the railway had been completed and that the company had complied with the conditions of the statute, I cannot contradict him there simply because there is no provision in the statute of any kind or condition. The statute is the ordinary one bringing down subsidies to railways, so much is put in for the Belleville and North Hastings, and there was no more condition in that statute than in habeas corpus. But before the government paid over the money the Minister of Justice should know, as the Minister of Railways and Canals certainly knows, a contract was entered into between the railway company and the government and no money was paid over until this contract was entered into. All the money that was paid over was paid on the strength of a contract perfect in form, regular on its face, duly signed, sealed and delivered to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company and the only possible objection on the face of it was that there was no such company as that whose name was appended to the contract. This contract was made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the name of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company. The Grand Trunk almost became a party, because in the letter of William Wainwright, sent to the engineer, the Grand Trunk railway undertook to supply the rolling stock. If the Grand Trunk was bound to the people and the government to supply the road with rolling stock, they avoided that liability under the contract by ceasing to operate the road, so that no rolling stock would be required. The hon. gentleman thinks that is a perfectly reasonable and fair way to treat the people of this country. I would just like for a moment to call the attention of the House to an opinion which, I am sure, all respect, which possibly may have weight even with the Minister of Justice, an opinion concerning this and a similar grievance which the Minister of Justice complains has been aired so often before this House. Let me give you an opinion which I frankly say and believe is entitled to the greatest respect and should carry the greatest weight. The opinion is this:

> I think there is no doubt whatever that the intention of parliament, when the Railway Act was passed, was to give jurisdiction to the Commission to deal with such matters as the one brought up by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), that is to say to compel railway corporations to perform the duties towards the public which parliament has imposed upon them. I did not understand my hon. friend to dispute that, but if I understood him aright, he thought no party in this case could be brought before the Commission.

So there we have the opinion that the Railway Act, when it was passed, was intended to give this Commission the authority which I now ask parliament to give them. When we were told on authority which is at least respectable that the intention of this House was to give the Railway Commission certain power, and when the Minister of Railways has passed many a sleepless night because he could not find a remedy to obviate the oversight and give the powers which the government had intended to the board, I think it is about time that the members who sit on the other side of the House should have sufficient respect for the opinion of the right hon. the Prime Minister, expressed on 'Hansard' of 1908, page 2820, to vote for this Bill, I think I am justified in coming back again to the Minister of Justice and asking him what the influences are—for there certainly is some influence other than argument for of that we have heard none. What is the influence which prevents him from compelling the Grand Trunk railway of Canada to do what is right by the people of this country and to restore to the treasury of the Dominion the $21,000 which they wilfully and deliberately obtained on the promise they would perform a service which nobody pretends they ever did perform. Now, the Minister of Justice was very facetious over robbing Peter to pay Paul's debts. As a general proposition, like many other of his propositions, it is perfectly sound as a proposition, but unhappily, like the flowers that bloom in the spring it has

nothing to do with this case. I am not asking for legislation to compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company to pay anybody's debts. I am asking legislation to allow the railway board to do what the premier of this country said it was intended they should be given power to do when they were constituted. I am asking this House to give the railway board power to do what the Minister of Railways grieves they have not the power to do. I am asking this House to give the railway board power to compel a railway company which has wrongfully taken $21,000 and the interest on it for nearly twenty years, to pay back to the people of this country the money so long held and which they obtained by fraudulent representations. If such a matter as this were laid before the Board of Railway Commissioners, and if the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada had done just what the Belleville and North Hastings railway purported to have done; if the agreement which the Grand Trunk railway through its officials delivered to the government as being the contract with the Belleville and North Hastings railway had been signed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; every single thing would have been precisely as it is to-day except that we could then make the Grand Trunk Company pay back the money because it had not earned it. Whereas to-day, because they wilfully used the name of that non-existant corporation, they keep the money of the people, they refuse to carry out the contract which cannot be enforced, and this House is apparently unwilling to do what in a saner moment two years ago it thought should be done. And to-night, blindly supported by their followers behind them, the ministers vote down this Bill without giving any rhyme or reason which had any bearing whatever on the measure before the House.

Motion as amended agreed to.

INTEREST ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to amend the Interest Act. He said: The effect of this Bill if it becomes law will be that mortgagees holding a mortgage on real estate will be compelled to accept payment of over due principle no matter what the terms of the contract, upon one month's notice or upon being paid one month's interest in lieu of notice. Some members of this House have raised a question as to whether this parliament has jurisdiction in this matter, and in reply I point hon. gentlemen to section 10 of our Interest Act passed in April, 1880, and which was introduced into parliament by the Hon. Edward Blake. That section says that a mortgage made for any time beyond five years may be repaid at the end of five years under certain conditions. This is certainly the same class of legislation as that which I now propose, and if one is within the jurisdiction of this parliament the other certainly would appear to be. It has been urged against this Bill that it interferes with the rights of parties to make contracts and so it does. In reply to that I again point the House to section 10 of the Interest Act to which I have already referred and which is a much greater interference with the right of parties to make contracts than is the Bill which I now move. I may be asked what is the necessity for this legislation. I contend, Sir, that at many times and in many cases where the mortgagor allows the mortgage money to run beyond the due date, that it is an imposition which he ought not to be subjected to that he cannot at any time thereafter repay his principal unless by the gift of three months' interest to the mortgagee. The mortgagee who usually inserts in his mortgage a contract that the overdue principal cannot be paid except by payment of three months' interest, is generally a loan company. I do not want to excite the prejudice of any person against loan companies. I have nothing to say against loan companies; I believe that the loan companies of Ontario have done a great deal towards the development of this province. I believe that loan companies are to-day doing a great deal towards assisting in the development of the western provinces, but that is not in itself any reason why a loan company mortgagee should have or exercise any unreasonable right or impose upon the ignorance of the borrower. It may be said that if the man borrowing money and the man lending money enter into a contract that I have no right to endeavour to disturb that contract, and that it is not fair I should endeavour to do so. I want to relate the circumstances under which these mortgages are usually made. The mortgager who is very often a farmer, goes to the agent of the loan company; he signs an application for a loan; the agent of the loan company sends in the application to the loan company's head office; if the application is accepted the mortgages are made out by the loan company's solicitor and are forwarded to that loan agent for execution by the borrower. The loan companies usually use a mortgage form that contains many long covenants, some of them very difficult indeed to understand. The mortgagor seldom either reads or has read to him all the long covenants contained in the mortgage. It may be said that he has the opportunity to read the mortgage if he so desired. That is true; but the mortgage being a very long document, when he sees that the rate of interest which he has contracted for and the

time of the year when it is payable are correctly stated in the mortgage, that is as far as he usually looks. If in an odd case the mortgagor should read the mortgage, and should understand the covenant, and should remonstrate with the agent, and say: I do not like to be bound by that covenant, he is probably told that it is a mere matter of form, that it is never likely to be exercised, and that he will be able to pay his mortgage when it matures. But if he is a strong-minded man and says: 'I will not sign that mortgage', the agent will say to him: 'Very well, you have signed an application for this loan, your application has been accepted and the mortgage has been made out, your farm has been inspected by the company's inspector, and if you refuse to go on you will have to pay about $20 of expenses.' Then he signs the mortgage rather than pay this amount. The borrower may wish to borrow money to pay off a mortgage maturing at a certain date, and for that reason it is necessary that he should obtain his loan promptly. Or it may be that he requires the money to make a payment on the purchase of another farm, which he has agreed to make on a certain day. In either case, his refusal to sign the mortgage might cause delay, and involve him in great expense, and so he signs it and is under the covenant. Now, I have here two letters written by the managers of two different loan companies. One manager says:

> We inclose herewith an agreement, and if you are able to have this signed and sent in, we shall be pleased to allow you the usual commission. We desire to point out that the mortgage is now overdue, and can be paid off at any time with a bonus of three months' additional interest.

In this case the borrower signed the mortgage containing a covenant that he could not pay off the mortgage if overdue unless he paid three months' interest by way of bonus. The mortgagor died, and his widow, not being aware of this covenant in the mortgage, and finding that she could borrow money at a reduced rate of interest, found that she was unable to pay off the overdue mortgage which her husband had made unless she paid three months' interest by way of bonus. The other letter, from the manager of another company, says:

> This mortgage is overdue, and by the terms of the contract the borrower will require to pay three months' interest in advance in addition to the principle and accrued interest. We cannot accept the notice in lieu of this, but will require the three months' interest in advance if the loan is to be paid off.

In this case the borrower was a poor farmer struggling with a large mortgage on his farm. He too had an opportunity to borrow at a lower rate of interest, but he could not avail himself of that opportunity, unless he paid three months' interest as a gift to the company who had had a mortgage for 10 years or more on his farm.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give the names of those companies?

Mr. MILLER. I do not think I should do that. I do not wish to injure the companies.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. gentleman has read the letters in the House, he is obliged to give the names.

Mr. FIELDING. They are not state documents. That rule does not apply to private documents.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I ask your ruling on the question. If an hon. gentleman reads a letter or an extract from a letter in this House for the purpose of strengthening an argument, is he not obliged to give the names?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that Bourinot holds that in the case of private members this rule does not apply. It applies only to a minister of the Crown quoting from a public document.

Mr. MILLER. I want to point out that when a man's mortgage matures, if it is allowed to run on and become overdue, that is essentially the act of the two parties, both the borrower and the lender. They must agree to allow the mortgage to run on, otherwise it cannot do so. If at the time the mortgage matures, the prevailing rate of interest is lower than the rate stated in the mortgage, or if it remains the same, the mortgagee will in all likelihood allow the mortgage to run on overdue; but if the rate of interest has increased and the mortgagee has an opportunity to lend the money at a higher rate, he will call it in. The mortgagor may allow the mortgage to continue until the opportunity occurs to call in the principal and lend it again at a better rate. Under the terms of the mortgage, the mortgagee may at any time, after the principal money is in arrear, take action without notice, to enforce the repayment of it. If he exercises the power of sale contained in the mortgage, he will usually have to give thirty days' notice, though sometimes he does not have to give any notice. If he desires to take proceedings under the mortgagor's covenant, he does not require to give any notice at all. I think the same privilege ought to exist as to the mortgagor as exists to the mortgagee. I know that an argument may be made, a very well sounding argument, that we ought not to interfere with the rights of parties to make contracts; but I want to point out that this fine or penalty of three months' interest by way of bonus is not a material part of the earnings of a loan company or any other

mortgagee; it is not necessary to add to the profits or the dividends to be paid upon the stock; and therefore it is not imposing any hardship upon anybody to enact this law and to that extent interfere with contracts that have been made. It may be said that we have not the right to interfere with existing contracts; but in the province of Ontario, by chapter 11 of the Ontario statutes of 1903, the very same law has been enacted, with the exception that the Ontario statute requires three months' notice or three months' interest, while I have made it one month. It may be said that the Bill which I have introduced is retroactive. It is, but so also is the Mechanics Lien Act of Ontario and the Woodman's Wages Act of Ontario. I took the trouble to go to the registry office and read some of the covenants contained in the mortgage to which one of the letters which I have read refers, and in that mortgage I found the following covenants:—

The mortgagor shall be liable for any tax the mortgagees may have to pay by reason of the mortgage, or money invested therein, or revenue derived therefrom.

Here is another covenant:

And that the society may at any time in their reasonable discretion, and from time to time, appoint some person to inspect the mortgaged premises and report thereon at the expense of the mortgagor.

Here therefore is a covenant signed by the borrower providing that the person or society he borrows from may at any time send an inspector to inspect the premises and the borrower has to pay. Then there is this covenant:

In the event of the mortgagor failing to pay the principal or any part thereof, at the time the same falls due as aforesaid, it is agreed that the mortgagor may pay the same at any time within ten days after maturity thereof, with interest for such ten days, and, if he shall fail to pay the same within ten days the society shall be entitled to three months' interest in advance at the said rate from the date of payment thereof, and to all the remedies for the collection thereof that they are entitled to in respect of any of the other moneys payable hereunder.

Another most vicious covenant reads as follows:

Whenever any interest shall be unpaid and in arrears for two weeks, the mortgagor, his executors, administrators or assigns shall and will, upon demand, give the society a chattel mortgage covering such of his chattels as, in the opinion of the society, shall be sufficient to secure the payment of arrears.

Here is a man borrowing money on his land who binds himself that he will, if required, give the loan society a chattel mortgage to secure the arrears of interest. And in the case of the sale of the land by the society before the maturity of the mortgage, the society shall be entitled to costs of inspection, to three months' interest by way of bonus, and costs to them of obtaining the loan.

Then there is a covenant providing that the loan society may exercise the power of selling the lands before the maturity of the mortgage. If the borrower allows his interest to go in default, the mortgagee may sell him out:

In the case of the sale of the lands by the society before the maturity of the mortgage, the society shall be entitled to costs of inspections to three months' interest by way of bonus, and costs to them of obtaining the loan.

The mortgagor thus attorns to the mortgagees and becomes their tenant. In case any of the covenants or agreements contained or implied be untrue, unobserved or broken, the society may, without any prior demand or notice, enter on the land and take and retain possession thereof and determine the lease. Thus the mortgagor, on borrowing perhaps half the value of his land, becomes the tenant of the mortgagee, and in case of default the mortgage may at any time, without notice or previous demand, close the tenancy and take possession of the farm and it shall be absolutely his. I say that the mortgagee who will, insert such covenants in a mortgage is not deserving of any sympathy; and if this House should chose to protect the borrower against companies which insert such provisos, I do not think any injustice would be done. I do not think there are many loan companies which insert such covenants or which would use them if they were inserted, but these have been inserted in this mortgage in order that they may be used should the mortgagees choose to use them. If such covenants were commonly used, it would be the duty of whatever parliament may have the jurisdiction and power to adopt a model form of mortgage and allow no other form to be used. These are my reasons for pressing this Bill, and I trust it will have the support of the House.

Mr. JOSEPH PIERRE TURCOTTE (Quebec county). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to this Bill. Were such a proposal to carry, its effect would be to entirely do away with mortgages. While I do not deny that grievances may exist, I do not think they can properly be dealt with by this parliament. It does not behoove us who represent the general interests of the Dominion to enact a law with the object of doing away with grievances which, I admit, may at times be excessive on the part of the creditor by opening the door to downright abuses on the part of the debtor. I do not think it is our duty to state in our statute-books that henceforth the debtor shall no longer be left at the mercy of his creditor, but rather the

creditor who shall be left at the mercy of his borrower.

This Bill provides that whenever a sum of money has been obtained under deed of mortgage for a certain fixed period, that sum may be paid back at any time after maturity, notwithstanding the fact that there may be in the deed a covenant whereby the parties have agreed that such payment should not be effected at any date after maturity, but only at the expiry of a term of two, five or ten years. According to the provisions of the Bill, the borrower would have the right by giving a month's notice or paying one month's interest, to terminate the mortgage.

This is what occurs as a matter of fact. Take the case of a small capitalist or of an estate. The sum of $10,000, let us say is loaned for a period of ten years, and it is covenanted in the deed that, if at the expiry of ten years the sum borrowed has not been paid back, the borrower will have to keep it for another period of five or ten years more. That clause is inserted because, as everybody knows, it is at times a difficult matter to find a good investment, and also because the rate of interest varies from year to year. It may happen very likely that the borrower finds it more difficult to borrow at the expiry of ten years than to-day; or, on the other hand, the creditor may experience greater difficulty in finding an investment at an equal rate of interest. The creditor when negotiating a loan at a rate of interest of 6 per cent per annum, to be paid back at the end of a period of ten years, covenants that if ten years hence the amount is not reimbursed, the loan will run for five years longer as a means of providing against the ups and downs of the money market. The lender, who had the assurance of drawing 6 per cent on his capital during fifteen years, will have to be content with drawing 6 per cent during the first ten years; after which, if he is bound to accept payment of the principal, according to the provisions of this Bill, he may not be able to secure more than 3 or 4 per cent. It was in view of such a contingency that the lender covenanted in the deed that should the borrower fail to repay the principal at the expiry of ten years, then the loan would run for five years more on the same terms. It must be admitted, therefore, that the provisions of this Bill interfere with the fundamental principles underlying contracts, the agreements entered into being actually as law to the contracting parties.

In the province of Quebec we have been in the habit on considering agreements as something which should not be broken, something which should be lived up to, provided they contain nothing contrary to morals or public interest. Well, an agreement such as I have outlined above, would be entirely lawful, and to my mind it would be undue interference on the part of this parliament to cancel the agreement entered into by the contracting parties.

My hon. friend referred to the grievances which occur in the province of Ontario. Of course, excesses will happen. But one of two things must be admitted: either those arguments are lawful or they are unlawful, and remedies other than the proposed legislation are available. True, it often happens that a borrower puts himself in the hands of his creditor; but that is the outcome of circumstances over which this parliament has no control.

I am satisfied the principle of this Bill is antagonistic to the spirit of legislation in the province of Quebec, and for that reason I am bound to oppose it.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is so obviously ultra vires that I have no hesitation in moving the usual amendment that it be not read now but this day six months. There is no question that this parliament has no jurisdiction whatever in the matter. One would imagine it was a Bill to regulate the rate of interest, as we have power to do under section 19 of section 91 of the British North America Act. In that case my hon. friend's proposed legislation would be at any rate intra vires of this House. But it is not so. It has for its object the regulation and modification of contracts. It would, if allowed to become law, completely upset our hypothecary system in Quebec, which is a real rights question, and I have no doubt it would have the same effect in Ontario. It actually interferes with existing contracts relating to real rights, contracts made under our Civil Code in which our provincial legislature has sole and exclusive jurisdiction under section 13 of chapter 92 of the British North America Act. It would interfere with the institution of millions of mortgages in Quebec, completely upset our mortgage system, and cause inextricable confusion in the transactions of our mortgage offices. Although I am quite prepared to admit that grievances. If this legislation was within my hon. friend exist even in our own province, still it is within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature to remedy those grievance. If this legislation was within our jurisdiction, we would have to suspend and hear the interested parties, the mortgage creditors and the mortgage companies in Quebec and the other provinces before attempting such drastic legislation. I have no doubt the Department of Justice would advise my hon. friend that this legislation is absolutely ultra vires under section 13 of chapter 92 of the British North America Act, as it interferes with civil rights and touches on real rights within the provinces. I do not think it is necessary for me to

point out in what way this legislation would interfere with clauses in existing contracts made under the provincial law. The legislation on its face bears that ultra vires character, and I do not think the government should allow it to be proceeded with.

Mr. E. ROY. I shall add only a few words to what has been said. This Bill is not under the jurisdiction of this parliament. It comes under chapter 120 of the Revised Statutes, which deals with questions of interest. The first clause in the Bill provides:

10a. Whenever any principal money, interest or other money secured by mortgage of real estate, is not paid at the time when, in the mortgage or in any agreement for the extension or renewal of the mortgage, the same is stipulated to be due and payable, the same may, notwithstanding any covenant, agreement or provision to the contrary, be paid at any time after due, by any person liable to pay or entitled to redeem the mortgage, upon one month's notice.

We see immediately that under this Bill, if it should become law, the term of the payment might be enlarged and these mortgages or money thus secured under the contract, which is a civil contract, would be interfered with. I could understand an amendment to the law relating to interest, but when it comes to interfering with the capital, the principal money, and to changing the terms of repayment, it is interfering with civil rights and is beyond our jurisdiction. I shall therefore be in favour of the motion that the Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal). I will support the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I think that the Bill proposed would prove to be ultra vires of this parliament. It is one of those many amendments which are being incorporated in our statute-book for the purpose of creating perpetual invasions on the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces. All the statutes of Ontario which have been quoted by the hon. member go to show that the contentions which I am now urging upon this House are sound. I understand quite well that it is within the scope of our provincial legislature to pass legislation regulating contracts and more especially to create additional causes of dissolution or setting aside of contracts; but I do not see that by the mere fact that under the constitution of 1867 the Canadian parliament is authorized to regulate the rate of interest, it is authorized at the same time and under the same section to create or define the necessary elements to constitute the contract of loan. The passing of this Bill would mean that the parliament of Canada would define the causes of dissolution of that contract of loan and consequently then I say that the Bill would be an invasion of provincial jurisdiction, which is empowered exclusively to define the elements and causes of dissolution of civil contracts.

I say that this Bill, first of all, would be unconstitutional and in the second place that it would be unfair and unjust in that it constitutes an invasion upon the law of nature which guarantees to every one full and complete opportunity to make contracts, and much more so as the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec and the Supreme Court of Canada decided, about twenty years ago, before the amendment of the Revised Statutes of 1886, that the parliament of Canada was powerless to declare that it was without the power of a loan company to stipulate, for example, that a loan should not be repaid before a certain period of years because it is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament to say under what condition a loan can be made or repaid. As a consequence the law courts have been consulted and in each case they have decided that it was not within the province of the parliament of Canada to regulate such contracts, although the parliament of Canada was authorized to regulate the rate of interest. The purpose of this Bill is to have re-enacted an amendment to the statutes concerning interest which has been repealed by this parliament, because it considered it ultra vires. There is a wide difference between the power to regulate the rate of interest and the power to say under what conditions a contract of loan may be created, set aside or may be dissolved. According to the text of the constitution of 1867, according to the jurisprudence of the Court of Appeal of Quebec and the Supreme Court of Canada, and according to the law of equity, this Bill, which the hon. member proposes to have reduced to an Act, would prove to be ultra vires, unfair and unjust, and in consequence I am ready to vote for the amendment. There is no reason why we should pass such legislation when there is in each province a legislative authority properly empowered to decide how such a question of civil contract should be governed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has addressed an argument to the House which I have often heard before, that is, with reference to whether an Act is ultra or intra vires. The hon. member says that in a contract made under provincial legislation we have no power to interfere or touch it, but that we might regulate interest as a matter of usury. But I remember distinctly some years ago when a Bill passed this House, that we did both the things which this Bill proposes. In the first place it provided that where a loan company stipulated that in the event of payments not being

made at certain times, a higher rate of interest should be paid, or something else which would have been a penalty. We did away with that, and we said by that law that over due interest was only to bear the same rate of interest as is stipulated in the original contract for the loan.

Mr. GERVAIS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—under the Usury Act which was passed a few years ago, the civil contract was declared to be set aside as a consequence of the creation of the so-called usury crime. But the question of crushing usury is not introduced in this Bill. The payment of three months' interest cannot be considered for a moment as a penalty, it cannot be considered as a fine. But I may say, and any member of this House who has some knowledge of business will say also, that this three months' interest is simply an indemnity, or a compensation which is made under the contract payable by the borrower to the lender. There is all the difference in the world between the Usury Act creating the cancellation of the contract as a consequence of violation of its provision; and this Bill which purports to set aside a contract of loan alone or of mortgage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether I correctly understand the hon. member. But there were two features of the Bill in regard to which he argued that it was ultra vires and could not be considered in this House. One was with reference to usury, which I contend we have strictly control over, and that feature would make it intra vires. But the hon. member who introduced this Bill does not touch the interest question at all, it is the contract feature. But even though it dealt with the contract, and contracts are assigned to the provinces, or the right to stipulate what a contract should be, this would appear to be an interference with that right. In that Bill to which I have already referred we provided that where a mortgage is drawn, I think it was for five or seven years, when three years of the five had expired, if the party who gave the mortgage desired to pay it off he could violate that original contract by giving six months' notice and paying it off. We stipulated that he could do that. Now the question was raised: Can we apply this in all cases to loaning companies? It was held that we could not, that we might possibly apply it to loaning companies that got their corporate powers from this parliament, but not to those who got their corporate powers from a provincial legislature. I think that was held by several prominent lawyers in the House to be good law. But whether it is good law or not, I know that we went so far as to alter a contract to that extent, with a provision that the morgage was to be payable at a certain time; we changed that contract by providing that after the major portion of that time had expired the mortgagee could give notice and pay that mortgage off before it matured by effluxion of time.

Mr. CARVELL. I must say that I am rather inclined to think that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is right in his view of the law. But although I am in doubt, I would still be willing to vote for the second reading of this Bill for the purpose of having it brought before a proper committee, and also for the purpose of getting the opinion of the Justice Department. I must say that if there is any class of corporations in Canada for which I have very little respect it is loan companies. I have been practising law 19 years, and I have never yet allowed a client of mine to borrow a dollar from a loan company if I could help it. You have only got to take up the contract such as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Miller) has cited here to show the unfairness of those contracts. Why, we are spending days and weeks of our time in this House in attempting to enact legislation against railway companies that we think are unfair to the people. But all the iniquities of all the railway companies in Canada heaped together could not, in my judgment, compare with the iniquities of the insurance companies and the loan companies. True, we are not now discussing insurance companies, but I hope later on I shall have an occasion to say something about insurance companies. But on account of the justice of the claim which my hon. friend is advocating this evening, I propose to vote with him, although I have grave doubts as to our jurisdiction. There is, however, one excellent example we might follow and that is section 10 of chapter 120 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, referred to by the hon. member for South Grey. This section I am informed was drafted by the Hon. Edward Blake, a lawyer whose opinion I think will be taken for its face value anywhere in Canada. Now it is true, as the hon. member has stated, that if, under this section, a contract is drawn for more than five years, then, after the expiration of the fifth year the mortgagor can tender the amount due, principal and interest, and three months interest in advance, and no further interest can be demanded. If that be intra vires of this parliament, then it is certainly interfering with a contract which has been made by two parties, and which, according to the contention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, would be relegated to the provinces under the British North America Act. But in view of the action of this parliament on a previ-

ous occasion, and in view of the fact that the matter has gone on for probably twenty years, I think it is a ma'ter of much importance that we can well afford to consider it. For these reasons I will vote for the second reading.

Mr. FIELDING. It is quite evident that the Bill which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has presented to the House is regarded as one of great interest and great importance. I am afraid, however, my hon. friend has not impressed the House generally with the merits of the Bill, I think that the sense of the House is against him. Nevertheless, I would hope that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) would not press the motion to give this Bill the three months' hoist in a thin House, and I would suggest perhaps that it would serve all purposes if he were to move the adjournment of the debate so that we may have a further opportunity of discussing the question. If that meets with the favour of my hon. friend from South Grey, I would ask him to accept that suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. As the Minister of Justice is present could we not have his opinion?

Mr. FIELDING. Ministers of Justice do not like to give offhand opinions.

Mr. MILLER. I rather think that if the debate is adjourned it may be a long time before we will have further discussion. I would like to have the Bill pass its second reading and be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. We will then have an opportunity of obtaining the opinion of the Minister of Justice, not an offhand opinion, but an opinion given after due consideration. We all agree as to the justice of the Bill, and that I am endeavouring to do something that is reasonable and right. I talked to a number of the members of the legal profession before introducing the Bill, and they have agreed that it is a reasonable thing, and none of them objected that it was beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament. I relied upon section 10, which was referred to by the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member beside me, as being of the same class of legislation, and I think that if one was within the jurisdiction of this House the other certainly is. I may be wrong in that. I would ask the minister who is leading the House to permit the Bill to pass its second reading and be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. MONK. I could not consent to that, not because I do not wish to accommodate my hon. friend, but the principle is at stake. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is a more reasonable and a wiser one, because the principle is too important for us to allow it to be adopted under the conditions which exist at present. I would be quite prepared to change my motion to a motion for the adjournment, but my hon. friend must see that if we allow the second reading of the Bill to be adopted to-night, the principle of the Bill is adopted, and I think it would entail to grave consequences to do anything of the kind by consent.

Mr. MILLER. If we allow this Bill to pass its second reading on condition that it be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee for the reasons I have stated, we are not accepting the principle of the Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Monk) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CANADIAN SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 15) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the shipping law of Canada as it now stands, provides for the annual inspection of the boiler, hull, machinery and equipment of every Canadian ship subject to inspection by an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. To this present provision I propose to add the following words:

> Provided that any steamboat holding a certificate from the British Board of Trade, or the committee of Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping, shall, during the currency of such certificate, be exempt from the ordinary annual inspection under this Act on sailing from any port in Canada.

The effect of this Bill will be to dispense with the double inspection of Canadian ships. Every Canadian ship now, as I have said, is subjected to practically a double inspection. She is required to be inspected by Lloyds in order to obtain insurance. She has to maintain her classification at Lloyds in order to be entitled to obtain insurance from Lloyds Company. That involves an inspection by Lloyds officers and the inspection of the larger ships is usually made in England, when they are over there trading. Then, under the present law, when a ship returns to Canadian waters she is required to subject herself to a second inspection by the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The contention is that this is unnecessary as Lloyds inspection is quite sufficient to satisfy the British Board of Trade. The British Board of Trade do not require a ship to submit to inspection by the Board of Trade after it has been inspected by Lloyds; in fact, the British Board of Trade have acknowledged Lloyds inspection to be quite sufficient.

Not only the British Board of Trade but the republic of France has very recently passed a similar law to the effect that whenever a French or English ship has been inspected by Lloyds the inspection in France as well as in Great Britain during the current year is dispensed with. I propose to place Canadian ships in the same position. This double imposes a great deal of expense upon Canadian ships. The inspection of a ship means that she must be placed on the dry dock, her boilers have to be cooled off the coal in her bunkers have to be cleaned out and it means several days delay. Some of these large ships earn $100 and some of them $200 a day or more. If Lloyds' inspection be considered good enough in England, there should be no reason why it should not be good enough in Canada. I submit therefore that the Bill ought to pass, and I would suggest, with the leave of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), that it be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready, so long as this Bill is going to be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries to agree that it should be read the second time. This question of inspection is somewhat important and I may say to the credit of the officer who has the administration of that branch of the service, Mr. Adams, that the work has been done in such a way that we must note the fact that no accidents have happened. This we attribute to the fact that this officer is exercising a great deal of caution in the proper inspection of all ships. I would like very much that this gentleman, who has had a great deal of experience, should have an opportunity of being heard upon this issue which my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) is raising. I know that our inspection is somewhat severe but at the same time it must be acknowledged that under certain circumstances it was found that this inspection was absolutely necessary in order to ensure the safety of the persons who are on these ships. I have in my mind a case which occurred lately where a ship having a certificate from Lloyds, I think—I am not sure about that, but it was from one of these large associations—was subjected to our inspection. We asked that the tests generally required by the department be applied to this ship and when they were applied it was found that the boiler was in absolutely bad condition. I think I would hesitate a great deal before accepting the proposition made by my hon. friend. But, I would like to have an opportunity to hear persons interested, the insurance companies and the vessel owners, on this subject and in view of the suggestion which has been made that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries I will not object to the second reading with that reservation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time and referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The Bills of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and afterwards we hope to move into Supply on the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 26, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Debates as follows:

Your committee recommend that, commencing with this session, the printing of both the English and French Revised Editions of the Debates for distribution to the public and the press be discontinued and that the King's Printer be authorized to have printed during the course of the session for the use of senators and members of the House 600 copies of the current sheets of the English Revised Edition and 100 copies of the French Revised Edition.

Mr. GERVAIS moved the adoption of the report.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not had an opportunity of examining that report yet.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman who proposes the motion, that I think he ought to make provision for the distribution daily of the unrevised edition of the 'Hansard' to the press and especially to the daily press.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That is provided for.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does it cover that?

Mr GERVAIS. Yes, that is provided for in the regulations. As a matter of fact this report is merely to save a few dollars to the exchequer of Canada by discontinuing the useless distribution of a few thousand copies of the revised edition. The unrevised edition is distributed daily to the press and to the general public. I think that the press and especially my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) will be satisfied. During last session every one was satisfied with this arrangement. This motion is

really to confirm that practice and to comply with the request made by the King's Printer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We have been in the habit of issuing to the weekly and daily press a revised copy of the 'Hansard.' We decided there was no use in sending that out, that we would send the unrevised edition instead, and this is merely to authorize the King's Printer not to send out both the revised and the unrevised to the press generally. We merely discontinue the printing of a number of extra copies of the revised edition which we have been sending to the press.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 42), respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 43), respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 44), respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company—Mr. Ethier.

Bill (No. 45), respecting the Phoenix Assurance Company, Limited—Mr. Macdonald.

Bill (No. 46), to incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company—Mr. W. H. White.

INSPECTION OF VESSELS.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to provide for inspection of vessels not now inspected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the object of the Bill which I now ask permission to introduce is two-fold. In the first place, clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 refer to barges and vessels not now inspected. I know for a fact, Sir, that what I am about to say with reference to this matter is absolutely correct as far as the great lakes are concerned, and I am informed that the same conditions exist in the maritime provinces. The custom is for old wooden boats and vessels, out of which the engines and masts have been taken, to be towed by other boats. While the government of Canada does not allow well found boats to leave a harbour unless they are properly equipped, no such provision for the safety of the crew is enforced in reference to these barges. One section of this Bill provides that they shall be inspected. Another section refers to steam yachts under five tons, clause 6 refers to fishing boats. These boats under a certain tonnage are not obliged to carry either a life boat, life raft or other apparatus for the saving of human life. In 120 Ontario reports, Sturgeon vs. The Port Burwell Fishing Company, page 154, it is clearly laid down in the judgment that had the boat in question, which is of the class referred to in this Bill, been equipped with life-saving apparatus, the lives of one or two men lost on that occasion would have been saved.

The last section refers to steamships towing vessels of steel which have not motive power. As is well known, these steel vessels cannot approach close to one another and the consequence is that when a line breaks, as frequently happens, the men on the tow are almost invariably lost. I desire by this amendment to provide that all steamships towing other boats shall have on board a rocket gun by which a heaving line can be sent 300 or 400 feet and a vessel with motive power can thus pick up her derelict tow. The United States steel trust which owns the largest number of vessels on the continent obliges all its vessels to carry rocket guns.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION AND SALES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Inspection and Sales Act. He said: I find that under the British North America Act, this parliament has exclusive jurisdiction in matters relating to weights and measures. This parliament in its wisdom has seen fit to pass legislation fixing standards for weights and other measures. Parliament has also passed an Inspection and Sales Act which deals with the standard weight of certain articles, such as a bushel of grain, a barrel of flour, a barrel of salt, a load of hay and a bag of potatoes in Quebec. Parliament has also fixed the weight of a dozen of eggs at one and a half pounds. I find, however, that the most important article of food entering into every-day consumption, that is the loaf of bread, has not been standardized by this parliament and the various municipalities and provinces have from time to time been struggling with this question, some of them endeavouring to fix the weight at one figure and others at another. Thus there is confusion and the law is not carried out. In consequence the public, especially the poorer classes, have suffered. I think that we should follow the wise legislation of the mother country and the other colonies in this respect and fix the weight of a loaf of bread as clearly as we have the right to do under the British North America Act.

This Bill is intended as an amendment and to become part 11 of the Inspection and Sales Act. The first clause defines the terms 'baker' 'inspector' and 'officers.'

The second clause provides that all bread sold by bakers shall be in loaves of one two and four pounds. That fixes a standard for the whole of Canada. Provision is made in the Bill for the carrying out of its provisions. It provides that inspectors under the Inspection and Sales Act, inspectors appointed under the Inland Revenue Act or other inspectors appointed by this government for special purposes, shall be considered inspectors under this part of this Bill. It also provides that the officials appointed under provincial statute or under municipal by-law, whose duty it would be to see to the enforcement of this Act, shall have jurisdiction in certain cases. Penalties are fixed for having bread under weight and also against a baker if he or the man who delivers his bread does not supply himself with proper scales and appliances to weigh the bread he is selling. I trust that the Minister of Inland Revenue, under whose care I presume this Bill will come, will expedite its passage through the House. I ask the indulgence of the House in reference to it because I think it is a measure in the interests of the public. It is an absolute necessity that we should have a standard weight for a loaf of bread and that standard should be so fixed that there will be some legal redress in case of a baker breaking the law.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). There is a question as to whether a Bill of this kind should not be introduced by resolution. It seems to me to affect and regulate trade, which, under the general rule of the House, is a subject matter that must be introduced by resolution. If we are going to regulate the weight of a loaf of bread that regulates the trade in bread as much as any possible treatment of that trade can. It is well understood that Bills of that kind must be introduced by resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the fact, the minister must be a great offender, because he has introduced such measures without resolution.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend will find that I have invariably introduced such Bills by resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps not this session, but I think last session and the year before he did.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has it not sometimes been the practice to have the Bills introduced and the resolutions brought in afterwards.

Mr. FISHER. That has been done, I am merely drawing attention to the fact.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is quite proper that attention should be drawn to it, but I think that practice has been followed. Whether it be a correct practice or not I do not know.

Mr. PATERSON. It is against rule 48.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 48 reads:

No Bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into this House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a Committee of the Whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

If it is a Bill in restraint of trade it will have to be preceded by a resolution, unless the House consents to the introduction of the Bill with the understanding that a resolution will be introduced later.

Mr. FISHER. There is no objection to that.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to cause any misunderstanding. The measure is not a measure in restraint of trade in any way, and the Bill provides clearly that there shall be no charges against the consolidated revenue fund by any of its provisions. I could quite understand that in the measure contained a clause whereby there was to be any charge against the revenues of this country it would be necessary to introduce it by a resolution. As far as restraining or regulating trade is concerned, it fixes the weight of a certain article. I would like to know from the minister if, when the weight of a barrel of apples was fixed by this House, that legislation was initiated by a resolution of the House.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say, but I think it was. Certainly if it was not it was contrary to the rules of the House. Bourinot says:

Rule 41 of the Rules of the House provides that no Bill relating to trade or an alteration of the laws concerning trade is to be brought into the House until the proposition has been considered in a Committee of the Whole House.

Then, later on it says:

Both in the English and Canadian Commons the rule, just cited, has been held to apply to trade generally, as well as to any particular trade, if directly affected by a Bill. It has also been decided that to bring a Bill under the rule it should properly propose to regulate trade as a subject-matter.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the Bill ought to be preceded by a resolution. I am not taking this objection for the purpose of blocking the Bill, but simply for the purpose of having it proceeded with regularly. The hon. leader of the opposition is quite right in saying that Bills have been introduced, probably on

several occasions, which, it has been afterwards found ought to have been preceded by a resolution, and then the resolution has been proposed and put through the committee, and afterwards the Bill proceeded with.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course, I do not need to argue that two wrongs make a right; but if the hon. member for North Simcoe is wrong on this occasion, the Minister of Agriculture was wrong yesterday. He introduced a Bill, and in the latter part of his explanation said:

The last clause defines the weight of a barrel of potatoes when potatoes are sold by the barrel.

I am quite sure that Bill was not preceded by a resolution.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right. My explanation is that I referred the matter to the law clerk of the House of Commons, and he informed me that that Bill did not require to be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then plainly the one before the House now does not require a resolution, because both Bills are of exactly the same character.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, it is for the House to say whether the rules are to be observed or not. Strict adherence to the rules is always advisable, and if I have to rule on the question of this Bill, my ruling will be that it will have to be preceded by a resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is always preferable to conform to the rule, and it may be that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will have to revise his own Bill and have it preceded by a resolution. But I would observe that the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe seems to be objectionable in another respect, not on its merits, but as being under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. The weight of bread is generally regulated by municipal authority, and it is very questionable if we have jurisdiction in the matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. What about a barrel of potatoes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same thing would apply.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the Bill had better stand in the meantime until the matter is looked into further.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are we going to do about the one of yesterday?

Mr. SPEAKER. I may have been in error in allowing the Bill of yesterday to be introduced without being preceded by a resolution.

Question allowed to stand.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER moved that the House go into committee now to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as follows:—

By repealing subsection 5 of section 17, subsection 5 of section 47, and subsection 2 of section 109, and amending section 104, by substituting for the words 'license fee of two dollars' the words 'required license fee.'

By authorizing the Governor in Council to fix the respective fees to be paid for licenses issued under the Act, and by providing fines for contravention of the said Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason that sometimes resolutions of this kind are dealt with by way of notice that proceedings will be taken on the following day, and sometimes the House is moved into committee at once? In the first case the motion goes on government orders and is taken up accordingly. Is there any distinction with respect to the character of these motions?

Mr. FISHER. No, I think not. If they are proceeded with at once, it is simply by consent of the House. I will give notice that I will take it up on Monday.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the case of a money Bill, notice should be given in advance, and then it becomes an order of the day. When it is a notice concerning a question affecting trade, it does not go on the Order Paper, and may be taken up at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is that to be found?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Bourinot.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it in the rules of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. I think in order to guard the rights of the people over money Bills, they must be preceded by a notice in advance. That is the reason of the rule.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This particular motion involves the payment of license fees.

Mr. FISHER. I give notice that I will take it up on Monday next.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE NAVAL DEFENCE BILL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the Bill announced in the speech from the Throne with regard to naval defence? There

has been considerable delay already, and I observe in the speech from the Throne that a plan had been adopted before the opening of the session. I presume there is no reason why we should not have the Bill at the earliest possible moment, and I merely rise for the purpose of inquiring when we may expect it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend will kindly renew his question on Monday, I think I shall be able to satisfy him.

REPRESENTATION OF DUFFERIN.

Mr. SPROULE. In compliance with the Act in that behalf, I desire to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that the representation of the county of Dufferin in this House is vacant, owing to the death of the late member, Dr. Barr, so that you may address your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a writ to fill the vacancy, that that county may be represented in this parliament during the present session.

REPRESENTATION OF OTTAWA AND QUEBEC EAST.

Mr. SPROULE. I see in the Toronto 'World' of November 25, the following in the correspondence from Ottawa:—

Two statements of uncommon interest and co-related were made in official quarters to the correspondent of the 'World' to-day. The first of these is that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's present intention is to sit for Ottawa, and the second is that the Hon. S. N. Parent, Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, has been asked to resign his commissionership and contest the vacancy for Quebec East when the premier elects to sit for Ottawa.

I desire to ask the premier if that is correct?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid that the official quarters of the Toronto 'World' are better informed than I am. I have not heard anything either of the one case or the other.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON ALCOHOLISM.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister with reference to the International Congress on Alcoholism which was held last July in London, England. It seems that this is an institution which has its regular meetings, and at its last meeting some twenty or 30 nations were represented. An invitation was extended to the Dominion government, as I am informed, and I would like to ask whether or not that was accepted and a reply sent or what were the reasons one was not sent. It may be more more convenient for the hon. gentleman just to lay the papers on the table, as they are not voluminous, without the form of a motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would have to refresh my memory on this point. I have no objection to bringing down the papers.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be possible to have the returns brought down in better shape? I mentioned this matter a couple of sessions ago. The grievance is a very frequent occurrence. I refer in particular to the papers brought down in connection with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden. They were not only up side down but inside out. They began at the end but did not end at the beginning. They were in such bad shape that it was impossible to ascertain where to look for any particular document. I went to the officials and asked them to take some steps to have the papers properly arranged and some kind of index made. The papers were brought down in such a condition that any member who wants to examine them, loses an hour to an hour and a half, which means great aggregate loss of time to a number of the members. This might be saved by a little attention on the part of some of the officials in the first instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

INLAND REVENUE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 9) to amend the Inland Revenue Act—Mr. Templeman—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This only increases the amount to be paid for a bonding warehouse license from $20 to $50 per annum. The charge has been long too low, and it has been considered proper to increase it to $50.

On section 2,

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The only change is the introduction in the fourth line of the words 'one-sixth,' providing that snuff may be put up in packages of one-sixth of a pound. The trade have asked for it and that is our only reason for making the change.

On subsection (e).

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The change in this subsection is the introduction of the words 'twenty-five', providing that cigarettes may be put up in packages of twenty-five. At present there is no provision for packages containing twenty-five; and as many are imported containing that number, it means that the packages have to be broken up and repacked to conform to our law which requires the packages to be of twenty or fifty as the case may be.

On section 3,

Paragraph (h) of section 311 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

(h) for determining the time and manner of payment of the duties on foreign raw leaf tobacco and other materials taken for use in any tobacco or cigar manufactory.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The only change is the addition in the second line of the words 'and other materials'. The duties are paid in tobacco factories in three kind of packages, ten, twenty and thirty. We have authority to provide for the arranging of the manner of payment of the duties on foreign raw leaf tobacco, and we want to use the words 'other materials'. Since the last change in the Inland Revenue Act, there is a duty of 16 cents per pound on other materials that go into the manufacture.

Bill reported.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved the third reading.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like that this Bill should stand over for a third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. Next sitting of the House.

SUPPLY—LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

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

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I desire to call the attention of the House to a doctrine laid down by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) recently in dealing with a question which I had placed on the Order Paper in pursuance of the privilege conferred by rule of this House that members may, on due notice given, ask questions relating to public affairs. Sir, the question which I put related to the public affairs of this country, inasmuch as it referred to an appointment which is not exceeded in importance by any other appointment in the gift of the Dominion government, the office of Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia. We had an intimation through the newspapers that a political organization in British Columbia had by formal resolution passed, made a recommendation to the government at Ottawa that a certain gentleman should be appointed Lieutenant Governor of that province. This recommendation was made in the most public manner as a notification to other persons concerned to 'keep off the grass.' It was a notification that the British Columbia executive of the Liberal party having made such a recommendation, it was idle for any one else to butt in on that preserve, and that all should govern themselves accordingly. To my mind, that was a most shocking interference on the part of a political organization in the appointment to an office which should be non-political, should be kept strictly apart from all political considerations. I had hoped, when I saw that intimation in the press, that, upon receipt of that recommendation at Ottawa, the Prime Minister, if it came to his notice—as I suppose it would come to his notice as the man most concerned in the appointment—would administer to the committee in British Columbia the snub which their course deserved, would have informed them that, with respect to the office of Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia, they were exceeding their jurisdiction, they were violating the laws of propriety, in making any recommendation of that kind, particularly in making it in the public and theatrical manner in which they did make it. In pursuance of that idea, I placed a question on the Order Paper in the hope that the Prime Minister in answering it would have clearly laid down the principle I have indicated, and that his answer to that committee in British Columbia would have been a warning to political associations everywhere that here was an office upon which they must not lay their hands. I may say frankly that I was disappointed when I received the reply from the Prime Minister that,

> Information of the description asked for in the first part of his question would be considered by the government or by any minister as absolutely private matter.

Sir, I must dissent from the doctrine that a recommendation on the part of a public association such as the association I have described can properly be considered by the government of this country a private matter. To my mind it is an essentially public matter, a matter as to which we are entitled to have the most complete information. To my mind, we are entitled to know what has been done with respect to that application. We would be entitled to it even under ordinary circumstances; but I claim that we are very specially entitled to that information in view of the very special circumstances respecting the gentleman recommended by this resolution for the Lieutenant Governorship of British Columbia.

We have observed by the press that an election has been in progress in British Columbia. We have observed that one of the candidates in that election is the very gentleman whose application for the appointment of Lieutenant Governor has been favoured by the chief political association in the province. We find that gentleman, with this appointment as good as in his pocket—unless the government had turned down the recommendation in the manner in which I thought it should have been

turned down; unless the government consider that the publication of the recommendation of the patronage committee was absolutely fatal to the claim of the gentleman to whom I have referred—I say we have this gentleman, with the appointment of the Lieutenant Governorship of British Columbia as good as in his pocket, campaigning in that province against that very government on which he expected to sit in judgment as soon as that appointment was made. I invite the attention of this House to the condition these facts indicate, to the intolerable condition so far as the provincial government is concerned—that a man should be one day on the hustings making most scandalous charges against the provincial government and the next day be called to the office of Lieutenant Governor. I do not wish to go into details, because this is a question of principle which I do not wish to befog with a cloud of words. But I wish to indicate the nature of the charges which this Lieutenant Governor designate has been making against the government of British Columbia, charges so grave that they have been made the subject of an editorial in the chief Liberal organ of Canada, the Toronto 'Globe.' We read in the Toronto 'Globe' the following:

> The British Columbia election campaign has brought out the startling news that Premier McBride issued a secret order in council directing the sale of 3,238 acres of land in the Okanagan Indian reserve to a political favourite. The price at which this alleged sale was effected was $2.50 per acre, and as similar lands are sold in the neighbourhood for $300 and $400 per acre the fraudulent nature of the transaction is obvious. . . . The disclosure was made by Mr. Wade, K.C., in a campaign speech at Nelson, and it has not only startled the province, but has caused an uneasy feeling throughout the Dominion.

Here, Sir, we have, as the 'Globe' sums it up in referring to the incident, a charge by the man who, so far as we know, it is proposed to make Lieutenant Governor of the province—because, when the government had an opportunity to deny it they did not deny it, but said it was their private affair—that the McBride government has made a fraudulent sale of the public lands. Before referring to the bearing of that charge upon the question I am discussing, I might say, in justice to the McBride government, against whom charges of fraud do not lie and never have, that this allegation of this Lieutenant Governor designate is purely gratuitous, since the provincial government has no power to sell the lands referred to. So far as this alleged agreement of sale is concerned, it was merely an agreement between the provincial government and a gentleman who was applying to the Dominion government for the sale to him of these lands, that, provided he could obtain the lands from the Dominion government having paid to them whatever price they saw fit to declare, the reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia in these Indian lands would be conveyed to him on the payment of the sum stipulated in this bargain. But we have this gentleman on the stump making a charge of deliberate fraud —a charge certainly so understood by the public and by the chief Liberal organ in Canada, and spread broadcast over the whole Dominion.

I think we are entitled to a pronouncement from the government on that question, an assurance that no man who has so stultified himself shall be considered to be eligible for appointment to the office of Lieutenant Governor, that our provincial governments may be protected from the insult to which they would be exposed by such appointments. I believe that we are entitled to have it laid down and clearly understood by the government and by all applicants for office, that public office is not to be given as a reward for participation in a political campaign, that we should have it made clear in British Columbia that these expedients will not be resorted to when it is impossible to get candidates to appear voluntarily against a government such as that of Mr. McBride, which has the confidence of the whole people of British Columbia—I believe there was one Liberal elected, a despatch appeared this morning in the newspapers, indicating that three Liberals had been elected, but I am told that the Minister of Inland Revenue, who represents British Columbia in the government, has subsequent returns which bring down the number of Liberals elected in British Columbia to one, or at the most two. So I say we are entitled to have from the government some assurance that possible candidates will not be induced to enter the field of politics by promises of appointment such as lieutenant governorships, or positions on the Supreme Court and appeal court benches of British Columbia. I refer to the Appeal Court bench more particularly because of information which I gather from the newspapers, that a very serious wrong has been perpetrated there because of the holding up of the appointment of judges to the Appeal Court bench until after the election which was decided yesterday when the gentlemen who were in the field as candidates would be released from the embarrassment of that position. I find that a man is imprisoned in the district of New Westminister, consigned to prison by a county court judge there conditionally upon the appeal court answering certain questions referred to them in a certain way. I find it stated in the press

that the judgment intimated that the Appeal Court was meeting on November 2, and therefore no hardship was involved by this peculiar sentencing, pending an appeal to that court. This unfortunate man is now appealing to the county court for a rehearing on the ground that there is no appeal court to which his case can be referred and in the meanwhile he languishes in prison while the bench of British Columbia is being made a football for what appears to be the political convenience of the persons who have the appointment of these appellate court judges. I think that this incident of the lieutenant governorship and of the withholding of the appointment of judges is a scandal. That it is so regarded by the people of British Columbia was made evident yesterday in no uncertain way. By their vote they showed the opinion they hold respecting the action of this government in these transactions, and I believe that as one of the representatives of British Columbia in this House it is my duty to call the attention of the government to these facts, as possibly otherwise they might fail to recognize the voice of the people expressed at the polls yesterday, as indicating to them the state of public sentiment in British Columbia with respect to our treatment by the government at Ottawa, in their manipulation of offices such as that of lieutenant governor and Appeal Court judge. I would like to have it brought out here that even if this thing has occurred, even if, for diplomatic reasons, the government do not like to admit having received the recommendation I have indicated, and do not like to indicate whether or not they have made a promise to these particular gentleman, we shall receive an assurance that nothing else of this nature will be tolerated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On a previous occasion my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. J. D. Taylor) put the following questions to the government:

1. Has the government or any member thereof received from the executive of the Liberal Association for British Columbia, or any other political organization, any recommendation purporting to be made by resolution of that body, in favour of the appointment of F. C. Wade, K.C., as Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia? If so, what reply has been made?

2. Is the office of Lieutenant Governor one as to which the jurisdiction of patronage committee is recognized?

I have no objection to admit that we are responsible for any action which we may take. At an early date we shall have to make the appointment of Lieutenant Governor for British Columbia because we have been notified by the present incumbent of the office that he does not intend to occupy the position beyond a certain date, and when that date arrives, it will be our duty to make an appointment and then we shall be open to censure or approval upon the recommendation we shall make to His Excellency, the Governor General. If at that time the selection which we make is not satisfactory to my hon. friend or to any member of the House we shall be open to criticism, but I think it would be fair of my hon. friend to wait until we have taken action before he criticises us.

My hon. friend tells me we should have rebuked the gentleman who presumed to advise us to appoint Mr. Wade if any person did presume to give such advice. I do not know but there may be some merit in the suggestion of my hon. friend that we should rebuke any such attempt whenever it comes, but if we are to rebuke every one who offers us advice that we should appoint Mr. Wade, what are we to say to or how shall we treat that gentleman who says we should not appoint Mr. Wade? Does my hon. friend see any difference at all between the one advice and the other? If somebody from British Columbia says Mr. Wade is a fit and proper person to be Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia and if this be, in the eyes of my hon. friend an offence, how should we characterize the conduct of the gentleman who tells us that Mr. Wade is not a fit and proper person to be Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia? I fail to see why if it is wrong in one case it can be right in the other. I have to say to my hon. friend that it will be our duty to canvass the condition of things and try to make the best appointment possible in British Columbia. I go further. I have no hesitation in saying that the appointment which we shall make in British Columbia will be unimpeachable even in the very particular eyes of my hon. friend. As to the advice which is offered to us, we are liable to receive advice from all quarters and from everybody. This is a free country. It is the privilege of any body to offer advice whether it is proper or improper, but we receive such advice wherever it comes from. If it comes publicly we receive it, if it comes privately we receive it also, but I dissent altogether from the view advanced by my hon. friend that if any one chooses to write to us with a recommendation to make an appointment whether to the position of a messenger or any other position, that is a thing to be disclosed to parliament. I refuse to accede to that position and this has always been our attitude. We are liable only for the action we take. It cannot be seriously contended that we must be responsible for the letters tendered to us, on this or that question, above all on questions of appointments which are sent to the ministers for their guidance. I

have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that sometimes advice is offered to us in matters on which I think we should not receive any, and as to which we should be competent to discharge our duties, but we should not canvass these things too critically and too minutely. I have only to say that we must be judged in these matters by the result and by our actions and the time will come before many days are over when we shall have to take action. Then I shall invite the criticism of my hon. friend.

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, in very briefly replying to the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that this question is rather more important in its bearings as to the people at large in this country than he seems to imagine, and before saying another word I would also like to point out that the hon. member for NewWestminster (Mr. Taylor) did not specially offer the government any advice as to the appointment or non-appointment of Mr. Wade, but he rather indicated a line upon which Mr. Wade's appointment in this case would not be in the interest of the community at large because he would necessarily be a partisan after his indulgence in the political contest prior to the provincial election. Any man who had participated in the way he had done in this contest would necessarily put himself out of the pale of strict impartiality, which quality is so desirable in the occupant of the distinguished position of Lieutenant Governor. I also want to say one word upon this for the reason that this whole matter was discussed in connection with the appeal court the other day, and as it has a distinct bearing upon this question, I have to make some extended explanation touching upon this debate to-day. Referring to the delay on the part of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in filling up the appointments to the new Court of Appeal of British Columbia, I made a statement regretting that those whose names were being bandied about by the press and the people of British Columbia as being likely appointees to the bench had unfortunately dipped strongly into the partisan politics of the day and, in saying that, I made this remark:

So far has it gone that some time ago despatches were published in the chief Liberal newspapers announcing that the late leader of the Liberal opposition in British Columbia, a gentleman who has the unfailing respect of all people in British Columbia, Liberals and Conservatives, and that gentleman and his friends seem to have attached such full credence to that report that he retired from the leadership of the Liberal party in British Columbia and, to his credit, is not taking any part in the campaign now in progress.

I would like to add that, while I do not take anything from my words in regard to the respect in which that gentleman, the late leader of the opposition, is held in British Columbia, it is my firm impression that much as he might have regretted dipping into the campaign, he was forced by the exigencies of party pressure to take part in it because it is very singular that on the very day on which I made that reference in this House, November 12, I have a report that:

J. A. Macdonald was the last speaker of the evening.

I am referring now to the gentleman who is to be made chief justice of the new court of appeal according to the despatches which have been printed. The report is of a meeting at Rossland:

He devoted his time principally to throwing cold water on the McBride railway policy.

Not very effectually, Mr. Speaker, as, of course, you can see. The point is of the greatest importance, and I think not only that my hon. friend from New Westminster is within his rights but that it is a timely thing to insist that, whether one party or another is in power in the Dominion or in a province, good government is impossible, and it will be impossible to fill high positions which should be above party, such as appointments to the judiciary and Lieutenant Governorships, if we have to wait and give these appointments as political rewards to those who will work for their party to the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute. That is the point that I want to make. I think it is a point that cannot be too strongly insisted on. The Minister of Justice, the other day, in his reply on this matter, stated that they would take their time, that it was not his delay or the delay of his department, and that he hoped to make the appointment from a list of gentlemen who were qualified to fill these positions on the court of appeal. Well, that may be true and while it is significant that the old Greeks represented justice as blindfolded because it was in the interest of no side or of no party and because justice should be dispensed evenly, it seems that if the head of the department was blindfolded the bandage must have slipped a little down so that he could get a view of the situation as it occurred in that western province, and I am sure we will agree that his last view must have been extremely discouraging. I do hope that in the interest of good government all over the country the Prime Minister himself—and we recognized, I think, that he is not always driven by the exigencies of party politics, that he must clearly see how subversive it is of the best interests of the country—we will see less of these practices which have been followed of late in British Columbia and

that they will put these high offices so much above political partisanship that they will be entitled to the respect of every member of the community whether he be Liberal, Conservative, Socialist or Independent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the government cannot be responsble for the tendering of advice, but that is an entirely different thing from what apparently goes on in practice. The government does become responsible when it recognizes the suggestions and recommendations of these patronage committees all over the country and if what comes to us from very authentic sources is to be regarded as accurate the patronage committee or executive committee, in British Columbia was only doing in this case what it has been doing right along and what other patronage committees have been doing right along, and in doing that they have received the recognition and endorsement of this government in many cases. I am speaking of it only from information gathered as to what I believe has actually taken place. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) put forward a consideration which should appeal to the Prime Minister. How would it be possible to carry on government in this country decently when a man who has gone into an election campaign as a candidate and uttered the most serious charges against the provincial administration was doing that upon the promise or understanding after the election campaign should be over he should receive his reward in the office of Lieutenant Governor?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was no such promise; not even hinted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But that is the standpoint from which my hon. friend from New Westminster was arguing and he was pointing out to the Prime Minister that if anything of that kind had taken place conditions would be intolerable as I am sure the Prime Minister would himself consider them intolerable. Look at it for a moment. Suppose a Lieutenant Governor in this Dominion were to be selected in the person of some man who had been campaigning immediately before his appointment against the government who were to be his confidential advisers. The thing would be absurd, monstrous and ridiculous, and I am glad to have the assurance of the Prime Minister that there is absolutely nothing in the suggestion. But it does seem to me to be altogether another matter that he should dismiss so lightly the delay in the appointment of the members of the court of appeal in British Columbia. I do not know of my own knowledge anything about the assertions which have been made by my hon. friend from New Westminster. He has made them upon his own responsibility as a member of this House and, as I gather from his remarks, they are to the effect that a man is languishing in prison in British Columbia to-day because he cannot get his remedy under the law owing to this default on the part of the government and of the Minister of Justice. A more intolerable and a more disgraceful condition than that I cannot imagine. It is absolutely intolerable that the appointment of men to the court of appeal in British Columbia should have been delayed with such results as that. What was the answer the other day? The answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was, forsooth, that the wheels of justice must stop because ne was away in Europe. The Act was proclaimed on the first day of September. He came back somewhere about the middle of October, I think, and he would not count the intervening six or eight weeks. Justice must stand still, the courts of British Columbia must remain without judges because he, on official duties, no doubt, had found it necessary or convenient to absent himself in the British Isles. When the Minister of Justice went from here in June or July last did he leave no other member of the government to preside over his department? Was there no other minister of the Crown, was there not the Prime Minister or some other member of the government, who could take up and who did take up the duties of that department? The excuse put forward by the Minister of Justice is absolutely unworthy of consideration. I say that within a week or ten days after that Act had been proclaimed by the government of British Columbia the corresponding Dominion Act should have been proclaimed by this government and there should have been constituted a court of appeal in the province of British Columbia not later than the 20th of September last, in which case the man who is now lying in prison because his rights under the law are denied him through the laches of this government would have been able to obtain his proper remedy under the law. Under these circumstances the country and the House ought to ask the Prime Minister and the government for some adequate explanation of the delay of now nearly three months during which the machinery of justice in British Columbia has been absolutely out of gear.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the opposition hardly gave a fair statement of what the Minister of Justice said. I remember that the Minister of Justice said that he did not think the proceedings required such very great activity in the case of these British Columbia judges because he pointed out that the government of British Columbia, after causing

the enactment of this measure, failed to proclaim it for very many months. And, curiously enough during that interim there was an election pending, and gentlemen on the other side are so ready to suggest that elections have something to do with things, might I mention that it was even rumoured that the reason why the British Columbia Act was not proclaimed was that the British Columbia government was waiting for the results of the Dominion elections in the hope that a Conservative government might have a chance to make the appointments.

Mr. BURRELL. May I ask a question?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. Is it not true that during the time the British Columbia government failed to proclaim their Act, there was an efficient and available court of appeal in existence?

Mr. FIELDING. I was merely pointing out that when the leader of the opposition undertook——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. FIELDING. One of my weaknesses is that I never undertake to answer a question when I am not familiar with the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Or when you are in a tight place.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I do not know that; I think hon. gentlemen opposite will give me credit for being ready to answer questions whenever I can. I was pointing out that the leader of the opposition had hardly put the position of the Minister of Justice fairly, and I rose specially to take exception to some very dangerous doctrines that were laid down by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). I took down the words of my hon. friend, and he says he wants this government to lay down as a principle that public office is not to be given to any one as a reward for service in a political campaign.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says hear, hear, but I refuse to subscribe to that doctrine. The hon. gentleman himself holds an honourable and important office as a member of this House, and I have no doubt he received that office as a reward for his services in political campaigns. If my hon. friend did not get his office in that way, I should think he did not very well deserve it. In my opinion participation in political campaigns is not a crime. Politics is the business of the people at large, and the men who engage in politics, according to their respective views of public affairs, ought to be regarded as the best citizens in the country. It is the duty of every good citizen to participate in politics, and far from being a cause for condemnation, participation in political campaigns ought under proper conditions to be a cause for reward. I hold a rather important office in the government of the country, and I venture to say that had I not taken a part in a good many political campaigns I would not have the pleasure of occupying it. This idea that a man is to be ignored and condemned because he takes a part in a political campaign is certainly a very strange notion. Then, my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Burrell) went a little further; he said: Look at this question of the judgeships; here is the former leader of the opposition—a gentleman whom he spoke of and deservedly so in terms of respect—he actually went out and poured cold water on the McBride government and the hon. gentleman asked: Would you dare to make that man a judge after that? What a monstrous thing it would be to appoint a man to the bench after he has dared to pour cold water on a local government? Well, I have had a long experience along these lines. It was my pleasure and duty for a great many years to be the leader of a local government and I remember on one occasion that my chief opponent in the constituency of Halifax was a gentleman of the legal profession and a very eminent one. He went out through the length and breadth of the province, he poured cold water and sometimes hot water upon the government which I had the honour to lead, and, fortunately, I was successful and he failed. And, a very short time after that he was appointed by the Conservative government of the Dominion to the high and honourable position of Judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it not some years afterwards?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it was not some years afterwards.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what year was the campaign?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot tell my hon. friend, but I will remind him of the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know the case.

Mr. BURRELL. Would the Minister of Finance permit me a brief explanation.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. The only point I desired to make was in reference to the statement of the Minister of Justice, that he hoped to make the appointments at the end of the month, and that was why I said that speaking on the 24th of November he only had six days in which to do it.

Mr. FIELDING. I am referring to whether participation in a political campaign on one side or the other ought to be regarded as a disqualification for public office in this country, and I am dissenting most emphatically from the position taken by my hon. friend. Now, this gentleman to whom I referred was my opponent in the campaign in Halifax and very shortly afterwards—the leader of the opposition says several years, but I think he is istaken in that; I am speaking from memory entirely, and I quite realize that memory may fail—very shortly afterwards; speaking now in good faith, a very few weeks afterwards that gentleman was appointed to the bench.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. FIELDING. I will look it up as a matter of curiosity, and if I am wrong I will tell my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us all.

Mr. FIELDING. I would if I thought you were interested. At all events it is not important, for what I want to point out is that when this occurred it never seemed to any of us that there was any great wrong in appointing that gentleman to public office. True, he poured cold water on that most excellent and virtuous government of which I was the leader.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. As I have said, sometimes he made it rather hot for us, but when a short time afterwards he was appointed to the honourable position of a judge, far from finding any fault, when his professional associates—including the leader of the opposition—desired to do him honour, it was my pleasure and my privilege to preside at the dinner which was given to him on the occasion of his appointment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. And so I should think that my hon. friend ought not for a moment to lay down the doctrine that because a man has participated in a political campaign in any province of the Dominion it ought to be regarded as a cause of offence. From my point of view—always supposing he exercises his right as a good citizen properly and reasonably—I would say that instead of that being a reason why a man should not be appointed to a public office it may be a good reason why he should be honoured by such an appointment.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How does the Minister of Finance reconcile his statements to-day with a resolution which was passed in this House some years ago and voted on unanimously by the then Reform party, and which enunciated the solemn principle that no man should be appointed to an office of emolument under the Crown during the time he was a member of this House or within two years afterwards?

Mr. FIELDING. If I had voted for any such resolution my hon. friend would make a good point, and I might not be able to square my views with that, but if the hon. gentleman will look up the records he will find that no such a resolution was ever unanimously passed, and I do not think it was ever passed at all. At all events, speaking for myself, I never approved of it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works chargeable to capital—Ottawa Astronomical Observatory — additional buildings, &c., $11,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This afternoon my hon. friend who represents Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked me if I would take up the items for public buildings in the province of Quebec. I told him I would try and do so. The hon. gentleman is not now in his place, and I do not know whether he is still desirous that I should take up the Quebec items. In the meantime, with regard to the residence for the chief astronomer, which we were discussing when the House was last in committee, I stated that it was not intended to charge the chief astronomer any rental for the residence, following an example which was set by the Conservative government when the Experimental Farm was established. At that time a residence was erected for the director of the farm, Dr. Saunders, at a cost about the same as that of this building. The contract was for some $12,000 in addition to which there was the heating and lighting, just as in this case. The policy of the government then was not to charge the director of the Experimental Farm rent for the building, and the same policy was afterwards followed with regard to other residences erected in connection with the farm. I thought the same policy would be adopted with regard to the residence for the chief astronomer. I may say, however, that since the matter was last under discussion before the committee, I have given further consideration to the subject and have conferred with the Minister of the Interior with regard to it, and we have come to the conclusion that as the chief astronomer, if he resided in the city of Ottawa, would be obliged to pay a rental for a dwelling house, it would not be unreasonable that he should pay for the residence near the observatory which the government is providing, such rental as he would have to pay for a suitable residence if he resided in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BOYCE. $1,000 a year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say what a reasonable rental would be, as we have not conferred with Dr. King on the subject.

Mr. BOYCE. I asked the minister what would be a reasonable rental for this residence, and he said $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said $1,000, but I am not in a position to say whether or not Dr. King would be prepared to pay that. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the government could afford to rent the house at a somewhat lower rental than a private individual, because the government pays no taxes on its property. Whether that would be $1,000 or not, I am not prepared to say at this moment, but it would approach that I should say.

Mr. SPROULE. An allowance is to be made to him for the house he is to occupy close to the observatory, not that you intend to rent a house for him in the city.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no. He would pay for the house we are constructing for him near the observatory.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The members of the committee will agree that some good result has come from the motion I made at the last sitting of this committee. At the time I had a conviction that the Minister of Justice had some purpose out of the ordinary in discussing the motion at the length he did in order to reach the hour of 6 o'clock. However, a regrettable feature of the repentance to which the Minister of Public Works has come in the interval is that he strikes home at the innocent official instead of at his own department. I do not wish it to be understood that the purpose of this motion was in any way to affect Dr. King or the emolument that he receives. If the government were to go further and build a grander house still at the expense of the country, it would be no kindness to Dr. King. It would be just about as much unkindness to him as now to charge him $1,000 a year rental in order, if possible, to meet the wishes of the public in regard to the resolution which I have proposed. If they were to build a residence for him costing some $25,000 or $30,000, the doctor might have nothing left of his salary after he paid the expense of keeping it up. The principle I wanted to establish by the motion I made was this, that the government should adopt the rule of building for a salaried officer, if they built at all, such a house as the average man in this country would build for himself were he in receipt of the same salary. I do not wish to assent to the proposition that the government should undertake the construction of these residences at all; but this one is under construction, and I think a very good object would be served by cutting down the appropriation. It might serve the object of having the residence built at a reasonable cost, because it will certainly be an exception if it is so built. Therefore, if the government has come to this late repentance in order to meet the public wishes by striking home at Dr. King, I think the better course would be to strike home at themselves and cut out $5,000 of the appropriation, and then they would have a house somewhat in excess of what a man in receipt of a salary of $3,000 usually occupies in Eastern Canada. I beg to renew the motion which I made at the last sitting of the committee, to the effect that $5,000 be struck off that appropriation, the same to apply to the residence to be built for the chief astronomer.

Mr. TURRIFF. I feel that possibly I may have been responsible for some of this discussion. But when I referred to the matter, I had no desire to speak of this building particularly, but simply to draw the attention of the government to a few other buildings that they might have in contemplation. I do not agree for a moment to the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that Mr. King the chief astronomer, should pay a rental. I think he is punished sufficiently when he has to live in a house that costs $17,000, because it costs more to live in a house of that kind than in one which costs $8,000 or $9,000 which would be about the right amount for the residence of an official getting three or four thousand dollars a year. I would be sorry to see Mr. King punished to any greater extent than he is going to be, as it is. But I hope—in view of what I believe, namely, that the officials of the Public Works Department have been responsible for the extra cost of a lot of buildings—that they will be compelled to make their plans of a more moderate character. In my remarks I had no intention of singling out this building in particular but of dealing with the buildings in general. Take those erected for the officials of the Militia Department. There ought to be a general cutting down of the cost of such buildings. In this case the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was perfectly satisfied to have a house of moderate cost, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) only wanted a house of reasonable cost, but the officials increased the cost. I have heard men say on this side that in the case of post offices and the like, it is almost impossible to get the officials to make plans that insure a perfectly suitable and less expensive building for certain places. I make this explanation because I do not want to be put in the position of hurting Mr. King in any way. If Mr. King has now to pay rent in addition to living and furnishing an expensive house, you are punishing him twice, and I should be sorry to be responsible in any way for that condition of things.

Mr. BLAIN. We on this side welcome the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) in condemnation of the party and the government of which he is a prominent supporter. But I take issue with my hon. friend on one point. I do not subscribe to the policy that a government can shift their responsibilities on to a paid official. If the government had done their duty in this case, the Minister of Public Works would have said to the chief architect: We want you to submit a plan for a building that will cost not more than six or seven thousand dollars without the lot. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that if the chief architect were so directed, he would bring in a plan for a building to cost, as this one did in the first instance, I am informed, more than $25,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend stated last year that when the chief architect submitted the plan for his consideration, he sent it back and asked him to reduce the amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think he named $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps not, but I am sure the minister will not say that it would not have cost $25,000. Does he say that the first plan submitted would not cost that? He does not reply. I was quite sure he would not. Therefore it is not fair to condemn an official when the responsibility rests with the minister and the government themselves. I have sufficient respect for the chief architect of the Public Works Department to believe that if the minister had instructed him to submit a plan for a residence to cost not more than $6,000 or $7,000 he would not have submitted one to cost $17,000 or $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to correct the impression under which some hon gentlemen are labouring, and that is that some injustice will be done the chief astronomer by providing him with a house of the character of the one which is being constructed. The plans were submitted to Dr. King and everything done in connection with this plan had his entire approval.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he told he would have to pay rent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but that he would have to keep up the house and that the expense of so doing, outside the rent, would have to be borne by him. That is what my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) referred to when he talked of the expense of keeping up a larger as compared with keeping up a smaller residence. Therefore no injustice could be done Dr. King except in requiring him to pay rent, if that be an injustice.

Mr. TURRIFF.

Mr. BOYCE. It is proposed to cut down the item $5,000 and the minister objects, but he wants to charge a rental for a $17,000 house. Would it not be a mercy to Mr. King to have the estimate reduced $5,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is just the kind of house Dr. King wants. Indeed he asked for a house somewhat larger. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) made the remark that if the chief architect had been directed to plan a house to cost $6,000, he would have done so. I do not think my hon. friend does justice to his knowledge of buildings when he suggests that it would be creditable to this country to erect at the public expense a residence for so prominent an official as the chief astronomer and to direct that it should not cost more than $6,000. That would not be a suitable residence. You must bear in mind that this is not a brick cased residence. It is not a building with wooden partitions in the cellar, but the partitions are of brick. The house itself is a brick building, the joists are of iron or steel, the house is built as nearly fireproof as it is ordinarily possible to build a residence. The policy of the government in the construction of public buildings is to make them as nearly fire proof as possible and so substantial that the ordinary depreciation will be as light as possible. The cost of the building in question is substantially the same as that of the dwelling erected by the former government for Dr. Saunders, director of the experimental farm.

Mr. LALOR. How much is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The price paid to the contractor was about $12,000, which is about the contract for this residence. In addition, in the case of Dr. Saunders' residence, there were the heating and lighting and certain contingencies also to be provided for. And Dr. Saunders' house was built about twenty years ago, when the wages paid to workmen were not within fifty per cent of what they are to-day—and that I leave to the judgment of every member of this House who has had any experience in building.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is Dr. Saunders' house about the same size as this? I understood the minister to say this was a two-story house.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two stories with an attic.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is it the same size as the house built for Dr. Saunders years ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dr. Saunders' house is a wooden house and ought not to be so expensive as the one we are now building for the chief astronomer; yet the contract price is practically the same. This is a brick house, a more substantial structure and in every way better than the one erect-

ed by the old government for Dr. Saunders, and, as I have said, was put under contract for practically the same amount. Now let me say a word to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) with regard to his motion to cut down this estimate. I submit to him that the time to have moved such a motion was last session. At that time when this matter was before the Committee of Supply last session, I stated what was the contract price; I stated that we had called for tenders and that the lowest tender was $12,300. I informed the committee as to what would be the probable cost of the complete residence and asked for authority to proceed with the work. The committee voted the sum of $14,000, and upon that the contract was entered into. The country is now under obligation to pay to the contractors $12,300; and if the committee were to act upon the suggestion of my hon. friend and reduce this vote we should have to break faith with the contractors. We cannot now alter the plans for the building; we cannot provide for a building at a lower cost, because the country has agreed to this building and to pay the contractor this price. I think my hon. friend will see upon reflection, that now is not the time for his motion, but that, the contract having been entered into and the building substantially completed, the contractors must be paid the amount of their contract.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister says that the contract price for Dr. Saunders' house was about $12,000. Will he say that that contract did not include everything?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It did not; I say that on the authority of the chief architect.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Will the minister (Mr. Pugsley) lay that contract on the table, that we may see what it did include? I am under the impression that it included everything except some minor fittings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will lay the contract on the table.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. As the minister has made the comparison between the building erected some years ago and this one, I would like to know, for my own information, if the minister can state definitely what was the size of that house and what it cost. He says he thinks the contract was about $12,000. But, before I attempt to discuss the matter, I would like to know the exact facts. This comparing of indefinite sums is not very satisfactory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated to the committee on a former occasion what this house will cost, but I will give it again. The total expenditure, which includes the printing and advertising, the heating and boilers, the electric wiring and fixtures, the sidewalks and fencing and the cost of superintendence, will be $17,041.49. Deduct $500 for fencing and sidewalks, and the cost of printing and advertising and you have about $16,400 as the cost of the building.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Without the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Did the minister take into consideration the $11,000 or $12,000 of which he spoke on a former occasion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is all included. The total cost of the building alone is about $16,400. I would say to my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) that, as to the cost of Dr. Saunders' residence, it would be better that I should lay the contract on the table, for so we shall have the exact facts before us. But the Chief Architect tells me that the contract price was about $12,000, and that did not include heating or lighting.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What will the heating and lighting of this house cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $2,500.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The minister has said that it would be a breach of faith to dissolve the contract for this building. It seems to me it is for the House to decide whether it would be a breach of faith with Dr. King to charge him rent for a building more expensive than he expected to have. I remember that when this matter came up last session it was opposed by every member on this side of the House. We thought that this was too expensive a house for an official enjoying the salary of Dr. King. Dr. King might readily agree to a reduction in the cost of the house if he knew that he was to be charged rent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that it would be merely a breach of faith; it would be a breach of contract. The building is nearly completed and we shall have to pay the contractor.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not understand how the minister accounts for the $25,000 vote for this building. Last year, $14,000 was voted, and we are asked to vote $11,000 this year. The minister has stated the cost of the residence at $17,000 or less, and I understand that two other buildings are being provided at a cost of about $6,000. There would seem to be nearly $3,000 unaccounted for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) did not hear my explanation. The same question was asked by another hon. gentleman when the matter last came before the committee. It will be seen by the wording of this vote that it is not confined to this residence but covers 'Ottawa Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, etc.' That is the way the vote has been carried on since we began the con-

struction of the Observatory. We have in connection with the other buildings, electric wiring and fixtures, $527.97; hardware, paint, glass, $181.08; stone, cement, lumber, &c., $372.50; sodding, $289.75; paylist, $1,872.42; sundries, $480.

Mr. CROCKET. Are those other items for the other building in addition to the $6,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understood the minister to say that he considered $1,000 to be a reasonable rental for this House and that he would charge Dr. King the same rental as Dr. King would be likely to pay for a house in the city. Six per cent of the cost of this house, that is $17,000, would make a rental of $1,020. Does the minister think it would be fair to charge an official more than one-third of his salary for rent, and has Dr. King consented to pay more than one-third of his salary for rent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The conclusion at which I have arrived, after considering the matter since we discussed the item the other day is that it would be fair that Dr. King should pay the same rental that he would be required to pay in the city for a suitable residence for him. I do not know whether that would be $1,000 or a less amount. Of course, we must bear in mind that it would be fair to allow, in respect to government moneys invested in the building, say four per cent. That is the very highest the government pays for money. Then there are no taxes, but there would be a certain wear and tear each year. Possibly somewhere between $600 and $800 would be a reasonable rental for the government to charge. My idea is that he should pay such reasonable rental as he would have to pay for suitable accommodation in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has put it very pointedly to me that I should have introduced this resolution when the same subject was under discussion on the 4th of February last. During that discussion the viciousness of the whole undertaking was very thoroughly laid before the minister. Every opportunity was then given him for repentance both along the line of his present repentance, and on the broad principle of the transaction. The minister, however, having everything laid before him on that occasion did not see fit to reduce the estimite himself, or to come to the conclusion he came to last night to make the astronomer pay rent. Therefore, I retort on him, would it not have been far better for him then to have frankly told the House that they did not purpose making this gentleman pay rent. I find at page 619 of 'Hansard' of last year that the question of having Dr. King pay some rent for the house was brought to the attention of the minister and he then frankly told the House that he did not purpose making Dr. King pay any rental at all.

The facts laid before the House by the minister on the 4th of February last were quite different from those laid before us now. On the 4th of February last, the discussion proceeded all along the line of the ultimate cost of this residence being $15,000. To-day it is $17,000. Is that not a reason——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend sure I said $15,000? Did I not say about $16,000?

Mr. MEIGHEN. In one place in the remarks of the minister he seems to have been misread by other members. The minister did say about $16,000, but further on he was asked if $15,000 was not the ultimate cost and the minister did not dispute the figures. And furthermore throughout the discussion——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is very different. I did state $16,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But the point was put very direct to the minister at page 619 by Mr. Staples, who said:

> Are we to understand that $15,000 will complete this residence? My experience is that these buildings cost twice their estimated cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That shows that the gentleman was a long way astray.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It shows also that the minister took advantage of the opportunity not to put him right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be a very heavy contract generally.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There was the opportunity of his life then to put the far-astray member for Macdonald right, but this is his reply:

> This contract is for the building alone, and then there will be the heating and wiring and I assume, from information I have, that $3,000 or $4,000 additional will be necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would make it $16,300.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But why did not the minister so state? It was one of the characteristic replies of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I supposed the hon. gentleman could add the two figures together.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Where were the other figures? The whole matter, may I inform the minister, is on a par with many others that came before this committee last ses-

sion. There was not an apportioning of the cost of the residence and the coelostat hut and other matters, but all were lumped in a single vote of $14,000. The same expedient is used this session. In the course of one of his remarks he used $16,000 and throughout the whole discussion $15,000 was used as the cost of the residence, and the minister, courteous as usual and more than courteous in this case, continued not to correct us in the impression that $15,000 was the limit. How much of this $11,000 that he asks for this session is to be applied to the residence and how much to the other buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is still due on the contract $8,320. Then we purpose spending an amount for heating boilers, estimated by the chief architect to be $1,500; electric wiring and fixtures, $1,000. We expect it will cost $500 for sidewalks and fencing, and that contingencies with superintendence will cost $1,700, and all this vote will be used for these purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That amounts to the whole $11,000? Then I understand the whole $11,000 is to be applied to the residence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To the residence.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But the minister told us last year that it would only take $3,000 or $4,000 to finish the residence. It is no wonder that we do not know where we are at. Furthermore, it seems to me that in arriving at a fair value of a house good enough for any servant of this government——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I assumed my hon. friend would understand that we have yet a part of the vote of $14,000 of last year to be used during the current year, which will not expire until March 31 next.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand that, but no man can understand how much of the vote of the year before last and of last year and of this year is being applied to this residence. The point which I wish to make is that the salary received by a civil servant is about all this committee has on which to judge as to the character and expense of a house that would be appropriate for him. Where was the minister on February 4 last when we asked what salary this man was getting? He was absent, he could give no information at all. We were, on the 4th February last, absolutely in the dark as to what salary this man obtained, and, therefore, absolutely in the dark as to one of the main principles that should govern us in deciding how much should be provided for his residence. Therefore, there is ample reason for moving at a later stage for a diminution. If the fact that the minister has entered into a contract is going to tie the hands of the committee, why submit it to the committee at all? It is before the committee for approval or disapproval. The circumstances have altered since last February. Facts are before us that were not before us then. We could vote in perfect honour and in justice to our constituents that a man should be given a house such as an ordinary citizen of this country might occupy performing like service, and receiving like remuneration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not trouble the committee were it not for the fact that my hon. friend has sought to convey the impression that there was some misstatement of fact to the committee when this matter was up last session. Before any hon. gentleman undertakes to make an insinuation of that kind with reference to a minister he should be absolutely sure of his facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I made no insinuation; I made an absolute statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that I led the committee to believe that this building was going to cost $15,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is not the statement I made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman made that statement unless there is something very defective in my memory.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know the hon. gentleman made the statement and, unless he says he did not—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER I must point out that where a member denies that he made a statement that denial must be accepted.

Mr MEIGHEN. The statement that I made—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER I think it also extremcly desirable that any decision of the chairman should be received in silence with neither approval nor disapproval.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What I said was that the discussion proceeded on the assumption that $15,000 would be the ultimate cost and that when the minister was questioned whether it would or would not be he did not deny it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me read the first statement I made when the item came before the committee. The item was :

Ottawa Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, &c., $14,000.

This is the explanation I made to the committee:

This vote of $14,000 is asked to make provision for the construction of a residence for the chief astronomer, and also to complete

coelostat house and standardizing hut in connection with the astronomical observatory. The proposed building to be occupied by the chief astronomer is to be a brick building with a stone foundation two and a half stories in height. The residence of the chief astronomer will cost about $16,000.

Yet the hon gentleman says the whole discussion proceeded upon the theory that it was only going to cost $15,000, notwithstanding that I had made the statement that it would cost about $16,000 and notwithstanding also that I made the statement that the lowest tender for the building was $12,300, and that in addition to that there would be heating and electric wiring which would cost somewhere between $3,000 and $4,000. I think that the committee will acquit me of having given any information in any way misleading at the last session of parliament. I think it will agree that I put the facts fully and fairly before it, and I think it will also see that the suggestion which the hon. member for Macdonald made that when this building was completed it would cost twice $16,000 was entirely without foundation. The whole building, when completed, will cost a little bit over $16,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. Every one who listened to the reply of the Minister of Public Works must realize that it is in keeping with the manner in which he gets out of a very close corner. From the little experience I have had the minister has led me to believe that he is very apt to get out of any corner he has got into before the committee. The minister has stated that he did not lead the committee to believe that this building was going to cost $15,000. What the hon. member from Portage la Prairie did say was that the discussion was conducted freely during that debate on the assumption that the building was going to cost $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I ask the hon. gentleman what warrant he has for that statement when I made the specific statement that it would cost $16,000?

Mr. BRADBURY. Just because the Minister himself stated so. I will read his statement to him before I proceed further. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) asked:

Are we to understand that $15,000 will complete this residence? My experience is that these buildings cost twice their estimated cost.

The Minister of Public Works said:

This contract is for the building alone and then there will be the heating and wiring, and I assume from the information I have that $3,000 or $4,000 additional will be necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Add $4,000 to $12,300 and what does it make?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BRADBURY. The whole discussion proceeded along the same line and every one who asked a question did so under the belief that the building would cost $15,000. Later the Minister of Public Works said:

The lowest tender is a little over $12,000 and with the heating, wiring and plumbing it will likely cost somewhere between $15,000 and $16,000.

I do not think the minister has any right to assume or suggest that my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie has misquoted him or has tried to make it appear that he had endeavoured to lead the committee to believe that the building was only going to cost $15,000. The assumption last year was that that was the cost of the building and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie made that quite plain.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Minister of Public Works gives as a reason why this vote should pass that a residence was built by a previous government costing a similar amount of money. Admitting that for the sake of argument and believing as I do that every item of this kind and every change should be decided upon its merits, in order to make that a parallel on which to pass our judgment it will be necessary to have all the facts in connection therewith. While I do not pretend at this moment to have full knowledge of these facts I would like to know whether when the house was built for Dr. Saunders at the Experimental Farm it was not the case that his residence was understood to be a part of the emolument. It was thoroughly understood at that time that the building erected for the manager of the farm would be occupied by him free of cost. It was practically an official residence. His office, altogether likely, was situated in the building and probably part of the staff occupied quarters there. In any case he would there entertain a number of visitors who would require to go there from time to time on official business. So that the case the minister has cited is not parallel with the one we have here and for that reason I do not belive that any member of the committee should be asked to take that into consideration.

Amendment negatived. Yeas 42, nays, 67.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member from Quebec came into the House after the question was put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that an hon. member cannot vote unless he has heard the question put.

Item agreed to.

New departmental buildings, Ottawa, $300,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question of these new departmental buildings has been before parliament during the last few sessions and as last year and the year be-

fore I gave full explanations I do not suppose it will be necessary for me to go into details now. This $300,000 is to make provision for the completion of the payments for the land and also to enable the department to ask for tenders and enter into the contract for the construction of the buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the information the minister proposes to give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless some questions are asked.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be questions asked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I fully explained the matter last session.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the first vote for the construction and we would like to know what the proposed buildings are to cost, what their capacity and what use they will be put to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building will have one frontage on Sussex street and another on Major Hill park; length 590 feet and width 250 feet; two large courts 154 by 79; the building will have six stories and a basement on the park and seven stories and a basement on Sussex street; it will be 125 feet high on McKenzie avenue and 150 feet high above Sussex street; the centre of the building will face York Street which is quite a wide street. The lower end of the building will be 503 feet from St. Patrick street and the upper end 247 feet from the Lindsay property. It will be built of stone.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of stone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Something similar to that in the Museum. The floor areas will be substantially laid: ground and first floors 148,256 superficial feet, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth floors, 360,110 superficial feet. The basement on Sussex street will have 51,080 superficial feet, the tower rooms 9,984 or a total area in superficial feet of 596,430 or a net office area of 350,000 superficial feet.

Mr. FOSTER. How many officials will it house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be sufficient to house all of the clerks who are now accommodated in rented buildings or perhaps even more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. How many is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we rent to-day is about 300,000 superficial feet and this is 500,000 superficial feet.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this do away with the necessity of renting offices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope it will, but the business of the country is expanding so rapidly that what may be our hope to-day in that respect may not be realized five years hence.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated that the cost will be $3,439,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that include?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This includes everything but furniture; it will include the building and the heating, and the lighting, incidentals, contingencies, everything which ordinarily forms part of a building.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must be able to give the cost of the building itself and also the cost of the fittings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I cannot. The architect estimates upon the total cubic contents. The plans are not worked out sufficiently in detail so that I cannot tell just what the heating or lighting is going to cost.

Mr. FOSTER. The plans are not fully worked out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get at the cost then?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An architect can estimate pretty well what a building will cost taking the cubic contents.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include elevators?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it includes everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Everything but the furniture?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Everything but the furniture.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the site included?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 21st of September, 1909 we have paid for properties $528,000 and they have all been purchased but two.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the last one purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. M. and F. B. Hayes and F. McDougall; that purchase was completed on the 14th of July.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the purchasing agents?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Riopelle?

Mr. FOSTER. You had agents besides Mr. Riopelle?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we had valuators some time ago, but Mr. Riopelle has been the agent to make the purchases.

Mr. FOSTER. No one else has been associated with him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except as valuers.

Mr. FOSTER. Of any particular lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the expropriation proceedings; also the solicitors.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the solicitors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. A. W. Fraser and Mr. McLean. There are two properties still to be purchased. We have expropriated them, but have not paid the money. One lot is that of Mr. James Inglis, 100 feet by 150 feet 9 inches. For this we have made an offer of $38,000, which has not been accepted. Then the other is a half lot, 33 feet by 155 feet 9 inches, of Martha and Columbus Eagleson. For this we have made an offer of $7,750, which they have declined to accept.

Mr. FOSTER. That would make a total of about $575,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Adding together the three amounts I have mentioned, that would be the total cost of the land, assuming that our offers are accepted. It is estimated that buildings and land together will cost a little over $4,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the inside style of these buildings? Are they to follow the style of the other departmental buildings, and have small offices with a few clerks in each, and a few larger rooms, as in the later buildings, or has the minister, and the architect under his direction, had occasion to look at other business buildings, and if they have, have they decided on some other plan of inside arrangement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has been considered, and provision will be made to meet the very idea my hon. friend puts forward.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister might give us an idea of what is proposed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we propose to do in the first instance is to have a number of large rooms, to be arranged in consultation with the different departments. We shall have to have, of course, a number of small rooms as well. These will be decided upon after consultation with the ministers whose officials are to be accommodated in the building. We shall have a great many more large rooms than are contained in the present buildings. We recognize the desirability of affording accommodation for many clerks in one room under the eye of the chief of a branch of that department. We have not the details worked out yet.

Mr. WRIGHT. How near will the centre of the building come to the so-called Lindsay block?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 247 feet.

Mr. DANIEL. This new building will accommodate the Militia Department, the Census and Statistics Department, part of the Interior Department, the new Naval Department, I presume, and what others?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All that are now in the rented buildings—the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Labour, the Civil Service Commission, the Inspectors of Penitentiaries——

Mr. DANIEL. The Transcontinental Railway Commission and the Navy Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How much is now paid in rentals for the offices that will be taken care of by this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $140,000 a year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. For what length of term are the various leases?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For from three to five years. There are none longer than five years. We have made the leases so that we shall be able to get rid of the leased properties about the time we hope to have the new departmental buildings completed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When does the minister expect that the proposed building will be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a pretty difficult question. It is a pretty large building. I should think that if we got it completed in four years we would be doing pretty well.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As this is going to involve an expenditure of $4,000,000, that is, more than half the original cost of the parliament buildings, we should have more detailed information about this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The public buildings in Ottawa, I think, cost between $9,000,000 and $10,000,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not think we should vote any appropriation upon the estimate of an architect who has made his estimate solely on space. I think the House is entitled to further information as to the kind and size of this building, and the plans and specifications should be submitted to the House; because we shall probably have the same experience with regard to this building that we have had with regard to others. After we have committed ourselves to the proposed building by voting this $300,000, we shall be charged with having assented to a great

many details that we shall probably object to later on. On such an expenditure we should have a great deal of information, probably all that the minister has and a great deal that he has not got yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given to-day, I think, pretty full information. I have given the size of the building, the height of the building, the materials out of which it is to be constructed. Surely my hon. friend does not expect me to go into all the details of the construction of the building. I think that would be very unreasonable.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister yet got a regular series of plans and specifications?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans are pretty well completed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister think he should not submit these to the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad, if the hon. member or any other member desires it, to lay the plans on the table; but I think he will see the unreasonableness of postponing this item until that is done. On concurrence I will have the plans laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the minister propose to do with this appropriation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Complete the plans and specifications, call for tenders for the building, and make a start by tearing down the old buildings and preparing the foundations of the new building as soon as possible.

Mr. WRIGHT. The plan I have seen included a bridge across the Rideau canal. Is it the intention of the government to have such a bridge as well as the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That idea was thought of and a plan was prepared showing a bridge, but my own view is that we can get along quite a number of years without a bridge. The bridge would cost close on to a million dollars. There might be a small foot bridge.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before passing this estimate we should have some complete statement of the government's estimates and the cost of the building to be erected on Sussex street.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman include in his figures the cost of the removal of the buildings which have to be taken down before the new ones can be erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is included. It will be provided in the specifications that the contractor shall remove the old buildings. In the large majority of cases, he will find the material he gets will equal, if not exceed, the cost of the removal. That will be included in the contract and is estimated for in these figures.

Mr. HENDERSON. From what we have heard now, the new building when completed, is to cost a little over $4,000,000. That is practically the estimate for land and building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; of course not including fixing up the grounds after the building is completed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am speaking of the cost of the building and the site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Reference was made to the cost of the departmental buildings in Ottawa by way of comparison. I notice in the public accounts that the cost of the government buildings at Ottawa or their value is put down at $8,156,800. That I understand will include the cost of the buildings on the hill, the main building with the recent improvements, the library, the east and west wing and the Langevin block as well. It would also include no doubt the Printing Bureau, the Mint; and the Museum, which is now rapidly approaching completion would no doubt be included in the valuation of the government buildings in Ottawa up to the time these public accounts were prepared. Also the Archives, and there may be some other buildings which I have overlooked. I had always understood that the buildings on the hill including the Langevin block practically only cost about $5,000,000. But we have since then erected some pretty costly buildings. The Museum is a costly building, and is now, I understand, rapidly approaching completion. The Mint is a costly building, and I trust now is nearly completed. As I have said, we have the Printing Bureau, the Archives and some others. So, no doubt the $8,156,800 is a correct valuation of all the public buildings in Ottawa, and what is proposed now, is to erect one building at a cost at any rate of half the value of all the public buildings we have in Ottawa at present. All I desire to do is draw attention to this and have a distinct understanding of what the estimate of the minister is because he may expect to be held down to his estimate very closely by those who may be here in future years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend bear this in mind, that we are paying to-day for outside buildings 4 per cent on $3,500,000?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not criticising the propriety of erecting this new building because I understand that is a foregone conclusion. But when the previous vote

was taken, determining that a building should be erected, we had not such full details of the size and cost of the building as we have now, but in a few years no doubt, attention will be drawn to the statement made here to-day, and the minister may expect to be held down very closely to the estimate he has given. And I trust we shall not be called upon inside of the four years, in which it is thought this building will be completed, to expend more than one half the amount that the entire public buildings we now own in Ottawa actually did cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister should expect us to enter upon this expenditure of $4,000,000 or more without a little more discussion and a little more details with reference to the plans and what is proposed to be done. It is rather a startling statement to find in the public estimates that we are going to expend on one building about half as much as it has cost us to construct all the government buildings we have. It is all very well to say you are going to keep within that estimate, but what we particularly want to know, is whether that is an extravagant estimate or not. How did the minister arrive at that estimate? What skill, if any, outside his departmental officers, did he have? Then a very important inquiry would be as to what is the space provided by the government buildings which are now erected and which have been built for about $8,000,000, and how does that compare with the space to be provided by this building. We want to find out whether this is an extravagant estimate or not and whether it is not possible to erect a building for our accommodation at a less cost than $4,000,000. We must take into account the fact that wages have increased and some kinds of building materials cost more as well, but the main thing to be used is stone, and the cost of the stone itself would not be very much increased. But we are asked to sanction an expenditure, to give the minister an initial vote upon which a hard and fast contract may be given before we meet again, and we are entitled to have a look at the plans and see whether or not there are any suggestions to be made. We want to have a thorough explanation of these plans and what they provide for from the minister himself. It is rather absurd that we should spend only fifteen minutes authorizing an expenditure of $4,000,000 about which we have never seen the plans and know very little. It may be that some of us will not know much more after seeing the plans, but it is still better that we should have a look at them and have an explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is only reasonable. I should be glad to have the plans brought here and give all in detail that it is possible to give. Perhaps it might be better to let this item stand, and, this evening, take up items with regard to which there might not be the same——

Mr. FOSTER. Don't forget the floor-space.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might just say that the Langevin block contains 90,000 superficial feet of floor-space, and cost $1,250,000. The whole three blocks of departmental buildings contain 315,000 superficial feet. Therefore, we shall have nearly fifty per cent more space than is contained in all three of the present departmental buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister has given us the floor-space of the buildings covered by this amount of $8,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would there be any objection to allowing us to look at the plans not accepted, but for which a certain amount of money was paid as prize-money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. They were all here last year in the Railway Committee room. I may say we could hardly display them in the Chamber. They are on file in the department, and the chief architect will be glad to show them to any hon. member who would like to examine them.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not be too much trouble to have the plans that have been accepted hung in the Railway Committee room for the information of members?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These buildings are not being constructed upon any plan accepted from outside. The plans on which it is proposed to proceed with construction are prepared by the chief architect of the department. We could have these brought in.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister say that the plans are completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are well on toward completion.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the British North American Mining Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—Mr. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—Mr. Haggart (Winnipeg).

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. Donnelly.

Bill (No. 38) respeecting the West Ontario Pacific Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

SUPPLY.

The hour for Private Bills having expired, the House resumed Committee of Supply.

Royal Mint, refinery, buildings and equipment, $57,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is for payment upon the refinery which is being erected in connection with the Royal Mint, the construction of which was authorized at the last session of parliament. The total cost of the building of the refinery and equipment is estimated at a little over $60,000. The equipment is quite expensive and consists of very delicate and expensive machinery. It will cost $32,000, including customs duties of $2,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is the building now under construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is partly constructed now, by contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount of the contract is $31,047.

Mr. SPROULE. You had $30,000 voted last year and have spent $10,000, and now ask $57,000, which would make $67,000 if you spent it all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $57,000 and $10,000 make $67,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Instead of $63,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will show my hon. friend how this $67,000 is arrived at. Amount paid for advertising, $358.84; supplies, hardware, repairs to roof and boiler, $205.42; amount of this contract, $31,747; equipment, fitting, machinery, $32,000; sidewalks and grading, $500; superintendence, $1,943; total, $66,754.26, or within $240 odd of the amount that we are asking.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many men will be employed in this refinery?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid the Minister of Public Works will only be able to deal with the construction of the building. If the hon. gentleman desires information as to the kind of operations which are carried on there and if he will be good enough to state the point on which he desires to be informed I will be very happy to take a note of it and bring the information at another meeting. I could not tell off-hand, but the refinery will not call for many officers. We had hoped to have avoided the necessity of having a refinery at all. We had reason to believe that the refining could be done outside by corporations and we were hoping to save the expense of a refinery, but after carefully inquiring into the matter the mint officials informed us that the material they could get outside was not of sufficient purity for coining purposes and so, reluctantly, we had to undertake the construction of a refinery. I do not understand that it calls for many officials in addition to the present staff, but upon that, as upon any other point in connection with the administration of the mint, if any hon. gentleman will mention the point that he desires information upon I will be very glad to bring it down at another meeting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister be good enough to tell us the total cost of the Royal Mint, including the refinery?

Mr. FIELDING. It is on 'Hansard'—between $500,000 and $600,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works now to say that this will cost about $66,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nearly $67,000—$66,754.26.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister first gave the figure as $63,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had not these additional figures in my mind then.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not see how we are misled? We accept that as correct and if the minister afterwards corrects his statement it rather discredits the information given by him.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the present vote is only for the refinery.

What we call the Royal Mint is something different altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is part of the mint.

Mr. HENDERSON. What would be the entire cost of the Royal Mint, refinery and everything connected with it? Would it amount to three-quarters of a million?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is less than three-quarters of a million. The total expenditure on the Royal Mint up to the 31st of March last was $535,238.62. That includes the site. I do not imagine there has been anything expended since that outside of what has been spent on the refinery, amounting to $66,754.26. That will make it a bit over $600,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister remember the original estimate that was given to the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not.

Mr. FIELDING. It was certainly very much below that.

Mr. HENDERSON. About half.

Mr. FIELDING. The original estimate was between $300,000 and $400,000. But, of course, all public buildings have cost more since the time that estimate was made. The work was undertaken on a somewhat broad scale and I am sure the feeling of the hon. gentlemen is that if you are to have a mint you should have a good one. I confess that I was anxious that instructions should be given that if the mint was to be placed there we should have the most perfect machinery that it was possible to procure, and I believe we have it. I do not know how many hon. gentlemen have had an opportunity of visiting the mint, but if there are any present who have not been there, I think they would find it a very interesting place to go. I believe that every hon. gentleman who has gone to the mint has realized the fact that the work done there is of a very fine character. It was all done by contract and I have reason to believe that it was carefully and well done. I was surprised at the cost myself, but when we were doing an expensive piece of work of this kind we thought we should have it thoroughly well done by scientific men.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad the minister has extended an invitation to visit the mint. I had it in mind to visit it to-morrow and I was not sure if they would require a letter of introduction from the Minister of Finance in order to get inside to see what was being done.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure that any member of parliament presenting his card would be welcomed there. It would be a convenience if hon. gentlemen would let them know the day before. I would not advise the hon. gentleman to go on Saturday because that is a short day and he might not see as much as he would upon another day. But if any hon. gentleman would telephone any afternoon that he would like to go on the following day, I am sure he would be welcomed and that it would be very interesting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman will require more than his card as a member of parliament to get in there. The mint officials require a letter. I found that out myself.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not blame the mint people for being a little more stringent than at ordinary places, but there are a number of instances in which hon. gentlemen have asked me and I have said: Go down and present your card, and I rather think they admitted these hon. gentlemen without question. However, there should be no difficulty on that score. If any hon. gentleman intimates to me the time when he wishes to go to the mint they will be only too glad to have him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Minister of Finance give an idea of the amount of loss that the country has sustained from the operation of the mint during the last few years?

Mr. FIELDING. As the question before the House is merely that of a contract work upon the refinery I did not anticipate questions of that character. I would rather bring in a statement at a later date. I would not care to answer the question from memory.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there a residence in connection with this establishment for any of the employees?

Mr. FIELDING. No. The imperial authorities were very anxious that there should be a residence, but I advised the Minister of Public Works to try and disregard that for the present, and we have no residence. It is the practice in connection with Royal Mints elsewhere that the chief official resides in the mint and there is an advantage in it. However, the building was proving so much more expensive than we had anticipated that I have ventured to take the risk of the displeasure of the imperial authorities up to the present time and have not asked for a residence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do you pay the rent of the chief officer's residence in any other part of the city?

Mr. FIELDING. I think we make an allowance. It is done under the regulations of the Royal Mint and we contribute a lump sum for maintenance and upkeep generally. My recollection is that there is an allowance granted for the residence of the deputy master.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman stated that members of the House could get in on presenting their cards? I presented my card at the mint and I was told I could not be admitted unless I made an appointment a day or two before.

An hon. MEMBER. You looked suspicious.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I was also given to understand that the officials were not under the control of this parliament, that they were the appointees of the British government, and that though we had the privilege of paying for the mint we had nothing to say about its engagement. I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance on this matter.

Mr. FIELDING. Last session a notice was placed before all members of parliament intimating the times at which it would be most convenient to have them visit the mint, and many hon. gentlemen took advantage of it. I thought they were now sufficiently democratic to admit any gentleman who was a member of the House, although not necessarily at any moment he thought fit to apply, because I fancy that a large number of gentlemen going down there at different times might make it very inconvenient. The mint is something like a bank and it would not be possible to take visitors to the vaults of a bank at all hours of the day. I do not think it unreasonable that the director should be notified a day before of the visit of a number of members of parliament, and if that were done I have no doubt they would be received at once. It is a fact that the control of the mint is under the British government and that is so for reasons which we thought were good. We decided we would have a branch of the Royal Mint in Canada, and one great advantage of that has been that the building has been erected and the machinery installed on the advice and under the supervision of gentlemen who I have no hesitation in saying are the most experienced mint officials in the world. Had the mint been built as a purely Canadian institution we would have had great difficulty in obtaining equal supervision. While it is true that the mint is under the control of the Royal Mint, I have not the slightest doubt that every courtesy would be extended to every member of parliament who wished to visit it, and that far from desiring to put obstacles in their way the director of the mint would be most happy to welcome them. Last session one gentleman opposite came to me and said: I have just visited the mint, and I do wish that every member would visit it, because I had no conception of what an interesting process was carried on there, and I think every member who goes to the mint will come away proud of it and pleased with it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister states that the advice of the Royal Mint authorities was taken with reference to the machinery. I had the pleasure of visiting that mint and I noticed that about eighty per cent of the machinery was of American manufacture. Can the minister tell us what proportion of the machinery in that mint is of British manufacture, and what proportion of American manufacture?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Public Works who has charge of that would be able to give the information, but if it should turn out that all the machinery is American, that does not show that there is anything wrong with the mint, because the American mints are amongst the most modern and best equipped in the world. I am quite sure that the officials of the mint would get the best machinery possible, and in fact we sent them to Philadelphia, to observe the latest process there. I think it is quite possible that the American mints are more modern and better equipped than even the Royal Mint in England.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When does the government intend to proceed with the coinage of gold?

Mr. FIELDING. The object of this vote is to complete the refinery, and we cannot coin gold on any extensive scale until we have a refinery. They are able to do a little refining now on a very small scale, and they have already turned out a few British sovereigns, under authority which comes to us by virtue of its being a branch of the Royal Mint. Several of our gold mining companies have sent their gold to the mint and British sovereigns have been produced, but to embark on gold coinage generally you must have a refinery. I hope there will be the least possible delay in turning out the gold coins of Canada.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it the intention to coin a five dollar Canadian gold piece?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the relationship between the Royal Mint and our Mint?

Mr. FIELDING. The Royal Mint of England is an imperial institution having branches in several parts of the British empire, and we asked that ours might be treated as a branch of the Royal Mint. One of the reasons which led us to that were it a Canadian mint proper we could not coin the British sovereign. How far our Canadian people will make use of gold coins is a debatable question and a very interesting one, and as we believed it desirable that we should find a market—if I may so express it—for the gold of the Yu-

kon and British Columbia, we thought it desirable that we should have the privilege of coining not only Canadian gold coins but the British sovereign, which is current throughout the world. There are many people who believe that our gold should be kept in our own country as much as possible instead of it being sent to the mints in the United States. In consideration of the privilege of coining the British sovereign we had to relinquish some measure of control. The chief officials have been sent out from England, the appointments are made under the English competitive system; we surrender something of what might be called patronage, and I am bound to say that as a general result it has worked well.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no chance for defeated politicians getting in there?

Mr. TURRIFF. It is hard enough for members to get in.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This refinery is being built for the purpose of refining the gold to turn into coinage?

Mr. FIELDING. We have to have gold of a certain standard for coinage and this refinery will be for that purpose.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand it a large portion of the gold produced in Canada is minted in the United States at the present time. If we coin our own gold we will have to pay for the gold which comes from our western country, and mint it, and in the end there will be no profit on the process but rather a loss.

Mr. FIELDING. We quite anticipate that the gold to be used at the Canadian mint will be the gold of Canada. We will have to purchase it as others have to purchase it. There is a profit in coining bronze coins and a large profit in coining silver but there is no profit in coining gold. You take a given amount of bullion and you convert it into coins and after you have done so it is not worth any more than it was before, so that to that extent there will be a loss on the process of coinage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I cannot understand the wisdom of going to the expense of building a refinery when at present we can receive our gold coinage from the old land without cost.

Mr. FIELDING. Wisely or unwisely one of the objects of the Canadian mint was that the gold which my hon. friend says goes from Canada to the United States should be as far as possible kept within Canada. It was claimed that the city of Seattle has been largely built up by the trade of the Yukon country because the miners who produced the gold from our Canadian Yukon, went to Seattle and even to San Francisco with their gold. It was argued by our friends from British Columbia, with very great force, that if we could induce these miners to come to Vancouver or any other place in Canada, and could provide there a market for their gold, the trade would follow the gold, and we would keep in our own Dominion, particularly in British Columbia, the trade associated with the gold industry. How far that will work out is, like many another economic question, very debatable; but that is one of the reasons why this mint project commended itself very strongly to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. In your arrangement with the British government, is there any limit to the number of British or Canadian coins in gold that you may turn out?

Mr. FIELDING. No. The Mint Act provides that any person possessing gold may tender it to the mint and have it converted into British sovereigns at a stated charge, which is fixed in the Act or the regulations. In that we suffer no loss. Indeed, I think there has been a slight profit from the minting of British sovereigns. When we come to mint our own gold coins, there may be a slight loss.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is there any limit to the number of Canadian coins you may mint?

Mr. FIELDING. No. That will be determined by the law of supply and demand. We will make as much coinage as the people absorb in their business. When they cease to absorb it, we shall cease to make it. British gold is not practically current in Canada at all. While it is the standard of our currency in a certain sense, the British sovereign, which is equivalent to $4.86⅔ of our money, is not available for general circulation in Canada, and, except in the case of a company which for some reason of its own wants these coins made, I do not think we may look for any very general demand for the making of British sovereigns.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that it is the intention of the government to coin a $5 gold piece of Canadian currency?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, $5 and $10, and we are free to make others if we wish.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to ask the minister if he proposes to take any steps this year to arrange with the banks to get rid of the large amount of American silver coinage circulated throughout Canada, and have the mint coin a great deal more Canadian silver coinage, which he says gives considerable profit in the making.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we have such an arrangement whereby the banks, for a very small commission, I forget the exact amount, undertake to collect the foreign silver and ship it to the United States. In

that way I think there will be a considerable increase in the work of the mint in coining Canadian silver, on which there is a very large profit.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Minister of Finance be good enough to tell us how he expects the miners of the Yukon to bring their gold to Ottawa and do their trading in Ottawa instead of going to Seattle?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not compare Ottawa with Seattle, but I did compare Vancouver with Seattle. I would not expect them to bring their gold to Ottawa, but we have an assay office at Vancouver, and we expect to get Yukon gold there. The question still remains how far the government will go to get the gold. We have to get Canadian gold for the Canadian mint, and if we have to go to the Yukon to get it, we will go.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are all the officials of the mint given an allowance in lieu of rent, and, if so, are these allowances included in the general allowance for maintenance, or are they kept separate?

Mr. FIELDING. My impression is that there is no allowance made for rent to anybody but the Deputy Master of the Mint, and the reason we make that is that we were required by the British government to provide a residence for him in addition to the salary fixed, and as we preferred not to construct a residence for him, we have made him a moderate allowance for rent instead—I cannot remember the exact amount. Under the statute there is a general vote of $75,000 for the maintenance of the mint. We have been trying to keep it down to that, but it is possible that in closing the account we may have to ask parliament to increase that amount.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the coins turned out at the mint—gold, silver, copper and other metals?

Mr. FIELDING. It is proposed to turn out all the coins which Canada requires—the silver coins of the various denominations, the bronze cent, and gold coins of $5, $10 and $20.

Mr. SPROULE. Nothing less than $5?

Mr. FIELDING. We have the right under the Act to make coins corresponding approximately to the British half sovereign, that is, $2.50. Some said that was too small a coin. However, that is a matter of detail.

Mr. SPROULE. What of silver?

Mr. FIELDING. 50 cents, 25 cents, 10 cents and 5 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. No dollar?

Mr. FIELDING. Not of silver. We use our dollar note.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you turn out medals or anything of that nature?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is intended that any work of that kind should also be done by the Mint.

Ottawa Victoria Memorial Museum, $260,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building, all members of the committee know, has been under construction for a considerable time. This amount will complete the building with the exception of about $21,000. It will also provide for the fittings, the furniture, and the general equipment. The contract for the building was let some time ago to Mr. George Goodwin of Ottawa for the sum of $950,000. He was the lowest tenderer, and I think it is generally recognized by those who have seen the building that he is doing his work thoroughly and standing up under his contract in the most creditable manner. The chief architect's estimate of the cost of the building was $300,000 higher than Mr. Goodwin's tender, and the next tender was something like $300,000 more than his. Quite a number of tenders were received.

Mr. DANIEL. How much has been expended on it up to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 30th of September last $870,494.52.

Mr. CROCKET. What will the total cost of the building be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost under the present contract, including $75,000 for furnishing, heating, wiring, electric fixtures, elevators, &c., is $1,395,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the contract call for wiring and heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the contract for these was given to the present contractor of the building.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost of the wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the fixtures, $30,500.

Mr. CROCKET. And the heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $48,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the original estimate of the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the building alone, $1,250,000. And, if the fittings, furniture and everything of that character were added, it would be about $1,500,000.

Mr. DANIELS. I quite understand that. Is that the architect's estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His estimate was $1,250,000.

Mr. DANIEL. And the contractor tendered for $950,000. The architect was pretty far out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor may probably have been out.

Mr. DANIEL. He seems to be satisfied.

Mr. FIELDING. No, he is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The next lowest tender was the same as the architect's estimate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What proportion of the $1,400,000 was not let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The heating apparatus, the electric wiring, the elevators and the ventilation.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Have they all gone to Mr. Goodwin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. How was the price arrived at?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Our own staff went carefully into the matter.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. And did Mr. Goodwin accept their estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did, reluctantly and after a good deal of discussion and negotiation.

Mr. DANIEL. He is an experienced contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and a very reliable contractor.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How does the hon. minister justify the letting of $450,000 of this work without tender in view of the resolution passed by this House last session that public works should be let by tender? Because we had got a good bargain on a contract, we then proceed to let the balance to this same contractor without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must remember that there is still $100,000 of furniture which has not yet been let. What I said was that the heating apparatus, estimated at $38,600; the electric wiring, $30,000; elevators $32,000, and ventilation $27,000—total about $127,600 not $450,000, as the hon. member said had been let without tender. If I am asked to justify this, I do it on the principle announced last session and I happen to know that my statement then met with the approval of some of the most prominent of hon. gentlemen opposite, men who know Mr. Goodwin, the contractor, who know what a thoroughly honourable, reliable contractor he is, and who were satisfied, as I am satisfied, that he is standing up under a load which means $300,000 less than the work he is doing for the country is fairly worth, $300,000 less than the chief architect, who is a man of large experience, has certified the work to be worth. Under the practice which has prevailed ever since confederation, upon the certificate of the architect, the contractor for a building may be given the contract for the fittings also. And this is often to the great advantage of the country. I thought that under the circumstances of the present case it was not unreasonable that this work should be given to Mr. Goodwin at reasonable prices as ascertained by the chief architect after careful consideration. I believe that my course in this matter will meet with the approval of the majority of the members of this committee on both sides.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are we to understand that the minister (Mr. Pugsley) justifies the violation of a resolution of this House by the plea that some man who is honourable gets the benefit of that violation? That is the way I understand it—that, because Mr. Goodwin has the reputation of being an honourable man, the minister is justified in dealing with him in violation of the resolution of this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not understand that I have violated any resolution of this House.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there not a statute which requires all public works of the value of over $5,000 to be put up for public competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not in the way the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) states it.

Mr. CROCKET. There is some statute of that nature. I have not it before me. Did the minister let this work without tender on his own responsibility, or was there an order in council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an order in council authorizing me to take this course. I may say also that the making of that order in council was absolutely within the authority granted by the statute. I would also say that in the completion of a building of this character it is desirable that there should be no conflict beween those who are doing the electric wiring, putting in the heating apparatus and so on, and those engaged in the work of construction, There is, therefore, great advantage in having the work done by one contractor, provided that it is done at fair prices.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the system of ventilation of which the minister has spoken operated by means of fans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Do I understand that the contractor is making a loss of $300,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated that the contractor is doing the work for $300,000 less than the chief architect's estimate of the

cost, and $300,000 less than the next lowest tender, and I believe he is carrying a very heavy load in connection with it. How much he is losing I do not know. Mr. Goodwin belongs to the other side of politics but I give him credit for being too courageous a man and too good a contractor to come to us and cry about conditions which he has accepted. He has not stated to me what his loss is, but I beleive he is, as I have said, carrying a heavy load, and also he is doing his work in a very creditable manner.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister know whether the contractor is sustaining any loss at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not. All I know is that the chief architect was of the opinion he could not do the work without sustaining a loss.

Mr. DONNELLY. What was the reason that the heating apparatus and lighting was not included in the original advertisement for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certain practices grew up in the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And this practice began at a time which my hon. friend from Grenville and Leeds (Mr. Reid) said was the good old time, and it continued more or less until recently. The practice has been changed, and the chief architect has been instructed as far as possible to let all the work under one contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was not the policy applied to the construction of the residence we had under discussion this afternoon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had two under discussion, one was the departmental building and it will apply to that absolutely.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the other?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was done under the good old Conservative way.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the hon. minister converted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite a while ago.

Mr. BRADBURY. Was any change made in the construction of the building after the contract was let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tower was changed, but it was not much of a change.

Mr. BRADBURY. What did the change amount to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no extra cost and no saving either way. It did not add to the cost or take from it.

Mr. BRADBURY. If I understand rightly, there was quite a tower, 40 or 50 feet high, which was taken off. Surely that was some saving.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only the crown was taken off.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When will the building be ready for occupation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think in about six or eight months.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The hon. minister says he does not know that the contractor is losing any money at all. I think that usually when a government contractor is about to make a loss on his contract of some two or three hundred thousand dollars, he will make that public; and since this contractor has not done so, my opinion is he is not losing anything. Is the minister still employing that architect. There is $300,000 difference between the contract and the estimate of the chief architect. Is the minister still employing an architect who will make an estimate $300,000 more than the work will actually cost, according to the tender accepted? It seems to me that this was pretty wide of the mark.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend surely does not suggest that because a contractor may have made a mistake in his figuring and tendered at $300,000 less for an expensive building then he ought to have done, that implies that the chief architect had estimated the cost of the building as more than he ought to have done? There were several tenderers, men of the widest experience, some of the most practical and experienced contractors we have, whose figures were very close to the estimate of the chief architect, but some $300,000 higher than the tender of Mr. Goodwin. Had Mr. Goodwin not put in a tender, the government would have given the contract to the next lowest whose figures were very close to those of the chief architect. With regard to the latter, let me say this. Hon. gentlemen opposite have passed criticisms on his estimates. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) said that his estimate for the residence of the chief astronomer would be no doubt doubled when the actual cost of the completed building was ascertained. All I can say is that during the time I have been in the department, I have learned to have the very highest respect for the judgment, care and knowledge possessed by the chief architect. He has been in that position some 25 or 30 years, and has held, and deservedly enjoyed, the confidence of all governments which had charge of the administration of our affairs down to the present. I believe that he carefully safeguards the public interests in every way possible.

Mr. STAPLES. The Minister of Public Works appears very anxious to keep reiterating the question I put him a year ago. It is somewhat satisfactory for me to know that it was I who opened over a year ago the discussion that was settled on the floor

this afternoon. On that occasion the minister was gliding along with his estimates in that smooth manner of which he is past master; and when last year I asked certain questions, he assured us that this building would be constructed for not more than $16,000. I then made the statement that, from our past experience in the case of other public buildings, the cost of which very often doubles the original estimates, we might expect something similar in this case. Let me tell the minister that I think I can verify that statement even to-night. If he will go back to the first discussion on the Grand Trunk Pacific, he will find that the right hon. the Prime Minister told this House and the people that its cost would not be more than $13,000,000. What has that public institution cost up to date? Let me ask him what was the original estimated cost of the institution we are now discussing. Was it not about $300,000, and it has now amounted to over $600,000. You can go through the long list of smaller institutions, post offices, and other public buildings throughout the country, and if the hon. gentleman will take time to look through the Auditor General's Report and compare the actual costs with the original estimates, he will find that in many cases the former has doubled the latter. I hope the minister will now be satisfied and not again bring up my assertion that the cost of the residence of the chief astronomer would be double the original estimate. Let him wait until the residence is completed. Possibly then he will find, if the general reputation of this government for extravagance is lived up to, that I was not very far astray in that statement which I made a year ago. You are not through with the building yet. Next year the minister may listen to what we will have to say when he comes asking for a further amount to complete the construction of that building. I hope the minister will give me a little credit for the statement I made, and I think I would have no difficulty in verifying my statement if I desired to go back and review many of the buildings constructed by this government.

Eastern Departmental Block, revote, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of undertaking a work which was considered necessary some years ago and which was actually provided for but which the government thought might stand over, even although it was at some inconsiderable inconvenience to the departments which are occupying the Eastern block. The Finance Department particularly is in very great need of additional room. Additional room is required in connection with the Treasury Branch of that department which ought really, in the public interest, to have been provided some years ago. The Justice Department also requires additional room and it is very desirable that just as soon as possible the Department of External Affairs should be located in that building. The Minister of Finance reminds me that he is afraid that the room will all be required for the extension of the Finance Department. Still I hoped we might be able to have some of the other officials there. The total cost of this extension is estimated by the chief architect at $200,396. The addition will be 120 feet by 64 feet exclusive of the tower, two stories high, with an attic and basement It will contain 31 offices and 8 vaults. This estimate does not include the vault linings, which of course will necessarily cost a considerable sum.

Mr. DANIEL. Just before dinner the minister stated it was the intention to place the Department of External Affairs in the new building on Sussex street.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I will have to put in a word on this subject. I discover that a vote originally designed for the Finance Department is being appropriated to others and I want to warn the Minister of Public Works that until he provides adequate accommodation in that building for the Finance Department I do not want him to allot space to any other. If there is more than enough space to accommodate the Finance Department I do not object, but this vote was taken to provide much-needed accommodation in the way of vaults, etc. for the Finance Department ; it has been presented to the House in that way and I wish the Minister of Public Works to have it understood that he is to give only surplus accommodation to any other department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my understanding, the Finance Department is to have first claim on any accommodation constructed.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister stated that among other things this is to provide vaults.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I suppose that is where he keeps the surplus.

Mr. FIELDING. In these growing times the vaults that keep the surplus have to be enlarged.

Ottawa Public Buildings—instrument testing and standardizing building, Cliff street, revote, lapsed amount, $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is a standardizing building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A small building to be erected on the ordnance lot on Cliff St. for the purpose of standardizing the different instruments, such as surveying instruments, tape and chain measures. It is for

the testing and standardizing of the various instruments used in the Surveyor General's Branch of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. My understanding is that the standardizing of weights and measures is done in the Inland Revenue Department, and if they have a building for that purpose it would not seem to be in the interest of economy to establish another building to carry on the same work for the Interior Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for instruments to be used in the Surveyor General's Branch. The Interior Department send out many surveying parties during the year, and of course it is highly desirable that their instruments should be absolutely correct. If there is such a building in connection with the Inland Revenue Department, I am satisfied it is not sufficiently modern or sufficiently large to meet the demands of the Interior Department, because I have been informed there was formerly a building upon this lot for testing purposes belonging to the Inland Revenue Department. That building was destroyed and I do not think any building has been erected to take its place. The demand for this building has been before the Public Works Department for many years. It has been urged from time to time by the Department of the Interior and it has been represented in the strongest way that there was a necessity for a testing room where engineers can adjust and test their instruments.

Mr. DANIEL. How much will the building cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimate is $10,000.

Before passing from this item, why should we not pass the item of new departmental buildings and discuss it upon another item later? This afternoon the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) suggested that we might let the item for the new departmental buildings stand until the plans had been examined by the committee. But, I would think that it might be better to pass the whole item with the understanding that the matter could be discussed on concurrence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there would be a very serious objection because every one of these items requires to be questioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well; it was only to save time.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia—Digby public buildings, rewiring, &c., $1,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Will $1,000 complete the work which the minister has in view?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that will complete the wiring.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of building are you rewiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been reported that the building at Digby requires to be rewired to make it safe.

Halifax Dominion Building—improvements, repairs, &c., $60,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would suggest that as the members for Halifax are not here, we might pass over these six items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would agree to that if it were a new item, but it is simply to pay the contractor for the work being done on the building. I will let them discuss it on any other item.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the minister would give us a statement as to the cost and of the nature of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make a payment upon the work of remodelling the whole interior of the Halifax Dominion building. The floors are to be removed, only the walls and roof remaining.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the customs house or post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the old post office, and we are fitting it up now for post office purposes and for the Assistant Receiver General's office. The customs examining warehouse and the Inland Revenue office were removed to the new customs house building.

Mr. DANIEL. How much will it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $134,795.50.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the size of the building?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give the dimensions, but the hon. gentleman will remember, from his visits to Halifax, that this is the building facing the parliament buildings. It was erected before confederaton and is commonly known as the post office building. It was taken over by the Dominion government in an unfinished condition. It was then finished and several of the departments were located in it. The customs house was in one end, the post office in the other and half a dozen minor departments upstairs. Gradually it became necessary to hire three or four places in the city and some years ago it was determined to erect a new building right below, or nearer the waterside, for customs purposes. The customs house was removed and temporary accommodation was secured by the post office. This building, which is a very handsome one, is now being reconstructed for post office purposes. Nothing now remains but the walls and

part of the roof. It is really almost a new building. It is intended to be chiefly used for post office purposes, but there will be some space available for others. My own department is hiring quarters in another part of the city, and it is proposed to provide offices for the Assistant Receiver General in this new building. I think there may also be some space remaining for minor offices.

Mr. DANIEL. Will it take in the savings bank?

Mr. FIELDING. The Assistant Receiver General's office is the savings bank.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can now give the hon. gentleman the dimensions of this building. It occupies 125 feet on Cheapside and George streets, and 55 feet on Hollis street and Bedford road.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it built in a fire proof manner?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the building in reference to which the minister received a report of defective work on the part of the contractor?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that was the customs house.

Mr. JAMESON. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. M. E. Keefe.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the contract price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $94,000.

Mr. CROCKET. How does the minister account for the other $50,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In addition we require for heating and boilers, $7,500; electric fixtures, without wiring, $1,500; elevators, $8,500; vault lining and doors, $7,000; contingencies and superintendence, $14,150.

Mr. CROCKET. Were these matters put up to tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. In all cases?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the exception of the elevators, for the reason that we make a contract for the Otis-Fensom elevator because we think it—perhaps it is quite a strong thing to say—the only thoroughly safe electric elevator built in Canada.

Mr. CROCKET. That is a good advertisement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is. If it were not for that we could not justify the letting of the contract without tenders.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Did just one contractor get the work?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not the same contractor.

Halifax Quarantine Station, on Lawlor's island—repairs and renewals, $3,500.

Mr. DANIEL. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Repairing the wharf. It was reported in a dangerous condition.

Lunenburg Public Building—improvements, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the payment in connection with the installation of the clock in the tower and for wiring. The building is to be lighted by electricity.

Mr. SPROULE. If an election comes on in Ottawa I would like either to have a new clock put in the tower of this building or some very great improvement made in the clock, because it is now impossible to tell the time by it. I think we have a right to expect that the government will take steps to have this clock repaired remembering what they have done in that direction in Waterloo.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I admit the clock is acting very badly and I have taken the necessary steps to have it put in order.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would also remind the minister that we are very badly in need of a clock in No. 89.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has been ordered.

Mr. HENDERSON. Ordered a year ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be there in a few days, possibly to-morrow, but I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year I called the attention of the minister to the fact that the cellar of this building got flooded during rainstorms, and that there were some complaints with regard to the quality of the cement work, and saying that the contract was not being properly carried out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be some other building.

Mr. BLAIN. No, it was this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't remember anything of the kind.

Mr BLAIN. I have it here on 'Hansard.' The minister did not know anything about it last year and he seems to know less now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman read what is in 'Hansard?'

Mr. BLAIN. I will send over 'Hansard' and the hon, gentleman can read it for himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh yes, I see that the hon. gentleman did make a complaint but I regret that I do not remember making any inquiry about it as I seem to have

promised. My hon. friend did not mention it again during the session and I suppose when the rain stopped there was no further ground for complaint.

Mr. BLAIN. I had a complaint before me that the sidewalk was not completed according to contract and the minister led the committee to believe that he would inquire into it.. He now seems to have forgotten all about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no complaint in the department and I have asked the chief architect to make a further note with reference to what my hon. friend says.

North Sydney immigration shed, $2,500.

Mr. JAMESON. Where will the shed be located?

Mr PUGSLEY. It is an addition to the Intercolonial railway shed for the accommodation of immigrants.

Parrsboro' public building, $15,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the department own the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We bought it.

Mr. DANIEL. What will be the total cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not the plans but Parrsboro' is quite a nice town, and I suppose we would give them a building that would run up to $25,000. It will be for a custom house, post office, &c.

Mr. DANIEL. Have you called for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. CROCKET. What did the site cost and from whom was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was bought from Mrs. Vickery for $3,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the size of the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It fronts on Main street, Station street and Spring street, on one street 69 feet, on the other 96, and the other 77 feet.

Mr. JAMESON. When will tenders be asked for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the coming year; as soon as we get the plans ready.

Mr. DANIEL. How does it come to front on three streets; I do not understand how that can be unless the block is very small?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite possible that it can front on three streets. You will find a building fronting on three streets in St. John city, and for example the Flat Iron building in New York.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like the minister to give the facts about this and not be drawing on his imagination?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Strange as it may seem these are the exact dimensions on the various streets.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not see how it can possibly front on three streets unless of course the block is very small.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why, my dear friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh pardon me. I was going to say that it almost paralyses one to think that my hon. friend does not know that a building could have a frontage on three streets.

Mr. DANIEL. They must be very small lots in that town.

Mr. LANCASTER. What streets will it front on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the three streets.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many sides on the building?

Mr. GRAHAM. Two, the inside and the outside.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the committee should get down to business and have some sensible information from the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman ask me a question?

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister seems to think this is a great joke.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister is the most serious man in the room.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister thinks it a great joke to compare this building with a flat iron building or a round iron building or a smooth iron building in New York.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Railways says hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. No he did not.

Mr. LANCASTER. Perhaps the minister will now tell us the dimensions of the building on each of these three streets.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building has not been laid out, but if you take the dimensions you will find that the lot is just of a size upon which you can construct a building suitable for a town of that size and having a frontage on three streets. Of course there may not be an entrance on each of these three streets but it will have a frontage on each.

Mr. LANCASTER. Which is the main street it will front on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the Main street.

Mr. LANCASTER. I might want to go down there to see this wonderful building

and I do not want to get mixed up looking for a building something like the flat iron building in New York which the minister has referred us to for a comparison. The minister ought to be able to give us some description of the building before he asks us for a vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman who is usually so serious should, now when we are dealing with the important question of voting public moneys lapses into frivolities and attempt to disturb the serious calm of this committee.

Shelburne public building, $3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the Minister of Finance promise that at the by-election or the general election?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not promise it either time.

Wolfville public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to enter into a contract for the erection of a building at Wolfville which is a very rising town.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not the plans prepared as yet but I should think this building ought to be erected for $20,000. It is a very nice town and there should be a building which would be creditable to it, but I think $20,000 would cover the cost.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Are we to understand that when the minister gives an estimate of the total cost of these buildings that under the new arrangement, that includes the heating and the lighting and everything pertaining to the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I intend to cover that; I may be astray of course until the details are worked out.

Mr. BLAIN. What did the site cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $4,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost including site, and everything else when the building will be ready for occupation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say absolutely but what we have in mind is a building which will cost, including the site, in the vicinity of $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a vote for this building in 1908 and how does it come that although the $900 voted then was not expended he is asking for this sum now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I explained in the House last year that owing to the state of the revenue a large number of these public works were dropped in the estimates and Wolfville was one of the number.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the buildings at Shelburne and Wolfville have clocks and towers?

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not yet thought of a clock for the Wolfville building but there is one to be provided for Shelburne.

Charlottetown drill hall extension, $4,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is this the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for the work we intend doing.

Summerside public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to replace the present slate roof which is in a bad state of repair. This will complete.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention to call for tenders for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not yet decided as to that, but I think very likely we shall. We shall if the work can be done by tender as well as by day's work.

Mr. BLAIN. That is rather indefinite. Surely the minister has a policy as to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The policy of the department is to call for tenders as far as possible for all public works, but in some cases we find that certain works, such as repairs to a wharf, can be done more cheaply by day's work than by tender. In some cases we have called for tenders, and the tenders have been higher than the chief architect or the chief engineer has reported to be fair and reasonable, and we have done the work by day's labour and done it for less than the amount of the lowest tender. The present work, I think, we can do by tender, and we intend to ask for tenders.

Public Buildings, New Brunswick—Bathurst public building—repairs and renewals, &c., $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is to make provision for repairs and renewals and also for a concrete sidewalk along the front and side of the building.

Mr. BLAIN. In the New Brunswick items I notice five revotes of amounts previously voted which have now lapsed. May I ask if every vote for the province of New Brunswick which has lapsed is renewed in these items, or has my hon. friend made a selection of some?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember any items that have been dropped.

Fairville public building—revote of $3,000 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to enable us to enter into a contract for the building. The site was purchased pursuant to a vote passed in 1908.

Mr. DANIEL. How much will the building cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $25,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What will it contain?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A post office, and we trust also a savings bank.

Mr. DANIEL. Will there be room for a janitor in the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. This is not on three streets?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it fronts on the main street. I may say that Fairville is a very important town. The monev paid out in wages alone averages about $450,000 in the year. My hon. friend knows that it is one of the most important manufacturing cities in the Dominion of Canada. It has a large number of mills, a very large pulp industry and other industries, quite a number of important business houses and some fine residences. There is a very thrifty population settled at Fairville and its vicinity, and I think it is well entitled to a public building.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite agree with the minister that the town of Fairville is growing and increasing rapidly, and that it is as much entitled to a post office building as other towns of the same size, or towns of even smaller size which are getting them.

Fredericton Dominion public building—government share of cost of permanent pavements put down by the municipal corporation on Queen and Carleton streets, $2,934.87.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This payment is in accordance with the principle of paying the frontage tax where granolithic sidewalks or asphalt pavements are being constructed by the municipality.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the whole of the government's share of the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the whole, as made up by the officials of my department, though there is a little difference between the city and my department. This will be paid to the city.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the government's share half the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My understanding is that we shall pay half the cost of the pavement on that side of the street immediately in front of the government building; in other words, one-fourth of the total cost of both sides.

Mr. CROCKET. I think the impression in Fredericton is that the government was agreed to pay one-half of the whole cost. I suppose the department has an agreement with the city in the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Grand Falls public building—revote of $4,050 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will enable us to enter into a contract for construction.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the total estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The total cost will be $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Are the plans prepared yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet. Grand Falls is a thriving growing town with magnificent water-power, the best east of Niagara, and it is expected that there will be development of that power very soon. I think that the town is well entitled to a public building, and there is at present no public building in the county of Victoria of which Grand Falls is the shire town.

Mr. BLAIN. When the hon. gentleman first introduced this proposed expenditure, he said to the committee that the cost of the building would be only $15,000 or $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That probably did not include heating and wiring.

Hartland public buildings, $5,000.

Mr. MAGRATH. I do not object to revotes, but when it comes to a question of voting for the first time public moneys for public buildings in this country, I want to remind the hon. gentleman of a question I brought to his attention last year. That was the necessity for a post office at Lethbridge, not for the purpose of beautifying the city of Lethbridge but of meeting the necessities of the people. Over a year ago I received a communication from the post office authorities stating that relief could only be secured by a public building. My duty, I presume, ends when I draw the attention of the government to that feature. I did that very fully last year. I see that no provision is made for a post office there in the estimates this year. I realize that this country is growng and that it is almost impossible to keep pace with its needs, but at the same time there are instances, this is one, when something must be done. Only to-day I received a letter from a business gentleman in the city of Lethbridge referring to business matters, and he added this postscript:

Can you not impress on the department the necessity of providing a post office here. The congestion is out of all reason.

I suppose the hon. minister is aware of that. I do not know that I could do any more than what I did last year and what I am attempting to do now. I have a question on the Order Paper that will come up on Monday, and I want to put myself on

record now. When it comes to providing votes for new buildings, I would like the hon. minister to understand that the people in the west will have every opportunity to consider these matters and will hold the government responsible. It is not a question of partyism but merely of meeting the needs of the people in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that there are not many new votes for public buildings in these estimates. I have endeavoured as far as possible to implement the pledge which was given parliament two years ago. I said then that the public works which had been provided for previously and which had been left out on the estimates were works which were simply postponed, and that when the turn in the tide came, so far as revenues are concerned, I would ask parliament to revote the amounts in order to enable the Department of Public Works to proceed with these various undertakings except in cases where, on further investigation, I was satisfied that they were not required, or not immediately required in the public interest. I think it will be found that in nearly all cases that promise has been carried out in the estimates now before the committee. The case of Lethbridge is one which certainly appeals to me. I have been very glad to learn of the rapid progress which has been made by that enterprising town; but it will be found, in the estimates on page 60, that three amounts are given for Lethbridge. We are asking for a vote of $10,000 for an armoury, we are asking for a vote of $6,000 for the enlargement of the customs house and Dominion land office and also for a vote of $6,000 for the immigration building.

Mr MAGRATH. These are revotes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not care, you are going to have them. It does not seem unreasonable that the question of erecting a post office at Lethbridge might stand over for consideration at the next session of parliament in view of the fact that we are asking for three expenditures on public buildings in that town.

Mr. MAGRATH. Our view points appear to be different. It is not a question with me of satisfying the people of Lethbridge by distributing some of their taxes within their own boundaries, but a question of supplying the absolute needs of the people. I have not raised my voice in this committee with reference to any revote, and I do not propose to do so; but when it comes to new votes I want the fullest information as to the absolute need of this money being spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As regards Hartland, it is proposed that this building shall be utilized for a post office and also for an armoury. I am inclined to think that Hartland has grown to be a place of sufficient importance to have a branch customs house there also, which will be accommodated in this building. The militia have been urgently asking for an armoury, and I think I can say that there is just as much demand, at all events for this building, in the town of Hartland as there is for a post office in the town of Lethbridge. I may say further that there is no other vote for any other purpose in Hartland, while there are votes for three different purposes in the town of Lethbridge.

Mr. MAGRATH. Perhaps we might as well settle this matter now. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that there is no possibility of anything being placed for a post office in the city of Lethbridge? We have there to-day a population of 15,000. There is no place in the country which is growing so rapidly. It is growing by leaps and bounds, and people have to stand out in the street waiting their turn to get into the post office and everybody is complaining. If it is understood that absolutely nothing is available for a post office in Lethbridge this year, we ought to know it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is nothing in the estimates for a post office there this year, and I cannot put anything in them now. I am not aware that there will be any supplementary estimates. There may or may not be. On that point, I can give no assurance whatever. All I can say now is that there is no provision for a post office for Lethbridge in the present estimates. I am glad to know that Lethbridge is growing so rapidly, but it has only begun to take on its rapid growth in the last year or two. If it is a place the size my hon. friend says it is—and I have heard from other sources that it is—I recognize that we must very soon provide a post office for that town.

Mr. MAGRATH. I must call the hon. gentleman to order—for that city.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure that the principle laid down by the hon. minister for the erection of public buildings is just what it should be. I understand he proposes to complete all the public works that were promised some two years ago before he undertakes any new ones.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I did not say that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that not the policy of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we were told a year ago that the intention of the government was that where a public building had been promised prior to the time when

the revenues of the country began to fall off and the government was forced to drop a great many public works which they had intended to prosecute, they would, before putting any new votes on their list, complete what they had promised. Is not that, in fact, the policy of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may have drawn that conclusion from my remarks, but it is possible that he was not here during all the time when I was urging these estimates in committee—because I had to answer a good many questions put by hon. members who were annoyed at certain items being left over last year. I said that, speaking generally—I used that expression advisedly—that would be the policy of the department. But I also said that there would probably be cases in which, on making further investigation, I might be satisfied that there was not the urgent demand in the public interest for the work which I had been led to suppose there was, and that there might be buildings in other cities or towns, other harbour or river works, more urgently required and for which we must provide. But, I repeat, I said that, speaking generally, the public works provided for in the estimates of 1907-8, but which we were obliged to postpone on account of the condition of the public revenues would be the first taken up.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is little difference between the minister's recollection and my own on that point. As to my possibly not having been present at the debates on the estimates, I may say that I came here last session on the day of the opening of the House, I left Ottawa after the gun had fired for prorogation, and I had never been out of the city during the entire session and had never missed a day sitting in this House. So, possibly, I may have been present—I think I was present at practically all the discussions that took place with regard to the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member (Mr. Henderson) was here pretty often.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and the minister may find that I shall be here pretty often this session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope so.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we have a right to arrive fairly at the conclusion that there is practically no difference between my recollection and the minister's recollection of what the policy was. I do not mean to say that there was to be absolutely no exception to the rule. But I would remind the minister that in the estimates prior to the last general election a great many buildings were promised. They were pre-election promises.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister knows as well as I do that a great many public buildings were promised throughout this country just prior to the general election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member said they were 'pre-election promises.' That would connect one with the other.

Mr. HENDERSON. Pre-election promises are promises made before an election. I will allow the members of this House to draw their own inferences as to why these promises were made just before the general election. Of course, I do not accuse the minister —I should decidedly refrain from accusing him—of making these promises for any ulterior purpose. But there is the fact—public buildings were promised from one end of this country to the other which this House did not regard as being urgently needed, and the general impression was that they were pre-election promises made for election purposes. These were all buildings that came under the estimates of 1908. Now I mention that it would not be fair, these buildings having been promised prior to the general election, and especially if they were offered for election purposes, to give them the preference over other buildings that are urgently needed, such as the post office in the city of Lethbridge. I do not see why, if a post office had been promised in my county—which it was not—prior to the election and for the purpose of influencing the electorate, but yet not needed, the government should go on and build that public work to the neglect of other places that have not been so fortunate as to get a promise prior to election. All these pre-election promises should be dropped, and the minister should start afresh and deal with the needs of each county as if these pre-election promises had not been made. Only so will justice be done to all localities. I hope that on reconsidering the matter, and in considering the supplementary estimates, this idea will be allowed for—because I can inform the minister, we will and are likely to have supplementary estimates. In twenty-two sessions I have never seen a session in which there were no supplementary estimates, and, as I have observed, new work generally appears in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were not many last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. That was immediately after the election—no, there were not many, but there were some. As I say, new works generally appear first in the supplementary estimates. No doubt, we should have a recurrence of that this session, though not perhaps to the same extent as in former years. I hope that my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Magrath) will not

be forgotten when the supplementary estimates are in preparation.

Mr. CROCKET. What is to be the total cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope that it will not exceed $10,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that it is to be for post office and armoury. Is it not unusual to build these two together?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is; but I believe it would be a very good idea to adopt the practice more generally—in towns of this character to have part of the public building used as an armoury in which the arms and stores of the militia are to be safely kept.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the size of the garrison in Hartland?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here at the moment.

Mr. MAGRATH. Has the minister any idea of the population of this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should say from 1,200 to 1,500. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) would know.

Mr. CROCKET. I should think the minister's estimate is not far astray. What proportion of the cost is assigned to the armoury in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not divided; it all comes under my department.

Mr. CROCKET. I should think the architect could tell us how much the armoury would increase the cost of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not the plans prepared. I will be able to give the hon. member that information next year.

Hillsborough — public building—revote of $4,970 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site for this building, which is admirably suited for the purpose, has been given free to the Crown by the Hillsborough Manufacturing Company. I have about the same statement to make with regard to this building as with regard to the other; I think this work should be entirely completed, including heating apparatus and fixtures, for something under $20,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I suppose this site was given by Mr. Osman in return for the wharf made for the manufacturing company by the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wharf?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know of any wharf given to the company. My hon. friend is mistaken. The wharf built there is a public wharf, built for the convenience of the public.

Mr. CROCKET. The money was voted and expended for an extension of a wharf which is used exclusively by the Albert Manufacturing Co. That is the information I have in regard to the Pink Rock wharf and that the public derive no benefit from that wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be more convenient to discuss the item of the Pink Rock wharf when we come to harbours and rivers. The trouble with my hon. friend is, and I think it is a misfortune for him, that he is all the time thinking of hidden motives and interested motives and improper motives. As far as Mr. Osman, the manager of the Albert Manufacturing Company, is concerned, I say to my hon. friend that he cannot get a man in New Brunswick, outside of himself, to deny it —there is no more honourable, straightforward man in the whole Dominion of Canada than Charles J. Osman. His company is carrying on an enormous manufacturing business whose sales extend throughout the eastern United States and a large part of the Dominion of Canada. As far as this wharf at Pink Rock is concerned, the company gave the right to use it to the public and the Crown is extending that wharf for the public convenience and to facilitate a large business in connection with which hundreds of men receive employment in that vicinity and many thousands of dollars are expended annually. I do not know of any wharf built by the Crown for such a small amount which affords so much convenience or gives such accommodation as the extension of this wharf. As far as the public building is concerned, the company were anxious to see a public building erected and they generously gave a site for the purpose.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to state that he did not propose to discuss the subject of the Pink Rock wharf, and then he proceeds to discuss it. My reference to the Pink Rock wharf was simply in connection with the minister's statement that this site for a post office was given so generously by his friend, Mr. Osman. I am not here to make any reflection upon Mr. Osman. It is a favourite method of the minister, whenever a fact is stated which might inure to the detriment of his department, to sound the praises, the high character and great reputation enjoyed by this and that gentleman. The House will remember that in the session of last year he sang the praises of another very distinguished friend of his in New Brunswick as one who enjoyed the highest reputation from end to end of the

Dominion, against whom not one word could be spoken, his bosom friend, George McAvity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear, as honest a man as any in Canada.

Mr. CROCKET. The gentleman who got away with the $36,000 rake-off in the Mayes contract, Mr. Mayes being the same gentleman from whom the Minister of Public Works received the $2,000 note which he would have the members of this House believe was received for professional services.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And what does the hon. gentleman insinuate it was received for?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the discussion is wandering away from the item before the committee. I must ask the hon. member to confine himself to the item before the committee.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has asked a question——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister may ask a question which it is not proper to answer, within the rules of the House. I rule that the hon. gentleman is wandering away from the point at issue and ask him to confine his remarks to the item before the committee.

Mr. CROCKET. I am simply replying to some observations made by the minister which grew out of this item, and you will remember, Mr. Chairman, how the matter arose. The minister was referring to his friend's great generosity in donating a site as if he were a public benefactor, and in connection with that statement the thought came to me of certain information which had been communicated to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. The way the matter arose was this. I stated——

Mr. SPROULE. What is the point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has not stated correctly how the matter arose. I stated that this site had been donated by the Albert Manufacturing Company. The hon. gentleman then said: I suppose it was in return for the wharf which the government generously built for Mr. Osman at Pink Rock. That was an insinuation, in my judgment, which is not worthy of an hon. member of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point is, I think; scarcely a point of order; it is rather one of correction. I will still ask the hon. members to confine themselves to the item before the House. I think I cannot properly allow the discussion to wander to the items the hon. gentleman has been bringing forward.

Mr. CROCKET. You will understand that I am speaking solely because of a statement and some reflections that the minister sought to cast on myself. I did not rise to a question of order when he described me as a gentleman always seeking for some hidden motives, which statement, I think, transgressed the rules of the House; and it was because of that state ment and that statement solely that I rose to reply to the minister. When I referred in connection with this observation of the minister to matters that grew out of the very reference of the minister, then the minister seeks to call me to order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. CROCKET. But if the minister wishes me to answer his question as to what I suppose and believe he got the $2,000 note for I am prepared to state my belief. I believe the statement of Mr. Mayes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has made the statement to this committee that he believes the statement of Mr Mayes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement of Mr. Mayes is false, and the hon. gentleman should take that back, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have refused to allow the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) to continue the discussion along the lines on which he was proceeding. I must still adhere to that. I did not want to be too abrupt, I could not tell to what extent he desired to go in continuing to speak, but the point that is under discussion is the Hillsborough public building. I will not, as far as my power goes, allow the discussion to wander to the items that have been brought forward. It is always impossible, where there has been attack and reply to cut short discussion at a point that will please each hon. gentleman. In that respect I may not be able to satisfy every one, but I must ask the committee to confine itself entirely to the Hillsborough public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did you hear the hon. gentleman state that he believed the statement of Mr. Mayes?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A man who either in this House or outside—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say that Mr. Mayes is a shameless and wicked perjurer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Moncton—public building—addition to building and alterations to fittings, $10,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the minister will explain this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make an addition to the public building at Moncton, 35 x 27 feet. We are to make some alterations to the fittings, modernizing it. The estimated cost of the addition is $8,500; alterations to the fittings, $600; contingencies and superintendence, $900, total, $10,000. We expect this amount will finish the improvements to the building.

St. John drill hall, $35,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the minister will explain this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is intended to erect a drill hall in St. John, and for that purpose the Crown has expropriated a site which I think is admirably adapted for the purpose, on Sheffield street, between Wentworth and Sydney streets, taking in two blocks near the exhibition grounds. Although we have expropriated the land, we have not yet made the payments to the owners because they have not agreed to take the amount which has been offered, and it is possible we may have to place the matter before the Exchequer Court, although I trust that an amicable arrangement will be made. We had a small appropriation last year which will be available for the payment of the land up to the 31st of next March, and with the vote we are asking for now we will be able to have the tenders called for and a contract for the erection of the drill hall entered into. For a good many years there has been a recognized necessity for a drill hall at St. John. The present one is quite old. It is a wooden building and it is not at all well adapted for the purposes of the militia. I think I can safely assure the committee that this work is absolutely required in the interests of the militia and the public.

Mr. DANIEL. From the minister's statement, I judge that the plans of this drill hall have been already prepared. Is that correct?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans were prepared some years ago, but we have not prepared new plans for a building upon this site. It may be that there will be some change necessary. Possibly some slight alterations in the old plans will be all that will be required. We could not prepare the new plans until we got the requisite vote for the purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. What is to be the size of the building? Has the minister any details at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend at present. We have a memorandum from the Department of Militia as to what they require, but we have not yet decided to erect a building according to the requirements of the Militia Department. However the Militia Department suggests a building 199 feet by 124, with two wings at the rear, each 40 feet square. They ask that the drill hall shall be 193 by 80. There will be two wings upon the building according to the suggestion of the Department of Militia, and it will be two stories with a basement. It will contain armouries for eight companies of infantry. It will also have a gun shed, wagon shed, harness room, and armouries for the garrison artillery, army service corps and bearer company. Whether we can meet the views of the Militia Department entirely, I am not prepared to say. The estimated cost of a building such as the Militia Department ask for would be about $200,000. Whether we can afford to erect a building of that high character or not, I am not prepared at the moment to say.

Mr. DANIEL. Could the minister give any idea when these plans will be available so that they can be seen? Have any orders been given yet to make the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not have the plans made until the estimate had passed parliament. Just how soon the plans will be ready will depend on how soon the estimates go through; I presume some time during the spring or summer.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it that this item is just to pay for the land expropriated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, to do more than that. I rather hope that we will get the land paid for out of the money which we have available during the current year.

Mr. DANIEL. That is only $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have $12,500, and we hope that $10,000 will pretty well pay for the land.

Mr. BRADBURY. There have been a great many of these buildings before the committee to-night, and it struck me as strange that the minister has never produced a plan. It would facilitate matters very much if plans of proposed buildings were laid before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am asking in these estimates for 1,200 different works. If I brought down 1,200 different plans of public buildings and wharfs they would fill this whole room and nobody would look at them. If there is any plan which my hon. friend desires to see, or any information he wishes, I will be very glad to give him a note to the chief architect and he can go and look the plan over. Plans have never been

brought to the committee unless specially asked for in some particular case.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to bring down a plan of the building that fronts on those three streets that we inquired about a little while ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As soon as that plan is ready I will be very happy to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another duty devolving upon the minister which he has not yet fulfilled. He is proposing to undertake the erection of a building which he says, according to the judgment of the Militia Department, will cost $200,000. He asks a vote for that. Whether he has or has no plans it seems to me that an intelligent business department would reach some understanding as to what they intended to build and as to about how much it is going to cost and let the House know what that cost is going to be before we vote any money to commence the undertaking. We want to know what we are committing ourselves to, the size of the building, whether there is a need of the building or not, whether what the people ask for is more than they should get and what the government have decided that they are prepared to do in supplying the needs of the people in that place. In other words give us all the information we ought to have to enable us to decide whether we ought to vote that money or refuse to vote it. We ought to know what we are committing ourselves to because afterwards we are confronted with the arguments that we ought to have taken our objection to it when the vote was asked and before the money was spent. Now we are committed to it, contracts have been let and we are obliged to vote the money if we think it wise or not. We want the information at the proper time, and this seems to be the proper time to get the information with regard to this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to be governed in my department very largely by what, in so far as drill halls and armouries are concerned, are the requirements of the Militia Department. My hon. friend can see that it would not be wise to erect a drill hall which, when it was completed, would not give the accommodation required for the militia.

Mr. SPROULE. It is on the basis of that information that council decides whether it is wise or unwise to put that item in the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As far as St. John is concerned, it was decided years ago to give them a new drill hall. I think it was decided ten or fifteen years ago, when the old government was in power. I think it has been the view of the different ministers that when a new drill hall should be erected in the city of St. John, it should be one that would be creditable to the city and the country and would give the militia the requisite accommodation. St. John is a very important city, having a population, with its suburbs, of about 55,000. The military spirit is very strong in St. John. It has a regiment of artillery and one of infantry, and it has been felt by both officers and men that great injustice has been done to them in not giving them a drill hall long before this. If we can get the cost of the building below $200,000, we will do so, but I cannot hold out to the committee any expectation that the cost will be less. If it costs that much, it will not be as expensive as the drill hall at Halifax or the one at Hamilton, not nearly as expensive as the one it is proposed to erect in the city of Toronto, and I doubt if it will be very much more expensive than the one erected in the city of Sherbrooke. Nobody will say that $200,000 for a drill hall and armoury in a city of the size and importance of St. John is an excessive amount, provided it is built substantially of brick and stone and fireproof material, and we do propose that it shall be constructed in a very substantial manner.

Mr. SPROULE. A good deal of what the minister has said is outside of the question altogether. I was not arguing that St. John was not entitled to a drill hall or whether it was costing too little or too much. I was arguing that when the minister submits an item for a new building or a new work of any kind, he should have some data to submit to parliament showing how his estimate was arrived at. I think he ought to tell us what data he placed before Council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have told my hon. friend that the Militia Department has asked my department to provide a drill hall and armoury of a size which my chief architect estimates will cost $200,000. Until the architect prepares his plans and details I am not prepared to say positively whether or not we can provide a suitable building for less. All I can say is that I do not believe the cost will exceed $200,000. If I can save anything on that, I will do so.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say that this matter of a drill hall for St. John has been befor parliament on several occasions and items have been frequently placed in the estimates for it. I think that in the very first year that I came here I found an item for it in the estimates. So far nothing has materialized, and yet there is no place in the whole Dominion that needs a drill hall more than St. John. I believe that the old drill shed there now was about the first one built in Canada. It is of wood and in wet weather one cannot keep dry in it without an umbrella. The garrison there con-

sists of a regiment of artillery and a regiment of infantry besides the Army Service corps and the Army Medical corps and we have also to house the heavy 4.7 guns which require a good deal of room. When a drill hall and armoury is to be built there, it would be very foolish to build it of anything but brick and stone. The armoury at Halifax cost from $500,000 to $750,000. In St. John we are not looking so much for extravagant expenditure as for the erection of a really needed armoury and drill hall; and comparing the cost of similar buildings in various parts of the country, members of this House will hardly expect to get anything there worthy of the name and suitable for the requirements at anything less than $200,000.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge island—water service and improvements, and repairs to buildings, &c., $2,500.

Mr. DANIEL. There is great complaint from the Water and Sewerage Board of the city of St. John of the great wastage from leaky pipes carrying water from the west side of the harbour to Partridge Island, and in connection with this I will read a short item which I have taken from one of the St. John papers:

Improvement needed.—Residents of Lancaster and Carleton Heights complain of the frequent scarcity of water. Carleton water officials say that the great trouble is the enormous leakage through the pipes to Partridge island.

This leakage, which has existed for some time, grows constantly greater despite all efforts to check it. According to dwellers on the heights, the scarcity of water is often a very great inconvenience, and the condition is such that vigorous efforts should be made to meet the conditions.

This is a statement made in the press. And certainly statements are current that there is a very great leakage from this pipe adjoining the service in St. John West with Partridge island. The pipe is under water, and it may be difficult to find the leak, nevertheless there should be some way of finding it and stopping it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know there are complaints of leakage, and some time ago I gave directions to have the matter looked into. As soon as possible it will be remedied. The pipes are laid a considerable distance under water. Whether the action of the salt water affects the pipes injuriously or not I am not prepared to say. We are constantly trying to overcome the leak by having a diver go along the pipe frequently. I do not know what is to be done, but I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) that the matter is having the earnest attention of the department.

Mr. DANIEL. Whereabouts is the meter situated—on the Carleton side or on the island side? In other words, who is paying for the leakage, the government or the city of St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect is not quite sure, he tells me. He thinks that recently one was placed on the Carleton side, and if that was done, I suppose it was to make the department pay for the waste.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the way it ought to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. DANIEL. As a citizen of St. John, I would like to know whether the city is or is not paying for the leakage due to the officials of the Department of Public Works not attending to this matter. It must be quite a large amount in the run of a year, and I would like to know——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department is a very good customer of the city for water.

Mr. DANIEL. Not very good. Where is the meter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have to find that out. The chief architect says it was formerly on Partridge island, but he thinks that latterly one was put over on the Carleton side.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. minister get that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to-night.

Mr. DANIEL. When?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On Monday, probably.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge island—to provide for full and final settlement of contractor George McArthur's claims for works performed, &c., in connection with his contract of 26th August, 1904, for the erection of two detention buildings and a hospital, $301.80.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the full amount of the claim?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so. At all events, it is all I am prepared to recommend.

Tracadie Lazaretto—house and barn, &c., $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a residence and barn for the doctor at the Tracadie Lazaretto. It is urgently asked for by the medical superintendent.

Public Works — chargeable to income—Maritime provinces generally — Dominion public buildings — renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $15,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the same amount as last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is one other item that, I am sure, the committee will

pass without hesitation. I refer to the item in the supplementary estimates.

Ottawa Military Stores building—to make good the damage caused by fire, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is necessary in order to enable the department to go on with the work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did the fire occur?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as we can judge it must have been caused by electric wiring getting in contact with some inflammable material.

Mr. LANCASTER. In what part of the building did the fire start?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The upper part.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any insurance on the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the government is its own insurer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the government buildings all liable to be burned down through defective wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know just what the question means. Fires are liable to occur at any moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are not liable to occur from the wiring if that wiring is put in properly insulated. I ask if public buildings are liable to be burned down because of defective wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there ought to be very little risk, but there is a risk. The insulation may be removed from a wire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there no supervision or regulation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the experts inspect it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do they know about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whatever experts know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY Well, for one thing, that if the wire is properly insulated and properly installed, the danger of fire from the wires is reduced to a minimum. But sometimes, I believe, the insulation may be removed. For instance a rat may gnaw off the insulating material.

Mr. SPROULE. I see by the press that the inspector of one of the insurance companies, looking over many Canadian buildings recently, declared that there was but a very small percentage of them wired in a reasonably safe manner, while many were very dangerously wired and liable to fire, and showing that it was of great importance that some inspector should look over these buildings and determine whether the wiring had been done properly or not. Has the government assigned that duty to any person? Have they been in the habit of examining these buildings to see whether they are correctly wired or whether the method of wiring may give rise to danger?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When government buildings are being erected, we have an electrical expert who examines very carefully the wiring to see that it is properly insulated, and from time to time we have the electric wiring inspected. In the items we have passed here are some amounts for rewiring which is the result of examination. Some years ago there was not the same care taken with respect to insulating wires which is taken to-day. Electric wiring is much safer to-day than it was some years ago, because greater care is taken to insulate the wires.

Mr. SPROULE. When was this building last examined as regards the safety of the wiring and how frequently do these inspections take place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect informs me that they are inspected very frequently. I cannot say from week to week or from month to month, but from time to time inspection is made.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any record taken when these inspections are made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say to-night when the last inspection was made?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the building last examined for rats?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend makes a joke of the rat question, but it is more serious than he imagines. I think that rats and mice are responsible for more fires than people give them credit for, in the friction of matches and the destroying of the insulation of wire.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the hon. gentleman have any investigation made to ascertain what was really the cause of this fire?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Militia Department did, but my hon. friend will see how difficult it must be to ascertain just how the fire occurred, provided it resulted from the wiring, and we are not able to trace it to any other cause. If it resulted from the wiring, that is in a part of the building which was destroyed, and it will be impossible to ascertain with what the electric wires came in contact.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the total amount of the loss?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $150,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. minister would do what any ordinary company would do, which had to pay that amount

of money, he would not be satisfied to guess at the cause of the fire. No insurance company would pay out that amount and content itself with guessing whether the fire was caused by rats or mice as the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building was occupied by the Militia Department and was known as the militia stores building. I understand that the Militia Department made an investigation, but I am not in a position to say what has been the result, and the Minister of Militia is not here to give it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then the hon. gentleman should not ask us to pass that item without such information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We must repair the building at once. It would be the greatest folly not to do so. We must have a roof put on to prevent the rain coming in and destroying valuable property.

Mr. LANCASTER. But we want the repairs done in such a way that the building will not burn down within another week or two.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend need have no fears with regard to the electric wiring, because now that is carried in steel conduits. I would be very glad to give all the information on this subject and will get it from the Department of Militia and lay it before the House, but I would ask the committee to pass the item so that we may get to work with the least possible delay.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister say that the government carry no insurance on the property but insure it themselves. What kind of insurance is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course there is no policy issued, but owing to the large number of buildings owned by the government it has always been thought less expensive not to insure at all, because the losses would not be so heavy as the cost of the premiums.

Mr. COWAN. If the government carries no insurance, one would think it would take the ordinary business precaution of having the wiring inspected at regular periods.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman means that on a certain day in a certain month each building shall be inspected, there is no periodical inspection of that kind, but there is a continual inspection going on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN, Is any record kept of each inspection?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say to-night, but I can find out from the expert who does the inspection, and will be able to inform the House later at what time this building was last inspected and what is the system of inspection.

Mr. COWAN. I would think that he should wait until he is prepared to give that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the meantime a big rain might come on and destroy a lot of valuable property.

Mr. COWAN. Or a big rat. It seems to me that the Dominion government should at least take the ordinary precaution exercised by a business firm——

Mr. PUGSLEY. So it does.

Mr. COWAN. I think it should either insure its own property or take steps to guard more effectively against loss. This particular item does not amount to very much, but if all the property of the Dominion, under control of the Public Works Department, is not subjected to periodical inspection, that seems to me a very startling condition of affairs.

Mr. STAPLES. Has there been any other fire in any other public building in this city during the last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I recall one slight fire.

Mr. STAPLES. Caused by a mouse or a rat?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I only know it was put out very quickly.

Mr. STAPLES. What fire was that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had better pass this item first.

Mr. STAPLES. But it is a fair question. We are responsible to the people for these buildings, the people carry their own insurance and we should receive adequate protection, as my hon. friend says, against any fire.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says there has been no fire in any of the public buildings except a very slight fire which occurred in my own office some months ago and which was immediately extinguished by means of the hose which was just outside the door. We have a very excellent fire apparatus in the buildings and there was no difficulty on that occasion in putting it out immediately.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of the position the item is in, I think it had better stand. The minister says he had no idea the item was coming up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, what I said was that I did not know I would be asked the question as to the inspection of the wiring in the buildings and therefore I was not prepared to-night to give the information

as to that. However, I will get the information and will submit it to the committee. I appeal to the good judgment of the members of the House and ask whether they think that as this building has been so seriously damaged by fire, a building containing a great deal of very valuable property amounting in all to nearly a million dollars in value, which is liable to be injured by rain, the roof having been destroyed, it is in the public interest that this item should be delayed. Should the item not pass in order that we may as soon as possible proceed to the repair of this building?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what year is it a supplementary estimate?

Mr. FIELDING. For the current year.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister spoke of another fire. Has he ascertained what it originated from?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be advisable to set apart a portion of this money to purchase a rat trap?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman's suggestions are usually worthy of consideration and very wise and I have no doubt this is as wise as the suggestions he ordinarily makes to the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the intelligence and great prescience of the hon. gentleman from whom it comes, I take it for granted it is accurate.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of these repairs and will they be done by public tender or day's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost is estimated at $20,000 and the intention is to ask for tenders for the work.

Mr. BRADBURY. I was surprised to hear the minister say that there was so much danger in connection with the wiring of public buildings. He admitted later on that a building could be wired and made perfectly safe. Every one who knows anything about the system of wiring a building knows that it is possible to wire it so that no mouse or rat can injure the wiring. I think that every public building in this city should be examined and that the wiring in many of them should be changed. A few years ago a serious fire occurred in the Marine Department and many very valuable documents were lost. That fire was attributed to bad wiring. Where it is an admitted fact that a building can be wired in such a way that accidents become almost impossible, every public building in Ottawa should be rewired. I think it would pay the government. Here is a loss of $150,000, an amount which would more than wire every government building in the city and make them perfectly safe. I think that is worthy of consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree that that is worthy of consideration. Of course when these buildings were erected the modern system of electric wiring was not in use. The new wing has the steel conduits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the information asked for this afternoon should be brought down later on. We should also have information as to whether or not there was any watchman in that building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Dominion Police have charge of the building.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I saw the statement, I do not know what reliance is to be placed on it, that if a watchman or caretaker had been in charge very little damage would have been done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will undertake that information will be furnished to the committee from both my own department and the Militia Department.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House. He said: On Tuesday next I propose to proceed with the Bills representing the French Treaty.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November, 29, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, Prince Edward Island) moved that the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, and volumes I. and III. of the report of the Auditor General for the same period, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before that motion is put I wish to direct the attention of this House to the advisability of making some change in our method of procedure in the Public Accounts Committee. There is no member of this House, whether he be a member of the Public Accounts Committee or not, who has not some knowledge of the very great difficulty experienced in getting at the information which the public of this country require in relation to the Public Accounts of Canada. There is no member of this House who, aside from political considerations, would hesitate to admit that in certain cases our investigations are not as full as they ought to be and that we do not get at the true state of the facts to

the extent we should. The opposition which we who investigate are met with from time to time by certain gentlemen in the House is one conspicuous cause of the failure to elicit the facts. In the years that have gone by it is true we have been able to divulge very startling conditions in reference to the public expenditure of Canada, but I venture to think, and I believe most people in Canada who follow the trend of public affairs think, that we are only on the threshold of all that could be divulged did we have the proper facilities to elicit it. I would be glad to feel—and for the present I will assume, and the subsequent attitude which the government takes will show whether I am justified or not—I would be glad to feel that the government is as anxious as are the members of the opposition that full light should be thrown on the circumstances surrounding the expenditure of public moneys. Following a time honoured precedent the hon. gentleman (Mr. Warburton) has to-day moved that the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31 be referred to the Public Accounts Committee for investigation.

Now, what I propose, Mr. Speaker, is that we should have a wider range; that instead of referring the public accounts merely for the year ending the 31st March last and the Auditor General's Report for the same period, we should refer at least two years of the public accounts to that committee. I do this for various reasons, one of which is that it is the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 31st March last which give the true bearing of certain items in the accounts of the year preceding. Therefore as it should be the object of every member of this House to get at the true state of the facts in the most expeditious manner possible, it is important that we should be able, after these accounts have come in, to go back to the preceding year and avail ourselves of the information afforded by the subsequent transactions in connection with the same item. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that many hon. gentlemen who believe they are acting in the interest of their party set themselves deliberately to block the investigation which is going on, impelled by the belief that if they can prevent it for one year it will be dropped altogether. The matter comes up within a few weeks of prorogation, and they will not allow the investigation to proceed rapidly; they take all the technical and captious objections possible, with the result that very little information is elicited during the balance of the session; and when we come to another session we are confronted with the statement: You cannot go into that, because the only public accounts referred to the committee are those of the year ended the 31st of March last. If the public accounts of the two years were referred, to the committtee, we would not be met with that difficulty, because these hon. gentlemen would realize, contrary to what they believe now, that we could not be blocked altogether in our investigations. It may be suggested that it would be rather unfortunate if the committee went back to investigate not the public accounts of last year, but those of the year before. To that I reply that no hon. member of this House is going to ask the committee to investigate for two years back, unless there is some good reason for doing it. It is said that there are no birds in last year's nests, and we realize that in the majority of cases our best work is done on the recent accounts; but there are a great many cases in which light can be thrown on a transaction on which the public should be informed if the rule did not confine us to one year's accounts, but gave us liberty to investigate the accounts of two years. I had intended to move an amendment to this motion, but I have decided not to do so on this occasion. I have listened, not always with approval, to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to long sessions. I have tried to believe, but have not succeeded in believing, that these hon. gentlemen are sincere in the ideas which suggest these remarks. Any one who reads the records of this House will, on a careful study of this matter, come to the conclusion, that the evidence is not strong that the government is sincere in desiring short sessions. If we want to have short sessions combined with efficiency of investigation, we will adopt the suggestion I make. If hon. gentlemen desire to have the time of the Public Accounts Committee used to advantage, and a rule broad enough to enable us to work effectively without having to make special applications to the House, they will agree to the suggestion I make, and say that in years to come, as long at any rate as this government is in power—and I think I can promise that when we get into power in the near future, we shall be quite willing to continue the rule—we shall have the right, without making any special motion in the House, to investigate the public accounts and the Auditor General's Report for at least two years whenever any hon. gentleman of this House deems it in the public interest that such an investigation should be made.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend has not made any motion on the subject proposed, it is not necessary for me to discuss the matter at length. The impressions I have received of the Public Accounts Committee are not the same as those which my hon. friend seems to entertain. I think that those who have given the closest attention to the Public Accounts Committee will be able to testify that the

investigations of that committee are very thorough, and they take a very wide range. If one wanted to be critical, he could often complain that the committee enters into the consideration of matters which strictly speaking do not pertain to its duties at all. But on a question of that character it is well to take a very liberal view not to be too technical. Inasmuch as we have annual parliaments, it follows that there should be annual inquiries into the public accounts. These matters are all regulated by the long experience of the mother of parliaments, and the rules and practices found to be successful in the mother country may safely, in most instances, be continued here. I quite understand that there may be cases in which the events of one year may be closely connected to those of another; the transaction beginning in one year may extend into another year. In cases of that kind it would not be unreasonable that the whole transaction should be reviewed, and I am sure that the Public Accounts Committee would at all times be willing to grant such an investigation. If there be any special circumstances which seem to call for such an inquiry, I think we can safely trust in the future as in the past the wisdom of the Public Accounts Committee and ultimately the wisdom of the House of Commons. It is unfortunate that in the discussion of questions in that committee occasionally some party feeling may be manifested on one side or on the other; a man who has strong party views may sometimes think that a man who has strong party views on the other side is a little unreasonable. We must learn to make allowance for one another in these things. I am persuaded that, all in all, the work of the Public Accounts Committee is well done; and if it should be desired at any time to inquire into a matter that is not before the committee in the usual formal way, I am sure that the committee and the House of Commons itself will always, on a statement of the facts, be prepared to provide a remedy.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to say a word in support of what the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has said. My experience of the Public Accounts Committee differs entirely from that of the Minister of Finance; and when he invokes the example of the mother of parliaments, my hon. friend cannot ignore the fact that the investigation of the public accounts is very differently conducted in the mother country. In England, under the rules of the House, the Public Accounts Committee is composed of eleven of or at most fifteen members of the House. The chairman is always by custom a member of the opposition. It would be entirely unheard of in England that one of the members of the committee, desiring information on some particular transaction, would be opposed by a member of the same committee on legal technicalities. The thing has never occurred, and never could occur there, because the idea that dominates the Committee of Public Accounts in the British parliament is that any man can ask any question which may lead him to a full understanding of the transaction under consideration. But what do we find here? So far from exhibiting any wisdom, the proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee, during the past four or five years, have degenerated into a farce. People go there just to see the kind of a battle that is carried on, just to hear the objections made and the difficulties put in the way of getting any information on any transaction. I appeal to any hon. gentleman who has attended any of the meetings, if that be not the case. That committee is the place where it is most difficult to get any information. What usually happens? A number of gentlemen, who form part of the committee, come to the meeting, and a certain number do not find a single matter to investigate. It is but fair to presume therefore that they are satisfied with the accounts presented to them. They do not ask any questions, but are perfectly content. Other members come there who are not so easily pleased. Certain transactions have come under their observations on which they desire to be informed, and they call for the papers. These are brought down, and on looking over them, these members of the committee find reasons for pushing their researches a little further. Witnesses are then brought before the committee, but the minute you begin to examine them, other members of the committee, who seldom come there, who have asked for no papers, who presumably are satisfied with everything, make their appearance on such occasions, and make it their business to enter objections and prevent the investigation. Is that the case or is it not? Some four or five members, in some cases more, troop into that Public Accounts Committee room for the sole object of blocking the investigation. There can be no doubt about that. The best proof is that these gentleman, as a rule, are able lawyers, and they interpose objections just as they would in a court of law. An hon. member from Nova Scotia will base his objection upon the rules of investigation which obtain in his particular province. Other members from other provinces will make objections founded on rules of evidence which govern in their respective provinces. The result is you cannot proceed. If the case be one which seems to lead up to discoveries of irregularities, the stronger are the objections and the greater is the number of members who come in to support them. It seems to me that proceeds from an entire mis-

conception of the duties of that committee. There is no possible ground, I submit, on which one hon. member can object to another obtaining information, unless the latter ill-treats the witness or clearly wishes to obstruct the work of the committee, but when he puts a question to a witness with regard to a fact, is it tolerable that one of his colleagues should object because that question violates some rule of evidence in some provincial court. For instance, the objection will be urged that you cannot put that question unless you have a commencement of proof in writing or some other absolutely technical objection, which could only be made in a court of law. We have all seen some particular member apparently designated as being an able lawyer accustomed to cross-examine, come into that committee when there is some ticklish matter under investigation, involving irregular transactions on the part of the government. We have seen four or five such members come there and sedulously one after another, object to questions on some technical rule of evidence. All members of parliament are not lawyers, and it is quite clear that this group of members has for its object the blocking of evidence and the preventing of our obtaining that information which the committee ought to have. I am very glad that my hon. friend from Simcoe has brought that matter to the notice of the House. It has been noticed by all strangers and witnesses attending the committee, and the result is that the examination before that committee, instead of being serious, becomes a farce.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). I am very much surprised at the statements of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). If these came from other members of the opposition, I would say that they were drawing upon their imaginations, but my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), I think, is the last person who ought to complain of the treatment he has received from the Public Accounts Committee. I have been rather a regular attendant at the meetings of that committee during the past three or four sessions——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. And I challenge the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to point out one specific case in which he ever asked a proper question for proper information and failed to have that question allowed.

Mr. LENNOX. I may say that I have not asked many questions altogether in the Public Accounts Committee and I do not recollect that my hon. friend ever interrupted me, and I would not be particular if he did, because I am able to fight my way, but I have heard, on many occasions, objections made on technical grounds to questions put.

Mr. CARVELL. I knew that the hon. gentleman could not point to one instance when he put a proper question and it was objected to. But let me point out what has occasioned this irritation on the part of the hon. members for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and others of their friends. In the first place, they ask for the papers and the original papers are brought down. Then they ask that witnesses be summoned; and to the best of my recollection, there never has been a refusal to bring witnesses from any part of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Thousands and tens of thousands of dollars have been squandered bringing witnesses, who, not only could not give any information, but who, I believe, these gentlemen knew could not give any; but they brought them because they had some ulterior object in view. After asking a few questions regarding the item under discussion, they drift off to some other outside matter, and when members of the committee who have some regard for the rules of order and decency——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL—attempt to hold them down to the question under discussion, these gentlemen make the charge that an attempt is being made to burk the investigation. Let them ask for their witnesses, and confine themselves to the subject matter under investigation and I can promise, as far as I am concerned, that they will meet with no difficulty, and I challenge them to point out where I or any other member, in the past four sessions, have attempted to obstruct investigation into any particular subject before the committee.

I am very glad this matter has come up. These accusations have been hurled at members on this side of the House from one end of Canada to the other. And I may say that my own name has been bandied about from the Atlantic to the Pacific as one of the leaders of a dark lantern brigade. I have only to repeat that I have not a word to take back that I have ever uttered in that committee. I have never objected to a solitary question that was proper;—I do not mean technically proper; I am not talking along the line of whether a question is one that would be allowed in a court of law or not; I mean a question bearing on the subject at issue. If these hon. gentlemen opposite will direct their investigations to the subject under discussion and not to some extrinsic matter they will have no difficulty. But I am afraid that if they continue to carry out the policy they have

pursued in the past, of attempting to bring out matters that have nothing to do with the subject under discussion, if they will attempt to use the Public Accounts Committee and the money of Canada as a means of trying to get some information which they think may possibly be of benefit to them in their constituencies but has nothing to do with the subject of the investigation, they will meet with the same treatment that they have met with in the past and of which they are complaining here to-day. We might as well have a clear understanding on this point. As a matter of fact, so far as I, for one, am concerned, there has been no objection in the past, and will be no objection in the future, to any proper investigation; every subject can be laid as bare as it possibly can be laid. On the other hand, I can only warn hon. members that if they will attempt to use this power of investigation in a way in which they are not entitled to use it, I am afraid they will meet with the same treatment as in the past.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). I do not desire to occupy the time of the House in repeating what other gentlemen have said on this very important subject. I think that, especially seeing that we have a new chairman, not so much accustomed as others to our ways, even what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said, may do a great deal of good. I can say that I have nothing to complain of particularly myself; but I have again and again in that committee heard gentlemen who are not versed in the methods and forms of the law, attempting to ask a question of a witness, a perfectly proper question, when three or four gentlemen would at once spring to their feet objecting that the question was not put in proper form. There is not a member of that committee who hears me but knows that that is the case. The hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) asked the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to give an instance. I can give him a very common instance of most outrageous interference with the witnesses. I have myself, again and again, in examining witnesses as to the value of property which they have sold to the government, asked them, as the very best test of that value, what they had paid for the property, which, perhaps, they had bought within a month and may not even have paid for; and everybody knows who is on that committee who the gentlemen were who objected that this was an attempt to compel a man to disclose his private business. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) will not deny this—

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. member name a specific instance; I cannot recall such a thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL. I would like to have an instance.

Mr. BARKER. There are so many that it is quite unnecessary—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARKER. One case was brought before the House.

Mr. CARVELL. What was it?

Mr. BARKER. That is quite enough; I will not give names unnecessarily; I know what I am talking about, and I do not think that there is one of the gentlemen here who has been declaiming but knows that I have only stated the facts. We have investigated the prices of articles sold to the government where we know that the most extravagant prices have been paid. I have asked what the seller paid for it, and what was his reply? His reply, suggested by a member of the committee, was that that was prying into a man's private business. I have even heard the chairman say that the witness was not bound to answer. Is that decent? Is that right? Is that reasonable, fair investigation? The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) knows that for a whole week we struggled with one witness to make him produce his invoices. He refused. We, at last, put him in a position where he would be forced to produce them, and then he said they were burnt. And we had to bring a man all the way from Galt, Ontario, to tell us at what price he sold these articles to the witness when the witness might have told us at once. I have heard members, not of the legal profession, asking a witness questions who were persistently interrupted by some legal gentlemen until the witness, alive to what was going on, found in what he should be careful, and then we might as well abandon the investigation. That is a very common thing, and every member of that committee knows it. As I have said, however, I think this little discussion will do good. It tends to show the absurdity of pretending that this is a court of inquiry to be conducted according to legal procedure. It is an investigation of business questions by business men, and ought to be carried on in the way in which business men would investigate such questions in their own office.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). As one member of that committee, for some time past I have regarded it as of little value in ascertaining anything with regard to the expenditure of public money. There is hardly a layman in this House, except one or two, who would go before that committee to investigate any of the matters referred to, for we know from experience that as soon as it appears that information is being brought out of value to the country,

we are badgered by a number of lawyers in that committee under the plea that we are not following the procedure laid down for a court of law. These gentlemen seem to forget that the rules that apply in a court of law do not apply here. I am well within the mark when I say I have heard that plea raised a hundred times, and I have often seen fifteen or twenty minutes of the valuable time of that committee wasted in a discussion which finally resulted in the member being prevented from putting his question because it was not according to the rules of evidence in a court of law. And I do not know a much greater sinner in this respect than the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says that the effort is to make the investigation thorough, and that it is thorough. It may be thorough as far as it goes, but, unfortunately, it does not go far enough. The time at the disposal of the committee is not sufficient to enable it to make a fair inquiry, by the examining of witnesses, when members are hampered in putting their questions. Of the thousands of items in the Auditor General's Report, only an extremely small proportion can be investigated owing to the absolute obstruction in that committee. That has been found to be the case over and over again. It may be said that if you go back over more than one year you even increase the number of subjects to be investigated. That is true. But one advantage of going back, as any one who has been in the House any considerable length of time will know, is that you may get most valuable information regarding these transactions after a year has passed. Generally, parties are close-mouthed for a year, but when they begin to settle up they are apt to be dissatisfied with one another and to disclose information which would not otherwise be in the possession of members or of this House. But, try to go back into the previous public expenditures and you are met at once with the objection: 'You are going beyond the fiscal year.' That objection has been raised over and over again.

The members of the committee who have been endeavouring to get information have been prevented from getting it on that one ground alone. I do not think that is right. I remember a long inquiry that took place in 1893, and when the then opposition desired to go back two years, the offer was made to them that they might go back two years, or three years, or four or five years, and they got that right. We said they had the right to go back just as far as they liked, only they would have to say that they had reasonable grounds for suspicion that something was wrong; and if they desired to bring evidence with regard to anything that took place three or four years ago, we allowed that to be done. I thought that was right. I always agreed with it when our friends were in power. I think if there were not an effort made now to restrict the inquiry within the limit of one year, and that the last year, there would not be so much inclination to go back. But only in cases where there was a strong ground for suspicion that something could be got out which had not been brought to public attention, would any member of parliament desire to go back beyond a year. I think it would do a great deal of good if we had the right, though we might not exercise it very often. The Minister of Finance says: If you make certain allegations of fact the House will consent. Well, allegations of fact have been presented to that committee over and over again, and the committee did not consent; and I think in one or two cases when it was brought up in the House, the House did not consent. There is always some excuse made, so that no matter what you do you are confronted with obstruction, and you are prevented from doing what you conceive to be your duty. The hon. member opposite who just took his seat said that no proper question was ever refused. Well, what is meant by a proper question depends altogether on the mind of the gentleman who uses the word. If we were only to ask such questions as the hon. gentleman thought were proper questions, we would never bring out the information that we desired. Besides, one hon. gentleman might have something in his mind that others did not have, and he might desire to ask the question in a way that would bring out information which other hon. gentlemen could not bring out. I know that many laymen have been prevented from asking questions in the committee to such an extent that they have abandoned the attempt to go before that committee and endeavour to get any information, because of the way they are badgered by, I was going to say, the brigade of lawyers who have been constantly in the Public Accounts Committee session after session apparently to obstruct for many years past.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I beg to move the following amendment.

That the motion now read be amended by inserting the words 'Public Accounts and Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending 31st March 1908' immediately after the word 'period' in the said motion.

I have very little to add to what has already been said, other than that it seems to me to be a very reasonable request on the part of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that the Public Accounts Committee should have an opportunity to investigate accounts further back in the history of this government than one

year. It is well known that it is only after a session commences that the Auditor General's Report is placed in the hands of members. Up to the present time we only have volume I. and volume III. of the Auditor General's Report, and I suppose it will be some days before we see volume II. That fact in itself is sufficient reason why the Public Accounts Committee should have an opportunity of investigating the Auditor General's Report after it has been in their hands for seven, or eight, or ten months.

My hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell) says that his name has been bandied from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean, to use his own words. If that is so, the reason is that my hon. friend has been the chief offender in the Public Accounts Committee, and if his name is well known from one end of this country to the other, as he states, it is because he has been most prominent among those who were unwilling to allow the opposition to investigate the public accounts of this government. Whether my hon. friend thinks that is an enviable reputation or not he must judge for himself. My hon. friend was asking for an example. I will give one. We had before the Public Accounts Committee the well known Mr. Merwin, the great middleman who has been supplying the government with goods for many years. That gentleman was called before the committee and the question was put to him: 'How much did you pay for these goods that were supplied to the government at such an enormous cost?' The gentleman supporting the government in the committee at once flew to his rescue and said: 'Don't answer the question.' The chairman coincided, and the question was not answered then. But after my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) summoned the gentleman who manufactured the goods, Mr. Willson, of Montreal, and after that gentleman came before the committee and was asked: 'What did you supply these goods for to the general traders throughout the country?' and after he was compelled to answer that question, then the committee said: 'Oh, yes, Mr. Merwin can answer it now.' Now if there is any person in the House of Commons, or any member in the Public Accounts Committee, who, more than another, is responsible for the expenditure of large sums of money for bringing witnesses from different parts of the country, it is my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick, he and his chief supporters in the committee. It is well known that one of the chief charges against this government is that they have refused to the opposition members, and have refused to the people of Canada who are the taxpayers, such information as they are entitled to. That has been one of the chief charges against the government for the last few years. Why is it that the government are afraid to let us investigate the accounts that are two years old? If the public accounts are as fair as the government would lead this House to believe, then the Prime Minister himself should be the first man to stand up and say: This government is all right, we fear no investigation, let the opposition have all the latitude they want. We are not asking to investigate accounts ten years old; my hon. friend is only asking that accounts about two years old, should be brought before the committee for investigation. Surely that is a reasonable request, and if I am not mistaken, it is a request that the people of this country will endorse. I say that one of the principle charges against the government is that they are buying goods at enormous prices from middlemen, and the opposition are making an effort to investigate the charge in some of the most glaring cases. My hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick, says if cases of this kind come up, perhaps, if you bring them before the committee, we may allow you to bring witnesses. Are we to be at the mercy of my hon. friend and his supporters in the committee? It is a well known fact that the committee is a partisan committee, the chairman is a supporter of the government, a large majority of the members of the committee are supporters of the government. If any man will look at the divisions in that committee during the last two years, he will find that when a question of this kind comes up, the supporters of the government on the committee, almost to a man, stand up and declare that these charges are too old and cannot be investigated. I am heartily in accord with my hon. friend's suggestion, and, therefore, I have the honour to present a motion which will give an opportunity to the Public Accounts Committee to make a fair and honest investigation of the public accounts of Canada.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, after the speech of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), which I thought was on the whole very moderate, I did not expect my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would move the amendment which he has just placed in your hands. I am unable to say at this moment whether this motion will be acceptable to this House or whether it will not. I listened to the observations of my hon. friend with some care, and I do not think I would object very seriously to the suggestion which he made to have the record of the accounts of the government for the last two years investigated. The matter is one which is quite worthy of consideration. I might say to my hon. friend, however, that he was a little more —what shall I say?—previous than his

friend. If he had given us an opportunity to have looked at his motion, I do not think that we would have objected to it very seriously. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) observed that our procedure in the Public Accounts Committee was not on all fours with the example of the mother country. He stated that in the mother country the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee always belongs to the opposition. That is a practice which has never been followed in Canada as far as my memory goes. I am pretty sure that at confederation the practice was adopted which has prevailed ever since of selecting as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee a supporter of the government. There has been no departure from that principle. Perhaps it is regrettable in this matter we have not followed the example of the mother country. I think that we would do well, as far as we can, to conform our procedure to the rules which prevail in the mother land. But, perhaps my hon. friend will not have any objection if I ask him to allow this matter to stand so that we may consider this motion and perhaps we may come to an agreement upon it.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the mover of this amendment will accept the suggestion made by the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and allow this matter to stand in the hope that the government will accept the proposition. As I take the words of the right hon. gentleman as an indication that the government intend to look into this matter, I would venture to suggest that there is another matter that they might well consider in connection with the same committee. Whether the committee is to be allowed to go back two years or only one is a matter of comparatively little moment, but there does seem to me to be a matter of the utmost importance, the very basis upon which the committee works, and this may be an opportune time to have it decided what the real function of each member of that committee is. Without wishing to do anything more than to speak with perfect calmness upon the matter, I think that all members upon this side of the House will say that our chairman for the last term gave perfect satisfaction to this side of the House, both by his ability and integrity. Whenever papers have been moved for to be brought before the committee there has been no ground for complaint from this side of the House of any papers not being allowed to be obtained. As far as the subpoenaeing of witnesses is concerned, I do not think that primarily there is any ground for complaint by hon. members on this side of the House. So, Sir, a great deal of good can be done by the committee, and I venture to think a great deal more might be done if one little change were made. When a matter is referred to the committee, prima facie, it being the Public Accounts Committee, every member of this House would have the same duty to perform; that is, to endeavour, if possible, to ascertain if the funds of the people have been properly or improperly spent. Nobody could have attended the meetings of that committee without having been struck by two facts; first, that no member of that committee has the slightest interest in investigating the payment of any of these accounts except members of the opposition. I quite admit that it would not altogether be natural for members of the government to be as suspicious as members of the opposition, but I think every one must admit—which casts a light upon the subsequent proceedings—that under no circumstances is any attempt made to investigate anything by any member of the House except by a member of the opposition. For this reason the whole committee is formed into two camps, and this does seem to be absolutely absurd in a committee like the Public Accounts Committee.

There is no doubt that when this committee comes to the discharge of its duties it has one side—the opposition—trying to investigate and the other side—the government—trying to prevent investigation. It is all very well to find fault with this, that and the other thing, but there is the primary difficulty and so from day to day the opposition is prevented from making the investigation it desires to make. Let me give you a little illustration. We have the case occurring again and again when a matter has come before the committee. A question has been asked in the committee and it has been ruled that it has been improperly asked. A vote is taken in the committee and a report is asked for in order that the minority of the committee may appeal to this House, where hon. gentlemen are in the majority and where there is a 'Hansard' in order that the matter may be threshed out whether the member of the opposition who asked the question was wrong or whether the supporters of the government who prevented it from being answered were wrong. Surely one would think there could be no conceivable objection to a question of that kind being referred to this House where hon. gentlemen opposite are in such a majority, yet the rule has been laid down again and again that we shall not be allowed the right of appeal from the Public Accounts Committee to this House unless the whole matter is closed, and that means that the party who has been unable to ask the question must drop that question and all other questions he wishes to ask in order to get an opportunity of finding out whether the primary question was correct or not.

Can any one imagine that any hon. gentleman who really desired to have a fair and honest investigation of the public accounts would impose such a condition upon men who were asking a question or who would say that you are bound by that question and that you shall not be allowed to appeal to the House of Commons unless, you drop your case and forego all other questions that you wish to ask? That is the greatest objection we have had in the committee and it does seem to me that there is no reason why we should not be allowed to appeal upon an interlocutory matter in the committee just as well as upon a final matter. Another difficulty that has arisen is that every witness practically that the opposition examines is an adverse witness. I do not suppose one would find one witness out of a hundred in the Public Accounts Committee who is not an adverse witness and that is a drawback to the opposition in its investigations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you mean by an adverse witness?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Adverse to the party trying to investigate the accounts and bring out the facts as to the expenditure. In trying to find out whether the expenditure is honest or not the witness, in almost every case, is adverse to the cross-examiner because he wishes to prevent the facts being elicited. There is no disputing the fact that the great majority of witnesses are very able witnesses—exceedingly able witnesses—men who know the facts, who, in most cases, are interested in concealing the facts and men who are most competent to attain the object which they desire. If members sitting on the government side would help members on the opposition side to investigate these matters instead of helping to burk such inquiry they would only be doing their full duty to the public. Instead of being hindered we should receive from them every possible assistance. How often does it happen, that in a case which it is in the interests of the people that the facts should be made known, the cross-examiner, when he begins to examine his witness, knows exactly how far his case will go, knows exactly what evidence he is to receive? It seems to me that if a member of this House is willing to spend the time that is necessary—and every one who has taken charge of such matters knows the long preparation necessary in investigation and inquiry—it does seem to me it would come with better grace from hon. gentlemen opposite if they would assist the member who is trying to do his duty instead of throwing obstacles in his way. I am prepared to support the amendment made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain), but I do hope the right hon. leader of the House will consider carefully the functions of this committee, and perhaps when we get the new rules which are promised there may be one under which the work of the Public Accounts Committee will in the future be much more valuable than it has been in the past.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Whilst we are all in such an amicable mood maybe the House would listen for a moment to another suggestion which, not for the first time, I have to make, and indeed I am not sure that the first minister himself is not entirely in favour of it. I was glad to hear the remarks made by the Minister of Finance with reference to the reasonableness of the committee (and he was certain of the House) granting the committee back time so to speak, were it shown to be necessary in order to get at all the facts of the case; and also the position taken by the Prime Minister in thinking the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) a reasonable one. The two great troubles that appear to be in the way of that committee doing the work it ought to do are these: in the first place the committee is too large to do good work. We assemble pretty nearly one half of the House of Commons there, fresh from all the disturbance and party rancour in the House and they immediately line themselves up on two sides, one side never making a move for the investigation of any of the items in the Public Accounts, and indeed watching very carefully and very jealously every move made by the opposition to examine into items, and using every reasonable and sometimes unreasonable method of making the inquiry as ineffective as possible, if not going further and preventing it altogether. Now, you will eliminate the greater part of that unreasonable party spirit on both sides by having a small committee and composing that committee chiefly of men of experience in Public Accounts, and in practical business work. Those are two elements which I think would make an effective committee. I am pretty certain that a committee of 15 members appointed in that way to investigate the Public Accounts would really do good work for the government as well as for the country. After all, it is not any gentleman's affairs that are being looked into; it is not the government's affairs that are being looked into except in so far as they are the supervisors of public expenditure; it is the money of the whole country that has been expended and the whole country and every member of parliament should see to it that that money has been properly expended, or that the facts about its wrong expenditure should be disclosed. In the end nearly every government comes to its defeat not so much through mistaken policies as through that dead weight growing every year of bad or foolish or corrupt expenditures. The government can have no better

friend than an intelligent and able finance committee before whom in review every item of expenditure may go, with the idea that it will be looked into closely and competently and thoroughly. On these two grounds I would like to urge on the first minister that he take also into consideration the absolute necessity of rescuing that committee from the intolerable and mainly useless position in which it has been placed during these many years past. It has not done the work it should have done; it never will under its present constitution, and it is too bad that you must take many hours out of hard worked members of parliament, and pit them against each other in that committee where from the very moment they enter the room until the session is over they know there is very little chance of getting at the facts of any one case let alone a general revision of the public expenditure. You get rid of that unreasonable party spirit in the committee if you lessen the number of its members, and you will, I think, go largely towards effecting a great reform.

But another way of doing it is that the reasonable views of the first minister and the Minister of Finance as they have been expressed here to-day be impressed upon the members of the government who form that committee that the policy so reasonably laid down and fairly expressed this afternoon by both these gentlemen should be the policy which should rule in the Public Accounts Committee. Give some grace and favour to the opposition; ask yourselves one question and answer it. Ask: Would there be an item of the public expenditure in any year ever looked into if it remained for the members in that committee who represent the government to do so. The answer comes that it has not been done in the past and that it will probably not be done in the future. More than one half of the members of that committee are not doing their work and the other less than half are being hindered from doing it. Lessen the committee and at the same time let the reasonable attitude advanced this afternoon by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance imbue its members and better work will be done. For myself I am a hard worked member of parliament; I came here to work and I have worked every year I have been here, but I have lost very many most valuable hours in that Public Accounts Committee and have seen very little good come from my efforts until for the last year or two I have cut it out and have largely devoted myself to other kinds of parliamentary work. That ought not to be. It ought to be the ambition of every hard working member of parliament to put his force into one or two of the committees of this House and do the same hard work there that he does in the House itself. I am hoping for a great deal to come from this proposition

Mr. FOSTER.

to adjourn the question under debate and to give time for the first minister to look into the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. At the request of the Prime Minister and as we are so accustomed to being controlled by my right hon. friend I will leave my motion for further consideration. On this side of the House there was no thought of introducing a motion but rather to direct the attention of the government to this most important question until the Minister of Finance took issue with the member for South Simcoe, and so, in order to get the matter fully before the House I moved the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose there is no objection that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) should carry. The amendment can be renewed by my hon. friend at any time.

Mr. BLAIN. That is satisfactory.

Amendment (Mr. Blain) withdrawn, and motion (Mr. Warburton) agreed to.

VACANCY IN DUFFERIN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the electoral district of Dufferin to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John Barr, Esquire.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Oliver J. Wilcox, Esquire, for the electoral district of North Essex, Ontario.

JOINT DISTRIBUTION OFFICE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have directed to be laid upon the table of the House, under the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, my recommendation of certain increases of salaries to the clerks in the joint distribution office, Senate and House of Commons, of the Department of the Printing of Parliament for the ensuing year.

BILLS RELATING TO TRADE.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question arose on Thursday last at the time of the introduction of Bills, as to the proper application of Rule 48. This rule reads as follows:

No Bill relating to trade or to the alteration of the laws relating to trade, is to be brought into this House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a Committee of the Whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

The Bill introduced by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) intituled an Act

to amend the Inspection and Sales Act, in my opinion, clearly comes within the terms of the rule and should first be considered in Committee of the Whole House, as provided by the said rule. This Bill not only related to trade, but deals directly with trade, and provides for certain inspection and other regulations applicable to a particular trade. Incidental to the brief discussion on the above matter, the question was raised as to whether the Bill (No. 40), intituled an Act to amend the Inspection and Sales Act, introduced by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture on the 25th November, should not also have been first considered in Committee of the Whole House under the said rule. In reference to this Bill, I may say that both the Clerk of the House and the Law Clerk advised the hon. minister, after looking into this Bill and considering the precedents referred to in Bourinot's 'Parliamentary Practice,' that such a resolution was not necessary. The precedents in support of this position I find on page 635 of Bourinot's 'Parliamentary Practice.' In looking into these it appears that on former occasions, in several instances, Bills of that nature have been allowed to pass the House without previous action by resolution; but these, in my opinion, do not constitute such a precedent as would warrant me in varying from the strict letter of the rule. The cases referred to do not appear to have been the subject of discussion, or of any specific ruling on the part of the Speaker at that time. I, therefore, recommend that in regard to that Bill (No. 40) the same stand until a resolution has been duly considered and approved.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ending March 31, 1909, Part III.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LOUIS J. PAPINEAU (Beauharnois) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to amend subsection 1 of section 298 of the Railway Act. This subsection was the subject of an amendment passed by parliament last session. It deals with the liability of a railway company for damage caused to property by fires started by a locomotive. It enacts first that in every case the railway company shall be liable for such damage. Then it declares that if it is shown that the railway company has used modern and efficient appliances, its liability shall be limited to $5,000 no matter what the value or the number of the properties injured or destroyed by the fire may be. The amendment of this subsection passed last session provides that the railway company, though liable to the amount of $5,000 shall have the benefit of such insurance as the property owner of the property destroyed may have had on the property. The company shall be entitled to deduct from the amount of its liability the amount of such insurance. This deprives the property owner practically of his recourse against the railway company. If, for instance, a property of the value of $15,000 is destroyed, and it is insured for $5,000, the company has a right to deduct this amount, which leaves it with no damages to pay, and the owner loses the balance. Previous to the adoption of this amendment, the railway company would have been liable for $5,000, the owner would have recovered $5,000 of insurance, and would have lost $5,000. Now, instead of this, the $5,000 of insurance goes to the railway company and the property owner loses $10,000. For these reasons I think this amendment should be repealed. As there were three amendments of the same section made by the Act of 1909, I have thought it best by my Bill to repeal the whole section and draft a new section.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways when the report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission will be ready for general distribution. I know that some printed copies have been distributed, but there has not been a general distribution.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make inquiries as to how the work is progressing. I am very anxious that the report shall be distributed without delay.

MR. LUMSDEN'S RESIGNATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, might I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether or not there was any communication from Mr. Lumsden to him. The right hon. gentleman has already stated that none has been found, but could he inform us whether or not any such document is in existence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far I have not been able to find anything in my office but I have instructed my secretary to make further research. I do not remember any such letter coming to me, but will investigate further.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to mention to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in respect of a little controversy

we had on a matter of fact, that I have looked up the dates and find that I was quite right. The general election to which he alluded took place in 1890, so far as I know, and the gentleman he mentioned was not appointed to the bench until February, 1893, or two years and ten months after the election had taken place.

Mr. FIELDING. I looked up the dates also and found that, as respects the lapse of time, my hon. friend was entirely right and I was mistaken, and I am very glad to admit my mistake. But I do not think the question of time affects the point I desired to make. He was appointed to the first judicial vacancy that occurred after he had opposed and even poured cold water on my excellent government.

THE DUFFERIN ELECTION.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman if we may expect the election in Dufferin to be held forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no reason why it should not come off immediately, as regards the results I expect from it.

NAVAL DEFENCE.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has heard anything with reference to the information which he said he would telegraph for as to the position of New Zealand and Australia on the defence question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have a despatch which is confidential, but I can show it to my hon. friend.

NEW PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to mention to the Minister of Public Works certain informations I shall require on the item in the estimates referring to the new buildings. I should like to have the space of the various government buildings and the number of clerks in each, the space of the various rented buildings and the number of clerks in each, and an estimate of the number of clerks to be accommodated in the proposed new buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to give the information.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, WINNIPEG TO EDMONTON.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What is the cost per mile to date of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Edmonton?

2. What amount per mile is estimated to complete this section?

3. What is the same information as respects the section from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction?

4. What is the exact mileage of each section?

5. What has been expended to date on the Moncton-Quebec section?

6. What is estimated as necessary to complete this section, and what is the exact mileage?

7. What has been expended to date on the section from Edmonton to Prince Rupert, and what is now estimated as necessary to finish it?

8. What is the exact mileage of this section?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. The cost to the 30th of September, 1909, of the section between Winnipeg and Wolfe Creek (Prairie Section) 915 miles—per mile is, $33,423.

The information asked in question No. 1 cannot be given Winnipeg to Edmonton, as the accounts are merely kept separate for the 'Prairie Section' and the 'Mountain Section'.

2. Estimated cost per mile to complete is, $1,557.

3. The estimate of Mr. Lumsden, of June 23, 1908, to complete this section was $85,003 per mile, exclusive of terminals in City of Winnipeg and shops near that city.

Up to the 13th of November instant the sum of $78,915 per mile had been expended. The present chief engineer, Mr. Grant, has not furnished any further estimate of the cost of completing this section.

4 From Lake Superior Junction to Water Street Winnipeg, 246·87 miles.

5 and 6. The estimate referred to made by Mr. Lumsden makes the total estimated cost of this section $26,935,902, exclusive of Quebec Bridge and terminals in the City of Quebec and line thereto.

Up to the 13th of November instant the sum of $17,334,113 had been expended. The present chief engineer, Mr. Grant, has not furnished any further estimate.

459·34 miles plus 1·11 miles, Quebec bridge section, making 460·45 miles to north abutment of Quebec bridge.

7. On the 'Mountain section' Wolfe Creek to Prince Rupert the expenditure has been up to the 30th of September, 1909, $7,053,-863.11, and it is now estimated as necessary to finish it $60,002,136.89, which includes $5,536,000 of interest.

8. As the revised location plans for about 400 miles of the 'Mountain Section' have not been submitted to the government by the company the exact mileage cannot be given It will, however, be about 836 miles.

ST. CHARLES RIVER, P.Q., LOTS.

Mr. MONK:

1. Are the two water lots on the St. Charles river situate in front cadastral lots Nos. 582A and 583B, of the Parish of St. Roch, in the county of Quebec, the property of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, under the statutes governing that body?

2. Have the said two water lots above described, been sold by the Quebec government to private individuals within the past four years? If so, what persons have the said lots been sold and for what price?

3. Who are to-day the registered owners of said two water lots, and in what proportion for each person.

4. What is the superficial area of said water lots in arpents and in foot measure?

5. Has the conveyance of said water lots been ratified by the Governor General in Council pursuant to paragraph 2 of Article 20 of Chapter 34, of 62-63 Victoria?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. The answers to questions Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, have been supplied to me by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

1. The Quebec Harbour Commissioners claim that, under the statutes governing them, they are the owners of those two lots.

2. By a deed of sale passed before Cy. Tessier, notary, February 27, 1909, the late Etienne Dussault sold to Hon. A. Turgeon one undivided fourth of a beach lot in the River St. Charles, situate in front of cadastral lots Nos. 582A and 583B of the parish of St. Roch north. Subject to all federal laws concerning commerce and navigation. In this deed the vendor declares that he holds said beach lot under letters patent from the government of the province of Quebec, dated January 13, 1909.

3. The registered owners are as appears by said deed.

4. 67 arpents, more or less.

5. No.

NEW POST OFFICES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many new Post Offices have been opened in each province of the Dominion during the past year?

2. How many Post Offices in the province of Nova Scotia are served only by weekly mails?

3. How many by two mails each week and how many by three?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

No 1.

Name of Province	No. of Offices established from 31st March, 1908, to 31st March, 1909.
Ontario	100
Quebec	94
Nova Scotia	25
New Brunswick	64
Prince Edward Island	13
British Columbia	46
Manitoba	36
Alberta	122
Saskatchewan	154
Yukon	2

No. 2. 101.

No. 3. (a) 292, (b) 586.

HOLLAND RIVER CHANNEL.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals had a survey or investigation made into the feasibility and cost of constructing a channel from the Devil's Elbow on the Holland river to a point in the neighbourhood of the Bradford Railway station in South Simcoe?

2. If not, will the department have this done at an early date, and if done, is the report favourable, and what is the estimated cost?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The Bradford survey was begun on the west branch of the Holland river at the junction of the Newmarket canal, which point is 4·9 miles from the mouth of the river, Cook's bay, and carried up the west branch of the river to a point about three miles above the Bradford and Holland Landing road.

The canal or channel leading to the proposed basin in front of the Grand Trunk station, Bradford, would leave the west branch at the Devil's Elbow, 7 miles from Cook's bay, and the Bradford basin would be 8·2 miles long, with a bottom width of 50 feet. The proposed Bradford basin is estimated at 200 feet width, inclosed with concrete dock walls. No work is required in the 2·1 miles of river between the junction of the Newmarket canal and the Devil's Elbow. The estimated cost of the work is $59,947.

DR. THORNTON.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Is Dr. Thornton, of Deloraine, Manitoba, in the employ of the government in any way?

2. Has he been employed by the government during the past five years? If so, how much has he drawn each year?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1 and 2. Yes, as a frontier inspector for smallpox, from March 14, 1908, to August 15, 1908. He has been paid the sum of $508.06 for his services during that period.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BOARD OF MANAGEMENT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any additional powers been granted or conferred upon the Board of Management of the Intercolonial Railway other than those contained in the original order in council, which provided for their appointment? If so, when, in what way and what are they?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government rented the building situated on the northeast corner of O'Connor and Queen streets, and known as the Royal Building, lately owned by the Young Men's Christian Association? If so, for how long a term has the building been rented?

2. What annual rental has the government agreed to pay for said building, if the rental is to be paid by the superficial foot of floor space, and what is to be the rate per foot rental?

3. How many feet have been agreed upon for which rent has to be paid, and what will be the amount which the government will have to pay annually for said building?

4. Is the building now or to be occupied by the Labour Department?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Yes. (b) 5 years, and renewable for a further term of 5 years.

2. (a) $16,095.73 per annum. (b) 68·58 cents per superficial foot.

3. (a) 23,470 superficial feet. (b) $16,-093.73 per annum.

4. The building is now occupied by the Labour Department and the Eastern Ontario Command Headquarters offices. The Insurance Branch of the Finance Department is to occupy the third floor.

LACHINE CANAL—CARPENTER SHOP.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the estimate allowed for the carpenter shop on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien for 1909-1910?

2. What amount has been spent up to 1st October, 1909, outside of the fiscal year, and what amount is now left to finish the year?

3. How many men were employed as carpenters on October 1, 1909, and how many men are now employed?

4. What are the names of the men now employed as carpenters and helpers and their length of time in the service?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. There was no special estimate for carpenter shop for 1909-10. A shed was transferred from the yard on Mill street to the north side of the dry dock and there re-erected as an extension to the new carpenter shop. The work was done out of the general appropriation for repairs.

2. Amount expended up to 1st October last, $51,202.22. Amount left to finish the year, $22,907.78.

3. Number of carpenters including assistant foreman employed on October 1, were eight. Number of carpenters including assistant foreman employed in November, are eight.

4. The carpenters and helpers now employed are:

O. Fiset,	time	of	service	12	years.
G. Larose,	"	"	"	15	"
N. Drolet,	"	"	"	13	"
J. Langevin,	"	"	"	9	"
A. Drapeau,	"	"	"	8	"
W. O'Brien,	"	"	"	9	"
J. O'Grady,	"	"	"	5	"
R. Parsons	asst.	foreman		9	"
	Helpers.				
J. Dowton,	time	of	service	7	"
H. Landry,	"	"	"	3	"

QUEBEC BRIDGE AND RAILWAY COMPANY—INTEREST.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. In the total sum of $6,424,718 paid by the government to, or for, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company during the financial year ending 31st March, 1909, were the following items and sums included and paid, namely:—

Interest to the Bank of Montreal on various amounts advanced to the company	$889,687 81
Interest to shareholders in company	65,209 07
Bonuses to shareholders in company	26,370 00
Making a total for these items of	$981,266 88

2. What was the rate of interest paid to the bank?

3. Was the interest to be paid by the company to the bank in arrears at the time the government assumed payment of the account?

4. Did the bank claim to be entitled to be paid the sum $75,673.18 or any sum, as interest on accrued interest, and did the government pay the sum of $75,673.18, or any sum, to the bank as interest upon accrued interest, or compound interest?

5. In the interest and bonuses paid shareholders as aforesaid was there included and paid as interest and bonus the sum of $3,304.84 to Hon. S. N. Parent, chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, and the sum of $17,901 to Mr. M. P. Davis, one of the contractors for construction of said railway?

6. How was the interest paid shareholders made up, from what date and at what rate was it computed, and was it compounded? If so, how often, or at what intervals?

7. Have all the rights of the company been acquired and paid for?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. Yes.

2. 5 per cent was the rate of interest payable to the Bank of Montreal by the Que-

bec Bridge Railway Company upon advances made to the company.

3. Yes.

4. Interest on such advances fell due half yearly, and when unpaid carried interest at the same rate as the principal. The government, in taking over the undertaking, paid the Bank of Montreal the sum of $75,672.58 on this account.

5 and 6. Simple interest at 5 per cent was paid shareholders from the respective dates of payment by them on account of their stock until December 1, 1908, when the undertaking was taken over in accordance with the terms of the statutory agreement of October 19, 1903.

Hon. S. N. Parent received interest, $2,600, and a bonus of 10 per cent on $7,000 capital stock owned by him, and Mr. M. P. Davis received interest, $8,411, and a bonus of 10 per cent on $94,900 capital stock owned by him, in accordance with such agreement.

7. Yes.

COST OF VOTERS' LISTS, ETC.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What was the total cost, by ridings, of the making up and revising of Voters' Lists in 1908, under the Dominion Election Act, respectively, for the constituencies of Thunder Bay, Rainy River, West Algoma, East Algoma, Nipissing, Muskoka and Parry Sound for the purpose of the last general election?

2. What amounts, respectively, were paid to the enumerators, to the Board of Registration, for printing and for miscellaneous disbursements in connection with the work in the ridings above mentioned?

3. Have any of the accounts been disputed? If so, which, for what reason, and what adjustment was made?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY. The information asked for in this question cannot be conveniently compressed into the form of an answer to be given here. I would suggest, therefore, that this should be allowed to stand as a notice of motion. I may say that even in that shape I would ask the hon. member to include the correspondence, for without that the information will not be very intelligible.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion.

SEED GRAIN ADVANCES.

Mr. MONK:

1. Referring to the following entries on page K—118 of Auditor General's Report for year 1908, for seed grain advances, net expenditures to 31st December, 1908, $1,373,808.27 charged as follows:—

Dominion government	$ 508,498 34
Alberta government	151,172 44
Saskatchewan government ..	714,137 49
Total	$1,373.808 27

Have the sums thus debited and charged to the provincial governments been claimed and recovered?

2. What is the total sum refunded up to date on said seed grain advances?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. The sums charged to the provincial governments have been claimed. The province of Saskatchewan has repaid $182,628.82, and the province of Alberta, $33,257.30.

2. The total sum refunded up to date on account of the seed grain advances mentioned in the hon. gentleman's question is $348,769.59.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. How any members compose the National Trancontinental Railway Commission and what are their names?

2. What is the salary of each?

3. What are their duties?

4. Had any member of the National Transcontinental Commission any experience in railway work previous to his appointment?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Hon. S. N. Parent, chairman, Charles A. Young, Colin F. McIsaac, W. S. Calvert.

2. The salary of the chairman is $8,000 a year and each of the other three commissioners, $7,000.

3. The duties of the commissioners are set forth in the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chapter 71, 1903.

4. The gentlemen named as commissioners possess the general training and experience of business or public men, and have a staff of engineers and others possessing the necessary experience and qualifications to advise the commissioners on all matters and requiring technical or other knowledge in railway works.

RURAL MAIL BOXES.

Mr. ELSON:

1. Has the government been informed that several rural mail boxes along the Proofline Road, London township, have been torn from their posts, pilfered, battered, carried some distance away and dumped in a heap?

2. If so, has the government taken any action to ascertain who the offenders are?

3. What would be the utmost punishment which could be inflicted on parties found guilty of tampering with rural mail boxes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Under Criminal Code 510 (c) five years' imprisonment.

FOREIGN CAPITAL IN CANADIAN INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES.

Mr. FOWKE:

1. What amount of foreign capital is known to be invested in industrial enterprises in Canada?
2. How much is American, British or other countries, respectively?
3. In what lines of industry are the investments principally, and where located, by provinces?

Mr. FISHER. The government have no information as to the origin of the capital invested in industrial enterprises, and consequently we cannot answer this question.

DREDGING PLANT FOR LAKE DESCHENES.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government purchased this year a dredging plant for use on Lake Deschenes?
2. If so, from whom was it purchased, and at what price?
3. What work is necessary on the aforesaid lake which requires the use of such a dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. (a) G. C. Hurdman, (b) $6,500.
3. Widening and deepening of the channels leading to the wharfs at Aylmer and Britannia, removal of obstructions at Britannia wharf and removal of various shoals in the steamboat channel between Aylmer and Constant bay.

MANUFACTURE AND IMPORTATION OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. How many cigarettes were manufactured in Canada during the past fiscal year, and how many in each province?
2. How many cigarettes were imported into Canada during the past fiscal year, and how many in each province?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. 356,189,380 cigarettes were manufactured in Canada, of which 29,477,100 were produced in the province of Ontario, and 326,712,280 in the province of Quebec.

2. There were 34,619 pounds of cigarettes imported into Canada, which, at an estimated weight of 2·8 pounds per M., would represent 12,363,928 cigarettes.

The importation by provinces was as shown below:

	Pounds.	Number, estimated at 2·8 lbs. per M.
Ontario	5,472	1,954,285
Quebec	17,282	6,172,143
Nova Scotia	4,162	1,486,428
New Brunswick	.....	.....
Manitoba	936	333,286
British Columbia	6,509	2,324,623
P. E. Island	.....	.....
Alberta	200	71,429
Saskatchewan	.....	.....
Yukon	58	20,714
Total	34,619	12,363,928

EXPENDITURES FOR IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT DURING SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. During the South African war what sum or sums of money was sent by Great Britain to Canada to be expended by the Canadian government?
2. Had the British government any say as to how the said money was to be expended?

Mr. FISHER:

So far as the Department ot Agriculture is concerned:

1. $8,142,742.04.
2. Yes. The Department of Agriculture acted as an agent for the Imperial government, which, from time to time, asked the department what quantities of hay, oats, flour, etc., could be obtained in Canada for delivery in South Africa within a certain time and at what price. The department would reply, specifying certain quantities at a price delivered at Cape Town, South Africa. The imperial government would then authorize the department to purchase and ship the required supplies which had to conform to specifications furnished by the War Office.

Speaking on behalf of the Department of Militia and Defence, in the absence of the minister (Sir Frederick Borden):

1. The exact figures are not available, but, approximately, there was expended by the imperial government, so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, as follows: Horses, equipment, &c., $1,500,000; clothing and saddlery purchased in Canada for imperial troops, $600,000.

2. Prices were submitted to the imperial government, and nothing was contracted for without the sanction of that government.

FISH HATCHERIES BERENS RIVER AND SNAKE ISLAND.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. What was the total cost for the erection and equipment of the fish hatchery located at Berens river?
2. What was the total cost for erection and equipment of fish hatchery at Snake island?

3. What is the total annual expenses in connection with Inspector Young's work?

4. What did the government pay for the steamboat 'Lady of the Lakes,' and what are the annual expenses in connection with the upkeep and running of the said boat?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. $15,596.

2. $14,700.

3. Salary, $1,500; disbursements, 1908-9, $123.24.

4. $8,000. Exenses, 1908-9, $7,650.

NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the naval station at Esquimalt been maintained continuously from the time of the union of British Columbia with Canada until the present? If not, during what period has it not been maintained?

2. Has the influence of the Dominion government been used to secure the continual maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt as agreed by the terms of the union?

3. Has the Dominion government made any report or representation to the government of British Columbia as to the outcome of the use of such influence? If not, why not?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1, 2 and 3. Yes, the naval station at Esquimalt has been maintained continuously, but the number of ships was reduced in March, 1905; owing to change of policy of imperial government as to naval strength it was necessary to maintain on outlying stations.

TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND GERMANY.

Mr. LALOR:

1. What was the total value of exports from Canada to Germany during each year from 1890 to 1909, inclusive?

2. What was the total value of the imports from Germany to Canada for each year from 1890 to 1909, inclusive?

3. What was the value of hosiery imported from Germany to Canada in each year from 1890 to 1909, inclusive?

4. What was the total value of knit goods imported from Germany to Canada in each year from 1890 to 1909?

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

1. The total value of exports from Canada to Germany during each of the fiscal years from 1890 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

1890	$507,143
1891	532,142
1892	942,698
1893	750,461
1894	2,046,052
1895	626,976
1896	757,531
1897	1,045,432
1898	1,837,448
1899	2,219,569
1900	1,715,903
1901	2,141,552
1902	2,692,578
1903	2,097,699
1904	1,819,223
1905	1,146,654
1906	1,872,557
*1907	1,066,605
1908	2,374,607
1909	1,476,552

*Nine months.

2. The total value of imports from Germany into Canada (entered for consumption) during each of the fiscal years from 1890 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

1890	$3,778,993
1891	3,804,090
1892	5,583,530
1893	3,825,763
1894	5,841,542
1895	4,794,159
1896	5,931,459
1897	6,493,368
1898	5,584,014
1899	7,393,456
1900	8,383,498
1901	7,021,405
1902	10,823,169
1903	12,282,637
1904	8,175,604
1905	6,695,414
1906	6,987,314
*1907	5,474,908
1908	8,163,047
1909	6,050,365

*Nine months.

3. The value of hosiery imported from Germany into Canada for each year from 1890 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

1890	$19,323
1891	19,907
1892	43,898
1893	56,924
1894	75,626
1895	85,797
1896	91,929
1897	81,359
1898	79,340
1899	121,194
1900	118,408
1901	112,460
1902	153,255
1903	174,044
1904	127,661
1905	156,731
1906	224,217
*1907	191,886
1908	369,346
1909	298,986

*Nine months.

4. The imports of 'knitted goods, including knitted underwear,' from Germany into Canada during the fiscal years from 1890 to 1909, inclusive, have been as follows:

1890	$50,779
1891	32,936

1892	32,262
1893	30,285
1894	37,949
1895	36,029
1896	69,359
1897	32,635
1898	34,706
1899	38,893
1900	18,613
1901	18,119
1902	20,427
1903	24,968
1904	46,589
1905	46,440
1906	48,149
*1907	34,322
1908	54,464
1909	31,904

*Nine months.

INDIAN LANDS SOLD IN DISTRICT OF ALGOMA.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What Indian lands, if any, in the district of Algoma, have been sold, en bloc, during the years 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909?
2. If any have been so disposed of, under what terms and conditions were they sold, at what price, to what person or persons, and under what regulations?
3. Have the conditions with respect to the sale thereof been complied with? If not, in what respect are the purchasers in default?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. No Indian lands in the district of Algoma have been sold en bloc during the years 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909. Any sales that have taken place during those years have been for areas provided for by the Land Regulations of the Department of Indian Affairs, not exceeding four lots or 400 acres in all, or a section of 640 acres.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

GARDEN RIVER AND MISSISSAGUA INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Will the Department of Indian Affairs construct, or bear any part of the cost of construction, of those portions of the Trunk Road projected and under construction from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie, which cross the Garden river and Mississagua Indian reserve? If not, why not?
2. What negotiations have there been with the department, and with the Indian bands controlling said reserves, respectively, for a grant of right of way through said reserves for the purposes of such road, and what the result of such negotiations?
3. What objections, if any, have been raised by the Indians, or otherwise submitted to the department, against the traversing of said reserves by the said Trunk Road?
4. What terms and conditions, if any, have been attached to any permission to traverse said reserves by said road, by whom were such terms and conditions imposed, and when?
5. Have such proposals been submitted to the government of Ontario?
6. Is the department aware that the completion of the construction of a Trunk Road, about 180 miles long, is being prevented by the inability to arrange for the necessary crossings?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No. The construction of these roads does not come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government.
2. An officer of the Department of Indian Affairs was sent to the reserves and obtained surrenders of right of way.
3. The Indians objected to parting with any of their land and contributing to the up-keep of the road.
4. The conditions attached to the permission by the Mississagua band were: That $100 should be made to individual Indians for any interference with their improvements, and that the Indians should not be called upon to contribute to the up-keep of the road. These conditions were imposed by the Indians when the surrender was taken and were embodied therein.

The conditions attached by the Garden River band were: That $4 per acre should be paid for the lands. The other conditions were similar to those of the Mississagua band.

5. Yes.
6. No.

SURGEON-MAJOR CHEVALIER.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government asked for the resignation of Dr. E. N. Chevalier, Surgeon-Major at St. John, P.Q.? If so, what is the reason for this step?
2. How long has Dr. Chevalier served in his present position?
3. Is he entitled to a pension?
4. Was he placed under arrest at the military camp at Three Rivers in 1907?
5. What is his salary, and does he perform his duties in a satisfactory manner?

Mr. FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. No. Major Chevalier has, however, reached the limit of age of his rank, and is being retired from the Permanent Army Medical Corps.
2. Eleven years.
3. No.
4. No.
5. (a) $4.50 per diem. (b) Yes.

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS CAVALRY BRIGADE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. At what place has the Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade trained during each of the last five years?
2. What was the strength of the different corps forming those camps of training?

3. What was the cost during each such training, respectively, for pay, provisions and supplies, transport, hire of ground, or other local expenditures?

Mr. FISHER:

1. 1905—Laprairie.
1906—Sherbrooke.
1907—Granby.
1908—Savard Park, Quebec.
1909—Granby.

Year.	Expenditure for				
	Pay and Allowances.	Supplies.	Hire of Grounds.	Transport.	Miscellaneous.
	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1905	43,510 78	8,716 75	.....	Note *(a)*	98 74
1906	45,708 99	11,288 17	2,250 00	Note *(a)*	268 48
1907	43,013 87	10,797 62	2,521 00	6,984 17	174 92
1908	68,792 79			Note *(b)*	
1909	28,610 76	7,862 02	2,275 00	Note *(c)*	

Remarks:

(a) Transport for 1905 and 1906 would be approximately about the same as 1907, but figures cannot be given as separate accounts for these camps were not kept as at present, the expenditure being shown under the general transport expenditure for the district.

(b) In 1908 the Brigade took part in the Quebec Tercentenary and the expenditure for supplies, hire of grounds, transport, &c., is included in the general expenditure for Tercentenary.

(c) Expenditure for 1909 transport, &c., is not yet completed.

Year.	Corps and Strength.																					
	Staffs & P. F.		6th Hussars.		7th Hussars.		11th Hussars.		13th Dragoons.		F.A.N.		6th Bge. C.F.A.		7th Bge. C.F.A.		5 C. A. S. C.		6 C. A. S. C.		Signal Corps.	
	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.	Officers.	N.C.O. & Men.
1905..	9	24	31	357	28	363	35	356	32	344	5	34	....	...	6	97	....	...	3	35	...	6
1906..	16	75	30	344	24	352	32	353	24	353	4	50	....	....	14	157	....	...	4	57	...	6
1907..	18	83	25	322	25	325	27	296	23	356	4	52	....	....	11	156	....	....	4	65	...	1
1908..	20	24	31	351	21	348	22	346	26	354	5	69	1	117	10	122	4	75	5	51	...	4
1909..	17	92	21	279	....	....	25	272	24	279	3	23	....	...	10	162	....	....	3	42	..	...

IMMIGRATION INTO EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What was the total immigration into the eastern townships of the province of Quebec during the last fiscal year, and from what countries did such immigrants come?

2. What are the names of the immigration agents in the eastern townships, where stationed, salaries, and dates of appointments?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The government has no record of the number or nationality of immigrants going into a particular locality.

2. None at the present time. Mr. E. W. Brewster was employed from 1st April to 1st November, 1909, at a salary of $100 per month, and travelling expenses, his headquarters being at Compton. The government has employment agents paid by commission, whose names, dates of appointment and addresses are as follows:

H. E. Colt, June 17, 1908, Coaticooke.

A. W. Westover, March 17, 1908, Sutton Junction.

George McCracken, February 11, 1908, Danville.

C. P. Taber, February 4, 1908, Cowansville.

Alfred Millar, February 4, 1908, South Durham.

Charles Manseau, February 1, 1908, Drummondville.

KING'S REGULATIONS FOR MILITIA OF CANADA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the last edition of the King's Regulations for the Militia of Canada now out of print? If so, for how long have copies not been available for issue for the department?

2. When may the issue of a new edition be expected?

3. Is it the intention of the government to amend paragraph 17 of those regulations so as to conform to the rules of procedure?

4. Have Canadian courts of inquiry been governed by the rules of procedure as respects the cross-examination of witnesses by persons whose conduct is under investigation and the production of evidence by such person, or have the court of inquiry proceeded as instructed by paragraph 77 of the King's Regulations for Canada in relation to such matters?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes; no copies have been available since January 28, 1908.

2. Two-thirds of the new edition is in page form, with slight corrections to be made before final print off. It is considered that the edition will be ready for issue by February 1, next.

3. It is intended to change the rule now contained in paragraph 77 of the King's Regulations and Orders for the Militia in Canada, so as to make it uniform with Rule of Procedure 124.

4. Militia Courts of Inquiry are governed by the rule laid down in paragraph 77, but it has been left to the discretion of those courts to modify the rule, and to admit such evidence as would best bring out the facts and do justice to the accused.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK:

What was the total amount expended by the government in connection with the Imperial Defence Conference, including travelling expenses and all other disbursements generally?

Mr. BRODEUR:

For Department of Marine and Fisheries, $3,581.30.

Mr. MONK. I would ask that the question remain on the Order Paper to be answered by the other department. It has only been answered by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO.

Mr. URIAH WILSON:

1. Has any claim been made by the North Atlantic Trading Company for balance due them by the government for work done according to their contract?

2. Has any claim been made for damages for non-fulfilment of contract?

3 If so, what is the amount of such balance, and of such damages?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No, except as stated in answer to No. 2.

2. Yes.

3. Damages are claimed to the extent of $71,275.

Mr. URIAH WILSON:

1. Has the North Atlantic Trading Company asked for a fiat in order that they may bring suit against the government for damages or other claims?

2. If so, has such fiat been granted?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

PESTS TO FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

What provinces of the Dominion are enforcing laws dealing with the eradication of pests affecting fruits and vegetables?

Mr. FISHER:

Ontario, Nova Scotia and British Columbia.

MR. WENCESLAS LEBEL.

Mr. MONK:

1. Is Wenceslas LeBel, farmer, of Kamouraska, province of Quebec, employed by the government as preventive officer or acting preventive officer of customs?

2. If so, when was he named, and what is his salary?

3. Is the said Wencesles LeBel also employed by the provincial government of Quebec as agricultural lecturer, and are both employments compatible?

4. Was the said LeBel actively engaged in the county of Charlevoix and elsewhere during the last federal election in political work?

5. Did the said Wenceslas LeBel address a public meeting at Murray Bay in the county of Charlevoix, during the last federal elec-

tions, in the presence of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister?

6. Did the same thing occur at L'Islet, province of Quebec, during the same election?

7. Has the said LeBel applied for an increase of salary? If so, with what result?

8. How many written reports has said LeBel sent in since his appointment?

9. Has he made any seizures? If so, how many?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. Wenceslas LeBel is employed as an acting preventive officer of customs.

2. (a) 31st May, 1898, (b) $50 a month.

3. The department is not aware that Mr. LeBel is also employed by the provincial government of Quebec, as agricultural lecturer.

4. Not that the department is aware of.

5. Not that the department is aware of.

6 Not that the department is aware of.

7. No application on file in the department for an increase of salary. Customs salary is the same as when first employed.

8. 109.

9. Six seizures have been made by this officer.

MR. LUC LIZOTTE.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has Luc Lizotte, of St. Pacôme, province of Quebec, been appointed or nominated preventive or acting or temporary preventive officer of customs? If so, when?

2. What is his salary, and how much has he drawn to date on account of salary or expenses?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

POST OFFICE ACCOMMODATION AT LETHBRIDGE.

Mr. MAGRATH:

1. Has the Post Office Department made any demand on, or representation to the Public Works Department, for proper post office accommodation in the city of Lethbridge, Alberta?

2. If so, when made and the nature of same?

3. What action, if any, has been taken by the government to meet the requirements of the people of Lethbridge in this matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1, 2 and 3. A building was erected in 1893-94, for post office, customs and court house. The post office was fitted up and completed, but objections were raised as to location and the post office was never moved into the building, the post office quarters being occupied by customs and inland revenue. Subsequently, in 1902, upon representations made by the Post Office Department, the postmaster at Lethbridge was allowed to use a portion of the fittings in a rented post office building.

CARGO INSPECTION.

Mr. BELAND:

1. How many inspectors of cargoes of perishable commodities, especially cargoes of butter and cheese, are employed by the Canadian government?

2. At what ports, as well in Canada as in foreign ones, do they perform their duties?

3. In what do these duties chiefly consist?

4. Have the results obtained been determined? If so, are they of such nature as justify the employment of such inspectors?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Eleven.

2. Montreal, and Halifax in Canada, Liverpool, Manchester, London, Bristol and Glasgow in Great Britain.

3. Montreal.—Six cargo inspectors are employed at this port to watch the handling of perishable freight as it is unloaded from the cars and loaded into the steamships, to test the temperature of butter before it is placed in the cold storage chambers in the ships, to report the condition of the refrigerator chambers before loading is commenced and the ventilation of the holds in which perishable cargo is stowed and to place thermographs (self-recording thermometers) in refrigerator and cooled air chambers and in the holds in which perishable freight is carried. Particular attention is also paid to the deliveries of cheese and butter by river boats at Montreal.

Halifax.—During the winter months an inspector is employed at this port to look after the loading of apples and other perishable freight and to install thermographs in the fruit carrying steamers.

Ports in Great Britain.—Five cargo inspectors are employed to report the condition in which Canadian cheese, butter, eggs, fruit, &c., are landed from the steamers and the manner in which these products are handled while being unloaded and to advise the steamship officials of any rough handling and to report same to the department as well. They also retest the temperature of the specially marked packages of butter which have been tested by the Montreal inspectors, remove the thermograph records and send them promptly to Ottawa and interview importers on matters affecting the trade in farm and food products.

4. Since the cargo inspection work was undertaken leading provision firms in Montreal, Liverpool, London and Glasgow have written the department expressing their appreciation of the beneficial results that have followed the appointment of inspectors at these ports.

During recent years the conditions under which Canadian produce is handled at the ports in Great Britain have been greatly improved. Previously there was considerable delay in the removal of shipments from the docks, but the inspectors have

succeeded in preventing this to a great extent and now as a rule Canadian shipments are handled with despatch.

The thermographs which are placed by the cargo inspectors in steamships at the ports of Montreal and Halifax have been a very important factor in improving the efficiency of the cold storage transportation, and have also been the means of bringing about more thorough systems of ventilation in the ordinary holds of the steamers.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between the following legal firms, Rothwell & Johnson, Rothwell, Johnson & Bergeman, and Rothwell, Johnson & Stubbs, on the one side, and the government or the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, on the other side, as to the instructions to the solicitors for legal services rendered in passing titles of property acquired by the government, and in respect of the bill of cost and charges of the said several firms; and all papers, documents, letters, telegrams and correspondence having any reference to the items of charges of said firms appearing on page W—370 of the Auditor General's Report of 1909, amounting in the whole to $1,376.60.—Mr. Meighen.

For a copy of all instructions sent to the Indian agent at Selkirk, in connection with St. Peter's Indians, pledging or disposing of their holdings, secured through the surrender of their reserve; a statement showing all those entitled to receive patents for lands in connection with the surrender of the reserve, the applications made by those so entitled for their patents, and receipts signed for the patents by those so entitled on delivery of the patent.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the number of lighthouses in British Columbia, the salaries of the lightkeepers at the end of the financial year 1907-1908; what the salaries are to-day; why some salaries have been reduced and when such reduction took place.—Mr. Ralph Smith by Mr. Turriff.

For a copy of all correspondence, papers and documents connected with and relating to the matter referred to in the letter of the Auditor General to the Secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission of the 18th of August, 1909, in which the Auditor General points out that 64,192 cubic yards of excavation classified at an average price of 83·06 cents, were subsequently reclassified at $1.10¼ per cubic yard, thereby increasing the cost by the sum of $17,453.80, and asking for an explanation.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all correspondence, had between the Minister of Railways and the Transcontinental Railway Commission, relating to the sub-letting of contracts for the construction of the Transcontinental Railway in New Brunswick; and the failure of sub-contractors to make payment for supplies and material furnished by farmers, merchants and others for use in said work.—Mr. Crocket.

For a copy of all reports and correspondence in connection with section 29, township 9, range 22, west of the 4th meridian, as well as applications for railway right of way and station grounds within such land.—Mr. Magrath.

For a copy of all orders in council relating to the North Atlantic Trading Company, and all correspondence between the North Atlantic Trading Company and the government or any member thereof, since November 1, 1908, and up to 20th November, 1909.—Mr. U. Wilson.

MAINTENANCE OF WRECKING PLANT.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR—by Mr. Borden—moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, contracts and other papers and documents relative to the maintenance of a wrecking plant on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts or in the River or Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. BRODEUR. The papers have already been brought down. I suppose it will cover only papers which have not been brought down?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Any subsequent papers.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would suggest the words 'not already brought down' be added to the motion.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. ROCHE moved:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, papers, bills and memorials passing between the government of the province of Manitoba and the Dominion government since 1st January, 1907.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend allude to the correspondence of the boundary?

Mr. ROCHE. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, Prince Edward Island) moved:

For a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents in the possession of the government, relating to the reduction of the representation, in the House of Commons, of the several provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and of all correspondence with the governments of these provinces with regard to the restoration to the said provinces of such representation as they respectively had at the time of their becoming provinces of this Dominion.

He said: I would ask permission of the House to amend the resolution by striking out the word 'Ontario' because that province does not quite come within the scope of the resolution.

Resolution amended.

Mr. WARBURTON. In discussing this question it is hardly necessary that I should point out that it is of the utmost importance to the three maritime provinces. I have bracketed them together in connection with my resolution because they have all suffered in the same way, though not to the same extent, and they have suffered for the same reasons. Prince Edward Island more than the other two, because she has only the fisheries and agriculture as her natural resources, while Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have minerals, lumber, fisheries, and agriculture to depend upon; they are the eastern gateway of Canada and attract to their ports the trade of Canada, particularly the winter trade, and hence it is that they do not feel to the same extent perhaps as Prince Edward Island the decrease in their representation. In connection with this important subject I shall give the House some statistics which I hope may be found interesting. In 1867, when the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick agreed to form the Dominion of Canada, Ontario was allowed 82 members in the federal parliament, Nova Scotia 19, New Brunswick 15, and Quebec the unit of 65. In 1873 Prince Edward Island came into confederation under the census of 1871 and according to the census of that year the population of the provinces was as follows: Quebec, 1,191,516; Nova Scotia, 387,800; New Brunswick, 285,594; Ontario, 1,620,851; Prince Edward Island, 94,021.

The representation of Quebec being fixed at 65 members and the unit of representation being one-sixty-fifth of the population of Quebec, that unit under the census of 1871 was 18,331, which gave Nova Scotia an increase of two members making 21 members and 2,849 of a population over, it gave New Brunswick 15 units and 10,629 of a population over, which being over one-half the unit, allowed New Brunswick to have a representation of 16 members; it gave Ontario 88 units with 7,723 of a population over or less than one-half the unit. These 88 members represented an increase of 6 members on the previous representation. It would have given Prince Edward Island 5 units with 2,366 or one-eighth of the unit of population over, but Prince Edward Island was given six representatives at that time. Later on I shall go into the question of why that was done. The decade between 1871 and 1881 saw a large increase in the population of the maritime provinces and of Ontario. The times were prosperous down there and the population increased largely so that according to the census of 1881, Quebec had a population of 1,359,027, or a gain of 160,000; Nova Scotia had a population of 440,572, a gain of over 50,000, New Brunswick had a population of 321,233, a gain of 35,000; Ontario had a population of 1,926,922, a gain of over 300,000, and Prince Edward Island had a population of 108,891, a gain of nearly 15,000. It will be seen that all of the provinces during that decade from 1871 to 1881 made substantial and respectable gains, notably the province of Ontario, notwithstanding that during that decade there was severe depression throughout Canada. Then in the census of 1881 the unit of representation was increased to 20,908 or 2,500 more than in 1871, and this gave the four provinces other than Quebec the following representation in the House of Commons: Nova Scotia, 21 members, and 1,504 of a population over; New Brunswick, 15 members and 7,613 of a population over, which being less than half the unit New Brunswick lost one of her representatives; Ontario 92 members, with 3,386 of a population over, giving her an increase of four members on the previous parliament, and Prince Edward Island five members and 4,351 of a population over, which was only about one-fifth of the unit, and yet the island retained her six members. Again I ask why was that?

The decade between 1881 and 1891 showed a reduced increase in Quebec and practically no increase at all in the maritime provinces. It was a period of stagnation so far as the population of these provinces was concerned, and although there was a growth in Ontario and Quebec it was not of very great extent. According to the census of 1891, Quebec had a population of 1,488,535; Nova Scotia 450,396, a gain of 10,000; New Brunswick 321,263, practically the same population as before; Ontario 2,114,321, and Prince Edward Island 109,078, or an infinitesimal gain. I shall, before I conclude, discuss what were the causes of this falling off, because I agree with the remark of the Finance Minister, addressed to the House a few days ago, that if you find that something happens you will likely see that there is a cause, and if you try you can discover what that cause is. I shall endeavour to present to the House some of the causes which led to this deplorable result. Now, the census of 1891 gave a unit of 22,900, or 2,000 more than the unit of 1881. The four provinces other than Quebec were under that census represented as follows: Nova Scotia, 19 members, and 15,296 of a population over, which being greater than half the unit allowed her 20 members or one less than she had on the previous census; New Brunswick had 14 members and 663 of a population over, giving her 14 representatives, or another loss of one member, and bringing her representation down to one less than when she entered confederation; Ontario got 92 members and 7,521 of a population over, leaving her representation the same as it was under the previous census; Prince Edward Island had 4 members and 17,478 of a population

over, or more than one-half of the unit, reducing her representation for the first time to five. The question arises: if the representation of Prince Edward Island remained at six members under the census of 1871 and 1881, upon what grounds was that rule departed from and her representation reduced in 1891? In the decade between 1891 and 1901, Ontario had a reduced increase of population, Quebec had a somewhat larger increase than before. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick a small increase of 9,000 and 10,000 respectively, and Prince Edward Island had a loss in her population of nearly 6,000. The population according to the census of 1901 was as follows: Quebec, 1,648,898; Nova Scotia, 459,574; New Brunswick, 331,120; Ontario, 2,182,247, and Prince Edward Island, 103,259. This census gave a unit of 25,367 or nearly 2,500 greater than the unit in 1891, and it gave a representation to the four provinces as follows: Nova Scotia, 18 members and 2,964 of a population over, or one-tenth of a unit, thus reducing her representation by the loss of one member below what it was in 1867 when she entered confederation; New Brunswick had a representation of 13 members, a loss of one on the preceding census, or 2 members less than when she entered confederation; Ontario had 86 members, reducing her representation by 4 less than she had under the previous census but still leaving her with a representation of 4 members greater than she had at confederation; Prince Edward Island had 4 units and 1,791 over, again reducing her representation by one, and making it 4. As there were 1,791 over, why were not five retained, as were the six in 1871 and 1881? Why was not the same rule applied to the census of 1901 as to the census of 1871 and 1881?

I must now, because it is essential to what I wish to present to this House, go back to the time when we entered confederation. As you are aware, Prince Edward Island did not become a part of confederation when the other four provinces entered, but remained a separate colony for six years, entering confederation on the first of July, 1873. In Prince Edward Island, as elsewhere, confederation was a very much debated question, causing much friction between two very strong and very honest parties holding diametrically opposite views and enforcing those views to the best of their ability. Two delegations were sent to Ottawa to take up the question of the terms upon which the province would enter confederation. At that time the province of Quebec was not progressing as it has since progressed. The delegates from Prince Edward Island were instructed to insist that Prince Edward Island should have six representatives, although according to the census returns, the unit of representation would entitle it only to five. The Dominion government of that day took the ground that the smaller provinces were entitled to special consideration, and they allowed Prince Edward Island six members. Had that number not been allowed, it would have been absolutely impossible to carry confederation. Any member of the legislature who would vote for confederation without six members would not have seen the inside of the legislature again after the following election. On the return of the delegates from Ottawa, the people of the province were told that six representatives were assured for all time to come. Unfortunately, of the delegates who attended that conference two were not lawyers, and the third, who was, does not seem to have given very careful attention to the way in which the agreement arrived at was reduced to writing. Instead of doing as British Columbia did, providing that in future the representations should be 'increased' from time to time, they agreed that it should be 'readjusted,' a very different thing, and through the unfortunate use of that word we have since lost two representatives.

Now, I have placed as briefly as I can the salient facts bearing on this question before you. The men from Prince Edward Island who negotiated the terms of union have all passed away, and those who negotiated on behalf of the Dominion are all gone, with one possible exception—I am not sure whether Sir Charles Tupper was one of the negotiators or not, but I think not. Now, we cannot dream that such men as Sir John Macdonald and Sir Leonard Tilley, deliberately intended to cast dust in the eyes of the people of Prince Edward Island. We entertain too high a respect for their reputation to think anything of the kind, and the proceedings after the subsequent census went to show that not only those gentlemen but the parliament of that day took the view that the bargain made with Prince Edward Island was intended really to give her six members. Otherwise, why should they have given more members in 1871 than the island was entitled to according to the unit of representation? If they had done that in order to get Prince Edward Island into confederation, intending to deprive her of that representation later, it would have been rather a shabby trick which I would not like to accuse those gentlemen of having been guilty of. When the census of 1881 came round, Prince Edward Island, according to her population, was entitled to only five representatives, with a few hundreds, much less than half a unit, over; and yet the government and the parliament of that day, while changing the representation in the other provinces according to that unit, allowed Prince Edward Island to retain the six members she came in with. It seems to me that this is an exceedingly

strong proof, if proof were required, that by the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and Canada it was intended that Prince Edward Island should have six representatives for all time to come. It is not conceivable that these hon. gentlemen, who represented the Dominion government at the time, some of the most eminent men Canada has produced, should have deliberately planned to treat Prince Edward Island to a desert of Dead Sea apples after they had taken her seat at the Dominion Board; and yet that would fittingly describe their action if it was intended, after the negotiations had taken place, that Prince Edward Island should lose any representation after she came in. It was, I may say, a difficult matter to carry confederation in Prince Edward Island.

I may say further, while this matter was being discussed, the then leader of the provincial government—the late Hon. J. C. Pope, afterwards Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the government of Sir John Macdonald—pointed out that the population of the province of Quebec was not increasing; and in order to impress upon his people the desirability of accepting the terms which he had negotiated, he said that they would eventually have more than six members in the Federal parliament. When the matter was brought up in the Prince Edward Island House of Assembly in those days, it was proposed that the three counties in the island—Queens, Kings and Prince—would each elect two members, although Queens had much the larger population, if not quite the double that of Kings, and a very much larger population than Prince. It was urged by members of Queens county—and Mr. Pope himself was one of them—that Queens was entitled by population to more than two members, but Mr. Pope said it was better to stick to county boundaries and give to the other counties two representatives as well as to Queens, although Queens had much the larger population. I find in the Prince Edward Island Parliamentary Reports of 1873, page 193, the following extract from the Terms of Union with Canada, quoted by Mr. Pope, section 12:

That the population of Prince Edward Island, having been increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861, the island shall be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members. The representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

That is an extract from the terms of union as brought down by him. When he moved it, an amendment was proposed to give Queens county more than two representatives, which was really an attempt on the part of the opposition of that day to burk the arrangements made and keep out of confederation. Mr. Pope said,and I have no doubt he was sincere:

In whatever way this matter was viewed, there were serious difficulties to contend with. Before long an additional member of the House of Commons will be allowed to this island, as the representation is based on that of the province of Quebec, from which thousands of people are emigrating every year to Manitoba, where land is abundant and cheap. The population of Quebec will increase at a slower rate than that of the other provinces, and the consequence will be that the latter will, the sooner, receive an increase of representation, it will upset the arrangement, whereas by taking the present county divisions as electoral districts, the additional member could be given to Queens county.

Again at page 210, he said:

As we shall be entitled to an additional member whenever the population reaches the required number, a rearrangement of the whole plan will be required if the amendment were carried out.

Unfortunately, in 1873 there were no 'Hansard' reports of the debates in this House. We have in the library simply a scrap book containing the reports which appeared in two of the Ottawa papers. Only matters that struck the newspaper men as very important were reported at any length, and this matter was not evidently in that category because the only record I find is that the resolutions were introduced and after some discussion agreed to. There is nothing therefore in the debates, as then reported, which can give us any assistance whatever.

Passing from that phase of the question, I have gone over the statistics bearing upon this subject. When the number of members in 1871 was fixed at six, I asked why that was done. When the same thing was repeated in 1881, I asked the same question.

Who is willing to answer it? Who can answer it?

Another very important question arises and that is why the maritime provinces have fallen behind. Actually Prince Edward Island has more population by nearly 10,000 than in 1873 but it has less than in 1891. Why have we lost population? The growth of the province of Quebec of course is the simple answer, but a good many more questions arise, and one is why has the province of Quebec increased in population? No one can surpass me in the desire to see Montreal greatly expand and to see the River St. Lawrence becoming more and more the great route of commerce. The great city of Montreal is the furthest inland seaport in the world, I believe. It is essential to the trade of the whole of western Canada; and although not of so much consequence to the trade and commerce of the maritime provinces, it is of very considerable importance to them also. But it is an absolute necessity to

the trade and commerce, not only of Quebec itself, but of Ontario and the other western provinces as well. It is the summer gate of commerce from the west and has to be improved. I do not know what the population of Montreal is at present, but I think it will be found at the next census to touch the half million mark. And I judge by the progress of the past few years, the time is not far distant when it will touch a million, and I hope that time will come soon. But in order to bring about the growth and expansion and consequent increase of population in the province of Quebec and particularly in the city of Montreal, this parliament had to spend, and rightly spend, enormous sums in order to create the channels and arteries by which trade and commerce would come. Already in improving the harbour of Montreal, some $12,000,000 have been spent, and it is in contemplation in the course of a few years to spend $18,000,000 more in order to make its harbour facilities equal to those of any port in the world. And it is perfectly right and proper that that should be done, but it means a lot of money. When we came into confederation in 1873, the St. Lawrence was a great river but you could not get ships drawing such draft of water up that river as now go up. You had to dredge it from end to end and make it so that large ships could get up in order that the trade and commerce, which naturally belongs to Canada, should find its way through this great Canadian port, and not through ports foreign to Canada. The consequence is we have spent enormously to dredge and improve that great waterway. You are going to make it practically a great canal. You have it down to something like 30 feet but that is not enough. The hon. Minister of Marine will have to undertake more work. Thirty feet is nothing extraordinary now. He will have to go on and deepen it to 40 feet, and that it should be done in the interests of Canada as a whole.

It is necessary, in order to bind the parts of Canada more closely together and to keep in our own channels the commerce which belongs to us. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, as one member of this House, although it is no particular advantage to me or my constituency, I recognize the need of that work and am just as strong in support of it as any gentleman living in Montreal itself. It is true this process of improving transportation develops other parts of the country than the province of Quebec, but I confine myself to a consideration of the effect upon Quebec because that is the pivotal province. Enormous sums have been spent in other ways which must benefit the city of Montreal and Quebec generally. Consider the effect of one of our earliest works, the Intercolonial. That railway was built, of course, as a part of the compact of confederation, to induce the four provinces to come together, it having been made, I believe, a sine qua non that this railway should be built to connect the maritime provinces with old Canada. It is true that this railway greatly benefits the maritime provinces. But it has been an enormous benefit also to the province of Quebec and the provinces further west. Long before other railways were in existence it afforded a means of carrying the manufactures of the west to the maritime provinces, and the manufacturers of Canada generally admit that the markets of the maritime provinces are among the best they have. It still does that. Of course, this road was not built solely for the benefit of Quebec or of the other provinces. What I desire to point out is not so much what the object is as what the result has been. The effect of these improvements of which I have spoken is to greatly increase the opportunities of employment in the great city of Montreal and so to increase greatly the population of that city and other parts of the province of Quebec. Montreal contains thousands and probably hundreds of thousands of people who but for these improvements in transportation would never have gone to help in building up the prosperity and the population of that great city. And now we have the great railways coming down from the west, the Canadian Pacific railway and the new Transcontinental. There is no question but that the Transcontinental will open up vast territories in the north of Quebec as well as Ontario and will gradually draw a large population to that region, with the result that the unit of representation will rise. Of course, we are all glad of these prospective additions to our population. I do not believe in a sectional view of these matters, for a benefit to one province is a benefit to the whole of Canada. Still, the result is that, through these enormous expenditures, expenditures made not only by the present government but by the several governments that preceded it, and made in pursuit of a well-defined and laudable policy carried out by all governments, which, though they may have differed in details and in questions of degree have always favoured the carrying out of this policy of development—population in the pivotal provinces has been increased and the unit of representation raised. Nor is the work finished, it goes on and will go on. There is the territory of Ungava, which is not now a part of the province of Quebec, but probably will be. This will mean a further addition to the population of Quebec. It is true there are few people in Ungava now, but we know enough of the resources of Ungava to lead us to believe that many will be attracted to that territory, and, in speaking of this matter I think of the future as well as the present. This will further raise the unit

of representation, making our chances o regaining our lost representation very poo indeed. The further improvement of ou canals, and especially the enlargement o the Welland and other canals, will add t the result that we have already seen. So it is a rather forlorn prospect that is pre sented to us, with this great province o Quebec growing by leaps and bounds with the result that our representation is going down. Even the regular public expenditure is having the effect of promoting the opening up of the west and developing trade which ultimately benefits the city of Montreal. As you fill up the west you bring nearer the time when hundreds of millions of dollars worth of grain, besides other products of enormous value, will be annually produced for export, thus giving still more employment to the people of that province in which is our greatest port and which is the unit of representation, and so increasing the population of the province of Quebec. This great west, on the other, takes people from us. Many of those who were constituents of members from Prince Edward Island are now in the west. If the Prince Edward Island voters in that country were to throw their influence all on one side they would easily influence an election. I believe that in half of the constituencies west of the Great Lakes electors from Prince Edward Island hold the balance of electoral power. There are hundreds of teachers alone, now engaged in training the children of the west, who came from Prince Edward Island. All these, I am sure, have a warm spot in their hearts for their old sea-girt home. And if my words should reach them, as I hope they will reach some of them, I am sure that they will sympathize with me in desiring to see the representation of Prince Edward Island restored to that which she originally had.

The objection raised to the plea of Prince Edward Island in this matter is the old cry 'representation by population.' That is a most excellent general rule. But, like all general rules, it has its exceptions, and the exception proves the rule. When British Columbia entered confederation an exception was made. They drafted their terms better than we did, inserting the word 'increased' when we said 'readjusted.' They came into the Union with six representatives in this House, and at that time, I think, they had scarcely white population enough to make up the number of the unit of representation. They have continued to grow. But what I point out is that the principle was recognized that special conditions should be recognized in this matter—the principle of representation by population was not carried out in its entirety. Nor do we carry it out with uniformity to-day. The unit of population is 25,000 odd, but take the case of the city of Montreal. I do not know what is the population of its several constituencies, but I think I am safe in saying that none of them is lower than 40,000, which would be 15,000 more than the unit. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, but that your own constituency has a population a good deal greater than the unit. The same applies to the city of Toronto and other portions of Canada. The reason for these variations is that the local conditions are taken into consideration. It is obvious that when you deal with a city population, concentrated on a few square miles, those people can make their public wants felt much more readily than can a scattered population such as that of your constituency or mine. The question of remoteness also is taken into consideration, and I have no doubt that it was this element that caused the representatives of the Dominion government, away back in 1873, to concede to British Columbia a representation much greater than the application of the principle of representation by population would have given. The system of representation by population has been ignored in the United States in relation to the Senate. It was applied in the case of the House of representatives, but the framers of the Constitution, desiring to protect the smaller and weaker states, provided that each state should have the same representation in the Senate regardless of population. I do not know that the Senate of the United States has quite fulfilled the expectations of those who created it, but that is neither here nor there: the idea was to give each state equal representation in the Senate in order to protect the smaller.

It is not necessary for me to go at greater length into this question. I think that I have said enough to bring the matter fairly before the House; and I think the subject is of sufficient importance to justify me in so doing. I have not the acquaintance with the conditions prevailing in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick when they entered confederation that I have of those that prevailed and prevail in my own province. But I have no doubt that hon. members from those provinces who have the facts at their fingers' ends will be quite prepared to advance arguments in support of the restoration of their former representation. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, and thanking the members of the House for their courtesy in listening to me on a subject which may appear to some of them trite, I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The motion to which my hon. friend

from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) has addressed himself this afternoon is, of course, one to which no objection can be taken. It is a very proper motion, and we will be happy to bring down any papers that may be in our possession in relation to the subject. I do not hesitate to say that personally I sympathize very warmly with my hon. friend in the good purpose he has in view; and if, by any stroke of my pen, I could restore to Prince Edward Island her lost representation, I can tell my hon. friend I should be exceedingly happy to do so. Possibly I see more clearly than he does the difficulties which arise in the way. I have no doubt that if, at the time the terms of union with Prince Edward Island were under consideration, any representatives of the Island had asked for a clause to be inserted to the effect that the representation of the Island should never be less than the number with which it started, I do not anticipate that anybody would have seriously objected to such a provision. We have such a provision, not exactly in so many words, but there is a like provision in relation to British Columbia, and if it should so happen that by reason of that provision British Columbia should at any time have one or two members more than she would otherwise have, I do not think any of the other provinces would regard it as a very great grievance. And I have no doubt that if, at the proper time, somebody on behalf of Prince Edward Island had made the request, it is altogether probable that no serious objection would have been taken. Still we have to deal with the matter as it stands. The Confederation Act is a compact between various provinces; and even though we should feel, or the people of any one province should feel, that the terms of union were not working out as well as we might like, we have to recognize the fact that we cannot expect those terms to be changed by any mere will of our own; we have to consider what would be the attitude of the other provinces as well. Now, I think it would be a gracious thing if the great provinces of Quebec and Ontario, not to mention any of the others, should see the matter just as my hon. friend sees it, and say, 'Yes, we will readily agree to such a change as would preserve the representation of Prince Edward Island, and perhaps of several other provinces as well'—that would, of course, be a very happy solution. But I have to return to the point I first made, that this is a matter of compact between the several provinces. We know our friends in the province of Ontario have always attached great importance to what they used to term rep. by pop.—representation by population; and it is well to understand the fact that if that principle had not been recognized the union could never have been brought about. I fancy that the good people of Ontario may attach enough importance to that principle to-day to object to a change of the constitution, or to a departure from that principle, which would be involved in the proposition of my hon. friend. If, as a result of the discussion which my hon. friend gave the subject to-day, and of other discussions which he may perhaps congratulate himself on opening up, we should find that the change which he desires could be brought about by the good will of the other provinces, no one would be more pleased than myself. But I know the difficulties in the way; therefore I should not encourage my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island to expect very quickly the result which he desires.

Mr. FIELDING.

Motion agreed to.

LIBEL SUITS INSTITUTED BY W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. McKENZIE. In the absence of the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) in whose name this motion stands, I beg to move:

For a copy of judgments or reports of judgments in connection with any libel suits instituted by W. T. R. Preston, while commercial agent in Japan, and all other papers or documents in connection with said suits in the possession of the departments.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not know whether we have any such papers. There will be objection to their being brought down if they are in the possession of the government.

Motion agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO SEED CONTROL ACT.

Order called for second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Seed Control Act.

Mr. FISHER. This afternoon I wished to move that this item be struck off. I intend to proceed by resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister will admit now that the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was not wrong?

Mr. FISHER. The Speaker ruled that he was wrong. I move now that this order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. FISHER moved that Bill (No. 40) to amend the Inspection and Sales Act be struck off the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FISHER moved that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go

into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as follows:—

By repealing subsection 5 of section 17, subsection 5 of section 47, and subsection 2 of section 109, and amending section 104, by substituting for the words 'license fee of two dollars' the words 'required license fee.'

By authorizing the Governor in Council to fix the respective fees to be paid for licenses under the Act, and by providing fines for contravention of the said Act.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. What are these subsections that are repealed?

Mr. FISHER. By substituting 'required license fee' for 'license fee of $2' it is proposed to change the system under which the fee is collected. At the present time all elevators have to pay the same license fee of $2, but there is a decided difference in the amount of business done in different elevators, and, therefore, they wish to measure the license by the amount of business done. The words have to be changed in the Act to 'required license fee.'

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to have reference to amending section 109, but the minister has not told us what he proposes to repeal.

Mr. FISHER. These words occur in different places in the Act, and the sections mentioned in the resolution are the sections in which they occur; therefore, they all require to be amended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the idea of the minister as to the fee that should be exacted?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give an exact statement as to the amount, but it will vary according to the business done in the different elevators. Some of the large elevators will have to pay more than $2. I do not think it is intended that any elevator shall have its license for less than $2.

Mr. SPROULE. At the present time the Governor in Council may impose fines. Have you any knowledge of the fines that are contemplated in the Act? This appears to be a new authority.

Mr. FISHER. That section changes the form of the proceedings. At present the proceedings under the Act are in the form of an indictment, whereas, it is desired that these proceedings be taken under the Summary Convictions Act, and that changes in the Act are required for that purpose. I have no memorandum from the Department of Trade and Commerce as to how great the fines may be. These fines are imposed by regulation.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they heretofore imposed by the statute itself? Does it propose to change that now and give power to the Governor in Council to impose fines by regulation?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It means that you are providing for fines by the Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I have the Bill here:

Any person required by this section to furnish such statement or declaration, and failing to do so within three days after receipt of a written demand to him therefor from the commissioner, shall be liable upon summary conviction, to a fine of twenty-five dollars for each day thereafter during which he shall fail to furnish such statement or declaration, and the minister shall have power to cancel his license.

Licenses issued under this Act shall be revocable by the commissioner upon a summary proceeding before the commissioner upon complaint of any person, in writing, under oath setting forth the particular violation of the law, and upon satisfactory proof in that behalf to be taken in such manner as is directed by the commissioner; provided that such revocation shall not take effect until the minister has given his sanction thereto.

I do not see anything defining any other exact amount, and I do not find anything in the Bill prescribing any other fines than the sections which I have just read. I think that must be the one that is referred to in the resolution.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the minister on what representation he is making these amendments. Has there been a petition presented, or has a delegation waited upon the minister to point out defects in the Act, or where the Act could be strengthened in any way? This is the first intimation I have had that the Act was going to be amended.

Mr. FISHER. As far as I know these amendments originated in the department to facilitate the working of the Act. I am not aware that they have not been asked for but I have no officer of the department with me to-night and I could not positively answer that question. Of course, this is merely the resolution upon which the Bill is founded.

Mr. STAPLES. There certainly must have been some communication from the officials representing the government of Manitoba or this amendment would not be advanced by the minister. I would like to know what representations have been made.

Mr. FISHER. I have no information about any representations. If the hon. gentleman considers it necessary, before proceeding with the Bill itself, to have that information I would have to ask the committee to rise and report progress.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it would be well to have all the information which we can have before any such amendment takes place. I rather agree with the minister that it would be well to ask the committee to rise and report progress and let us get some further information.

Mr. FISHER. All the information will be available when the Bill itself comes up for consideration. I think it would be well perhaps to let the resolution go through.

Mr. STAPLES. I have no objection providing this resolution does not commit us to any particular amendment. I fancy that if this resolution is allowed to pass the argument will be put forward, as it has been put forward on other occasions, that we have committed ourselves to the amendment. I do not know that we will retard the business of the House very much if we ask the minister to have printed, or laid on the table of the House, such information as he has with respect to the request for these particular amendments.

Mr. FISHER. The Bill is printed, but it cannot be distributed until it is introduced. The Bill will not be introduced until the resolution is adopted. I am just waiting for the adoption of the resolution to introduce the Bill. The Bill will be distributed the moment it is introduced. The information my hon. friend asks for will certainly be available when the Bill comes up for discussion, and it is quite open to the House to reject any portion of the Bill or amend it; so that the passing of the resolution does not in any way prevent the discussion, amendment, or rejection of any particular clause in the Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think it would be well to pass this resolution. I may say to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), that there has been some request for some amendments from the representative of the farmers, the man who looks after any difficulties that the farmers have.

Mr. STAPLES. Who is that?

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. D. D. Campbell, of Winnipeg. He has represented that some amendments are necessary to carry out the evident intention of the Bill of last year. I took these amendments up with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and he is of the opinion they are reasonable amendments, and although they do not appear in the Bill as introduced they will be passed later on. The sooner they are passed the better. The amendment to which I particularly refer is in connection with broken and small wheat. At present the elevators are not compelled to account for the screenings of wheat and this year in some cases there have been 100 bushels of screenings, which make first-class feed, cleaned out of a 1,000 bushel car. The farmer has to pay the freight on the screenings but at present the elevators can, if they wish, retain them. An amendment is to be introduced in this Bill to make it compulsory on the inspector to state, when he inspects a car, what percentage of dockage there shall be for number one or number two screenings, and the elevator in addition to giving a certificate of the out-turn of the whole wheat must also give a certificate of the out-turn of the screenings provided the screenings amount to over two per cent. Number one screenings will be the screenings that have over 50 per cent of wheat broken, and number two screenings under 50 per cent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How could the inspector tell how much broken wheat there would be in any car and how could he distinguish one car from the other after passing through the elevator?

Mr. TURRIFF. The inspector does that at present.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. He does, and the western members can tell my hon. friend that he does. The inspector at present says that it will take two per cent or five per cent or ten per cent to clean that car and that much is docked, but under the present system he does not say what that is, and the amendment will give the inspector the power to say what it will take to clean that car, and a separate certificate must be given the farmer for that if it is over two per cent. The inspector will also say whether it is number one or number two screenings. This year there has been as much as $40 or $50 worth of good feed taken out of a car which the elevator does not need to account for and the amendment is proposed to remedy that injustice.

Mr. STAPLES. Is that the intention of the Bill now introduced?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Bill was drafted before I took the matter up with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but he agreed with me that these were necessary amendments and that he would have them passed.

Mr. STAPLES. What I want to know is on what advice the minister is amending the Act on the lines suggested in the resolution.

Mr. FISHER. As I understand it from a short conversation with the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce these amendments which are in the Bill have been found necessary to facilitate the working of the Act. I am not aware that any of the provisions in the printed Bill now ready are based on representations from any particular body. I am speaking subject to correction; the department may have had representations in regard to these in addition to their own experience in the working of the Act.

Mr STAPLES. I know from personal experience that the farmers have suffered to a large degree because of the defects in the present system which the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) has referred to. I hope when the Bill comes down that it will have a provision for preventing the great loss of money which the farmers have suffered in this way in the past. There never was in the western crop, especially in Saskatchewan and Alberta, as large a percentage of broken grain as this year; a fact which is no doubt due to the well developed kernel and the extremely dry weather during harvest. I believe it is necessary to have the amendments referred to passed as soon as possible, and I have therefore no objection to the resolution.

Mr. A. HAGGART (Winnipeg). My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and Macdonald (Mr. Staples) are both farmers and their interest is for the farmers, but the elevator men and the grain merchants are also interested in the grain business, and, and I think an opportunity should be afforded to them to express their views before the Bill is passed.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment spoken of by my hon. friend from Assinboia (Mr. Turriff) is not contained in the Bill as printed. Probably the hon. gentleman himself will move it in the House at the proper stage of this Bill and it will be considered on its merits. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that if I have charge of the Bill at that stage I shall be only too happy to secure an opportunity for all the different interests being represented and heard.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 49) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

House in Committee of Supply.

Arthabaska public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A site has been purchased out of an appropriation made two sessions ago, and we are asking for this vote in order to proceed with the construction of the building.

Aylmer post office—addition to building, &c., $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of making necessary additions and improvements to the public building at Aylmer, a building which is now entirely out of repair.

Chicoutimi public building—ground improvements, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for laying concrete sidewalks and macadam roadways around the public building.

Mr. HUGHES. What other public works are in progress at Chicoutimi?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is dredging and, I think, a wharf.

Dominion public buildings Quebec—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $20,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What was the amount spent at Sherbrooke last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $274.40.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What will be the amount this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to tell my hon. friend.

Fraserville armoury, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the purchase of a site and the erection of an armoury, which has been requested by the Militia Department since October, 1907.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What regiment uses this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 89th Temiscouata and Rimouski regiment.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the full cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As near as I can tell, about $10,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Has it been arranged to put a shooting gallery in this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say positively.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It would be a great source of benefit to the regiment and would not cost anything, because the basement could be utilized for the purpose.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvements and repairs to buildings, and fittings, furniture, &c., $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of new buildings and also repairs to the old buildings. These have all been asked for by Dr. Martineau, the medical superintendent of the station.

Joliette armoury, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is asked to complete the erection of the building, which is now under contract.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Can the minister tell us numerically the strength of the force at Joliette?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the headquarters of the 83rd Joliette regiment and also a company.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, about $23,200.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Was there a drill shed there formerly, or what accommodation had the regiment up to this time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I really do not know as to that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many companies are accommodated there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think two.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the building is very nearly finished. Six tenders were received. The lowest was accepted, $13,500. In addition there is heating, electric wiring and fittings, furniture, inside walks, fencing, contingencies and cost of site. The electric wiring and heating were, I think, let by tender, but I am not sure.

Mr. SPROULE. What did they cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The electric wiring, $512; heating and boilers together, $2,000. The building is two stories of brick, with stone foundation and trimmings; 56 feet 2 inches by 47 feet 1 inch.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. According to the Militia list, there is only one company there. What is the hon. gentleman's policy with regard to armouries in general? Are any more being built? Why is it this one cost $23,000 and the one at Fraserville only $10,000, and how is it these are not paid out of the general vote for armouries of $50,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are endeavouring to build one at Fraserville at less cost than at Joliette. Fraserville is the last. There is a strong disposition on the part of hon. members on both sides to try if possible to reduce the cost of armouries, and we have felt that in the case of Fraserville, we should get a suitable one for $10,000. In the case of Hartland, we are providing for a building at $10,000 which will also accommodate the post office.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What regiment is that to accommodate?

Mr. CARVELL. Two companies of the 67th.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the size of the armoury at Fraserville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans have not been prepared yet.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The headquarters of the 67th are at Woodstock, and we have already constructed an armoury there to accommodate a regiment of infantry and a battery of artillery. Why then erect an armoury at Hartland?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. CARVELL. In the Woodstock armoury there are the 10th Field Battery, the First Company of the Engineers and two companies of the 67th. The remaining six companies of the 67th are at local headquarters. Two of them are at Hartland.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it the policy then, in addition to building armouries at headquarters for the regiments, to build armouries at other places for various companies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The armoury at Hartland is not in pursuance of any general policy, but it was represented to us that the people would be well satisfied if we put up a building costing $10,000 which would do for a post office and might be used also for regimental purposes. That was done to meet the necessities of a particular case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It would be more advisable to follow some uniform system. That has been discussed again and again in the House. There are a great many regiments in this Dominion which have no armoury and which, so far as qualifications and service records go, are unsurpassed. I must certainly protest against the system pursued here. We understood that there was one bulk vote brought each year that is to be used for these armouries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While there has been a vote taken of $50,000 each session for the construction of armouries in smaller towns, I do not think that that vote has been granted to the exclusion altogether of special votes for buildings which could not be erected out of the $50,000 vote. When I became minister, I found there was some departure from that rule, and that has been continued.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is Fraserville specially selected and Joliette and Hartland and other important places left out? Is there any reason for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing more than I have given.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle is that $50,000 apportioned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This apportionment is made on the recommendation of the Militia Department. Last session, when I asked for the general vote, I gave a statement of how the money voted for the previous year had been expended. And when we come to that item I will give a statement for the expenditure on armouries for the past year.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Was there a post office building at Hartland before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle would the selection be made of places in which the money is to be spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Militia Department makes a requisition on the Public Works Department for the erection of certain armouries out of the general vote. We recognize that their judgment is to be relied upon and we proceed with the work, drawing on the vote for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be the right of the Minister of Militia, of course, under the circumstances to recommend where an armoury was to be built, regardless of the judgment of parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the object of getting the vote in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. Very convenient for the minister when an election is coming on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That might be said, but I do not think that that has ever influenced the distribution.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether this general vote has been long in existence or not. But, from the knowledge we have of this government, I should not have the highest expectation of such a vote would be distributed strictly on sound principles.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. At this point I should explain to the committee, that while in the printed estimates there are two items connected with Grosse Isle station, I have called only one, as the resolution in my hand does not completely give the other. The second is:

Grosse Isle quarantine station—new detention building, $20,000.

I have entered it in the resolution. Does it carry?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is asked for by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who tells me that there is absolute need of it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. How many immigrants will it house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information before me, but no doubt the Minister of Agriculture will be glad to give the information.

Mr. FISHER. This building is intended to take the place of the present second-class detention building. These detention buildings at Grosse Isle are to receive those who arrive in ships and who, though not themselves diseased, may have come in contact with disease on the ship and possibly bear the germs of that disease with them. We have there what is called a first-class detention building where the first-class passengers are accommodated. It offers about as good accommodation as the second-class on a steamship. In the present second-class detention building the accommodation is not better than the present steerage on board the vessels, and has been frequently occupied by steerage passengers because we have not sufficient accommodation for all when a large number are to be detained. The new building will be about the grade of the first-class detention building at present, because the accommodation for second-class passengers aboard the ships is so much better than the present second-class detention building can offer. The new building will accommodate about 150 without crowding, with a possibility of putting into it 200 if necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. It affords sleeping accommodation, of course?

Mr. FISHER. Much like the state-rooms on a steamer. The building has a passage down the middle with rooms about the size of state-rooms on a vessel on either side. There are two stories of these. In the centre of the building are the dining and sitting rooms. There are wings on either side with the rows of state-rooms.

Mr. DANIEL. And bath-rooms, &c.?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, about the same accommodation as is afforded on the river steam-boats on the St. Lawrence. There is a bath-room at either end. As a rule, the lady passengers are housed at one end of the building and the gentlemen at the other, with exceptions in the case of married people.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see the statement made in the press that 8,000 Doukhobors are coming to Canada. I would like to know if that is a fact, and also if the $5 a head bonus is being paid on these people?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the government must know, and I thought perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could answer the question.

Mr. FISHER. The item before us has nothing to do with that point, and I have not the information before me. When an item concerning such things is before the committee, the information will gladly be given.

Mr. J. D. REID. How are you going to accommodate 8,000 Doukhobors when they come?

Mr. FISHER. The 8,000 are not likely to come all together. As a matter of fact, no ship carries 8,000 passengers.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this vote expected to pay the whole cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it to be a wooden building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably; the detention buildings are generally frame buildings; but the point has not yet been decided.

Mr. DANIEL. How does the minister (Mr. Pugsley) know what the building is to cost if he does not know of what it is to be built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We shall know more definitely when we get the plans, but I assure the committee in the meantime that we expect to put up a building which will not cost more than $20,000.

Lachine post office—tower clock, $750.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty years ago a post office was built in Lachine and a tower erected upon it with a place in it for a clock. But the clock has never been placed there. The opening for the face was boarded up and has really been an eye-sore to the people. They have urged very strongly that we should put a clock in this tower, and I trust there will be no opposition.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Who is to put it in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will not put it in until we get the appropriation.

Mr. HUGHES. How about the clock for Port Hope? Or was it Bowmanville? The government solemnly promised it some years ago and that promise has not been kept.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) oppose this vote?

Mr. HUGHES. I am calling attention to a promise made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find it hard enough to keep my own promises——

Mr. HUGHES. I know.

Lachine public building—installation of new heating apparatus—revote of $1,700 lapsed, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated that excavating the cellar for furnace rooms, putting in concrete floor, heating apparatus, &c., will cost $2,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Could the minister tell us whether a contract was let for the building, and another contract for the installation of lighting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell that, because it was built 20 years ago under the old government. I would assume that the heating and lighting was done without tender.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister, who is so well posted on the good old days, could tell us whether this building was constructed by public competition?

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to tell my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. Then my hon. friend should not be so free in his criticism, because he knows very well that the policy of the opposition to-day is a policy of public tender, and that is not the policy of my hon. friend's government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is.

Mr. BLAIN. Then my hon. friend is a recent convert to something of that kind, and we will expect to see him put it into practice. Since my hon. friend ventures on criticising the old government, perhaps he could bring forward some of this twenty years old information. For instance, he says the old government did not supply a clock in buildings constructed twenty years ago. We were not so profuse with promises in pre-election days as my hon. friend; therefore we are not in the clock business to the same extent.

Lévis—drill hall—revote of $20,000 lapsed, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of proceeding with the construction of a drill hall in the town of Lévis. The site is being provided by the municipality of Levis, free of cost to the government.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Tell us how this vote lapsed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote was in the estimates of 1907-8, and it was one of the buildings the construction of which was postponed in accordance with the decision which I explained to the committee last session.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What regiments is this building intended to accommodate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 6th regiment, a Quebec and Levis regiment of Canadian artillery, 265 officers and men.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the building been commenced yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister not think that when he is commencing a work for another department it is the duty of the head of that other department to be here to justify the vote? The Minister of Militia is not present. The Minister of Public Works is responsible for the construction of buildings on the request of his colleagues. But the deeper question is as to whether there should be a drill shed, and that can only be answered by the Minister of Militia. I think the House is entitled to have the responsible minister in his seat when these votes are canvassed. For instance, my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) asks for information from a mili-

tary point of view. The Minister of Public Works, though a genius in some ways, is not a military man, and he cannot answer all these things.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend in a general way is right. Of course if any item came up in respect to which there was serious opposition on the part of any member of the committee, I would ask it to stand over until the Minister of Militia was present. But in the case of this drill hall I can satisfy the committee that it is really necessary. There is no place in Lévis where the men of the regiment can be drilled. I should have mentioned that in addition to the 6th regiment there is the 17th regiment, which has 196 officers and men. Lévis is an important town, and I think everybody will agree that it is a place where there should be a drill hall. We do not propose to erect a very expensive one, it is to cost $60.000. That is not so expensive as the drill hall in Sherbrooke or Peterborough.

Mr. HUGHES. I may inform the hon. minister that the 6th regiment belongs to Vancouver, B. C.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the Canadian artillery I spoke of.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. gentleman says that this drill hall does not cost as much as the drill hall at Sherbrooke. Perhaps he will tell us what the drill hall at Sherbrooke has cost. He might also tell us whether accommodation has been prepared for the new regiment which is being formed at Sherbrooke. I understand there is a new French Canadian regiment being recruited now in Sherbrooke, and it is found that there is no room in the drill shed for this new regiment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry I cannot give the information to my hon. friend. We are not asking for a vote for the Sherbrooke drill hall.

Maisonneuve—post office—revote of $10,000 lapsed, $20,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. The first vote having lapsed, I understand that we are now starting afresh, this is practically a first vote. I think it would be well for the minister to state positively just how much money he intends to expend on this building, to erect it, fit it up, light it, heat it, everything in connection with it, including the site. I would like him to assure the House that he will instruct his officer of the extreme limit to be allowed in the erection of this building. In taking this vote we want the minister to tell us now what this building is going to cost complete, including site, and the House wants to be assured that he will never come back again to ask for any larger sum. This is the only way the minister can keep a check upon the expenditure of the country. We do not want him to come back next year, or the year after, and ask for a further estimate beyond what he now estimates the building will actually cost. But, as the minister was able to repeat my statement and so well understands my meaning, I do not think it is worth while for me to detain the committee further on it. I hope I will have the opportunity of meeting him here another year, when possibly this matter may be dealt with again, but I do not want that the minister shall ever come back to ask for any larger sum than he says this building is actually to cost. Now, will the minister make his statement and say just how much money he proposes to expend on this building, what limit he is going to give to his officer, and then we will know exactly where we stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like very much to give my hon. friend a definite assurance in regard to the cost of this building, including the site, but I am not able to do so for the reason that I do not know what it will cost us to procure a suitable site in the first place. Maisonneuve, while it is a separate municipality, is really a part of the city of Montreal, it is growing very rapidly and land is held at high prices. I am not able to state to the committee to-night what we will get a suitable site for, and I am not able to tell the committee positively what the building will cost, but my own impression is that we ought to get a building at Maisonneuve which would not cost us over $30,000 or $35,000. That would be exclusive of the site. Of course, in a city like Montreal, which is growing very rapidly, we must be prepared to pay something more for a public building than we would in one of the smaller towns.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am afraid the minister has taken a very wide range. Thirty thousand or $35,000 would put up a pretty handsome building, but I think that between his maximum and his minimum there is too wide a difference. I think he should be able to say to the committee that he considers $30,000 ample. If he does not think so let him tell the committee that he will instruct his officers not to go beyond the larger sum. Let him fix some definite sum, because, if he does not do so, he can rest assured that the amount, no matter what it is, will be very greatly exceeded. The minister says that he does not know what the site will cost. I am not asking him to declare how much he will expend on this building, including the site. We will leave the site in abeyance. That may cost $1,000, it may cost more, it may cost less; but let the minister tell us now just how much he is going to say to his officers that the building will cost exclusive of the site. There is no difficulty in doing that. The minister knows how much money he can afford to

spend on a building of that kind. It is not a question of whether it shall be $30,000 or $35,000. The minister is going to erect a building and he says: The country can afford to spend $30,000 or $35,000. But what I do want is to establish some fixed amount that shall be adhered to and that upon a future occasion he will not come here and ask for a sum in excess of that. That is the only way in which the minister, or the House, can keep a check upon the expenditure of the country, and I do say that before this vote is passed the minister must definitely give us the assurance that the amount to be expended shall not exceed a certain sum, and let him name that sum exclusive of the site if he thinks fit.

Mr. VERVILLE. As this proposed building is in my constituency, I may be permitted to say a word upon it. An amount has been mentioned as the probable value of land in Maisonneuve, but I should like to point out that you cannot buy land there as cheaply as some hon. members may imagine. You cannot buy a site for a postal station for much less than between $8,000 and $10,000. If a postal station is to be built there it will not be to please people in Maisonneuve but to satisfy the requirements of the postal department. Under these circumstances I think the minister rather underestimates when he mentions $35,000 as being the amount which will be required to satisfy the postal requirements of that community which is growing very fast. In the near future it will be absolutely necessary to have a building large enough to provide for the growing business of the postal department in that section. There are between 18,000 and 20,000 people in Maisonneuve, and the city is growing at the rate of 1,800 every year.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it annexed?

Mr. VERVILLE. It is not annexed yet, but will be next year. They are annexing everything around the city of Montreal just now and it will be brought in next year. There is vast difference between a post office and a postal station because in the city of Montreal to-day there are no more post offices; there are postal stations under the management of the general post office.

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) rather surprised me when he stated that the site for a public building in this town would cost as much as $10,000. He may be right. I have no knowledge of the value of land there. But, I made a fair proposition to the minister. We leave out of consideration the site and only ask the minister as to the amount which will be expended upon the building. I have a little suspicion about the cost of this building. No doubt when he comes to erect it the workmen will have to work only eight hours a day. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has an eight hour a day Bill before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not understand my hon. friend's statement that on all public buildings they only work eight hours a day. There is no limitation to eight hours a day.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member from Maisonneuve may have something to say upon that. He is supporting the government and he will expect the government to support him. What about the hon. gentleman's Bill providing for an eight hour day on public works. It would be a most remarkable thing after the hon. gentleman's advocacy of an eight hour day for public works that he should permit a public building to be erected in his riding and the men be called upon to work ten hours. Surely the hon. gentleman would not permit it. He would not want public money expended in his county if the men had to work ten hours a day. So that we can take it for granted that it would be an eight hour a day job, and of course it will cost a great deal more than if it were a ten hour a day job, because the men will reasonably expect to get as much for eight hours as they would get for ten. In that way the minister will have to be very guarded in his estimate and make sure that his proposal is sufficiently high. I understand the minister to say that $35,000 is to be the extreme limit that he will go in the erection of this building. Has the minister fixed that amount to cover everything, or are we to understand that $10,000 is to be paid for the site and $35,000 over that for the erection of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The figure I named was exclusive of the site.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not very much concerned as to what the cost of the building will be. I do not know anything about the size of the town or the requirements of the place, but I want to establish the principle so that we will know just exactly what we are doing. Now we understand the minister that whatever the site costs is not to be a portion ot this $35,000, but that the building, outside of the site, is not to cost more than $35,000 when completed, lighted, the walks around it, the grass planted and everything done that will make it a place of beauty so that the government will not be called upon to expend another dollar upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did I give that assurance?

Mr. HENDERSON. I want the minister to give us that assurance. If we allow the latitude that has prevailed in the past the

expenditure is bound to get beyond our control. Has the minister the plans and specifications before him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then perhaps it is so much the better because he can direct his architect to produce a building which will not cost more than $35,000, and if the architect does not do it he should get another architect. But I am perfectly confident the architect will and can do it if he is so instructed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it does cost more than $35,000 the hon. gentleman will want to know the reason why.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, the hon. gentleman can easily find a reason or an excuse; he could give the eight hour day movement as a reason, but here we are spending the money of the people and the minister should not treat it as a joke. I have advocated this in the House for many a year, and one Minister of Public Works told me that my plan was a good one and that when we were voting away the money of the country we should know just how much we were voting.

Mr. EDWARDS. I enter my protest against the utterly reckless manner in which the money of the country is being handled by this government. I do not think that even this House has ever seen such an exhibition as the Minister of Public Works has afforded in respect to this item. A year ago he asked for $10,000 to erect a building in Maisonneuve, and one would naturally suppose that was all that was needed, but this year he asks for $20,000, and before we have had time to realize it, he tells us the building will cost $30,000 or $35,000. Then the member for the constituency tells us that the land alone will cost $8,000 or $10,000 and the Minister of Public Works immediately tries to excuse himself for his intention to pile on something like $15,000 or $20,000 more than he is asking for to-night. Surely the minister should know what a building will cost before he asks for money for it, but he has no more idea of the ultimate cost of this building than a child on the street. That is our experience of him in connection with other buildings. The cottages for the servants of the Military College at Kingston were contracted for at $77,000, and then he asked for $112,000, and after spending two weeks trying to justify himself he finally agreed to knock off $20,000 from the vote. Last year his excuse for the large amount of money these cottages cost was that the foundations had to be dug out of the solid rock, but as a matter of fact there were not over three feet of rock excavated. The wall above the ground is over four feet high and allowing eight feet for the cellar, I do not see how he can make out that the excavation is as much as he said. But that is the way the money goes; drill halls here and there for the accommodation of the soldiers and the soldiers to-day at Kingston are out on Barriefield common providing films for a moving picture show. I protest against the minister asking an appropriation for a building until he is able to tell us what that building will ultimately cost.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Maisonneuve is a very important centre, and I am satisfied the minister will not erect a suitable building there for $25,000, but I want to ask him if he is providing that the public buildings erected by the government shall have 100 feet, or even 200 feet, of space all round them so as to separate them from adjoining buildings? That is the practice in the United States and a very good practice it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we made any such rule as that it would cost us a great deal of money.

Mr. HUGHES. Even so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I admit it might be in the public interest to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. It would.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not adopted that rule and we are not going to do so in this case.

Mr. HUGHES. In the country towns you will find some of these buildings erected between a corner grocery and a saloon, when it would be just as easy for the government to acquire a suitable site. I would suggest to the member for Maisonneuve that he should select a proper site and even if it cost a few thousand dollars extra the House will not begrudge it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Surely the minister must know what the ultimate cost of this building will be, and the House certainly has the right to know, before we are asked to vote this money. I would suggest that the minister let this item stand, as well as other items which may follow, until he is able to state to the House how much in each case shall be spent for a site and how much for a building to be erected thereon. I for one do not feel justified in letting an item of this kind go through without a proper statement from the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I stated very frankly to the committee what was the situation in regard to this building. Maisonneuve is a part of the city of Montreal; it is growing very rapidly, and land there has a value which is based upon that growth. The hon. member who represents the constituency states that in his judgment the site will cost between $8,000 and

$10.000. In my opinion the building will cost not less than between $30,000 and $35,000. I shall ask the chief architect to plan a building that will cost about that amount, though if a suitable building would cost $5,000 or even $10,000 more, I think we should still proceed with it. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) complains that while I am asking for $20,000, I intimate that the building is going to cost more. When my hon. friend has more parliamentary experience, he will know that the total amount required for the construction of any public work is never asked for in the first vote unless it is expected that the work will be completed during the year. All that is asked is the amount expected to be spent in the year.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is it also the case that when a minister asks for an appropriation for a public building, he gives no estimate of the cost of that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the point my hon. friend made.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is the point I am making now.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A postal station.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it not called so?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a post office at present, because Maisonneuve is outside the city of Montreal. When it is joined to Montreal, this will be a postal station.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the Postmaster General contemplates having a postal station there, and that is what it ought to be called. Did I understand the minister to say that he had not yet any plans prepared for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. It does seem to me to be a little peculiar in the minister to ask for a vote of $20,000 without a plan. When he comes and asks for an appropriation for a public building, he ought to be able to lay the plans on the table of the House. What are we giving the vote for? Not on the strength of the minister's assertion. We are going on a plan and a plan which is tangible and can be got at; and when we are asked for $30,000, we want to know the plan of the building. The minister says he has not got any. It turns then entirely on the minister's assertion, so that it is perfectly proper that he should have his land before he asks us for the vote. The minister might very well take a vote and purchase the land, but until he submits his plan for the building, it seems to me not proper for him to ask the House for a vote for the building and then give no definite promises because he has no plans on which to base them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will assure the committee that during the time he was in charge of the finances of the country, he ever knew of an instance when plans were laid on the table with reference to public buildings for which votes were passed, there would be some force in his argument.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is always at his old trick of going back to the past. Might I retort by asking, if during the time when he was a Liberal-Conservative and supported that party, and at other times he was half way between the two parties, on the fence, as an independent, and at others when he dropped down on the other side of the fence as soon as he felt the attractions of patronage, I suppose that kind of reminiscence would rather bother him and he would not consider it was the best way of conducting business. But suppose we consider that he is responsible for the votes he asks us to pass when he brings down the estimates, are we not justified in asking him to submit the plans for the buildings he asks us to authorize him to construct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman chooses to go back to the days when he used to live away down by the sea, before he found it necessary to change his political residence and move westward to Toronto, and if he would call to mind the thousands of dollars squandered, so far as New Brunswick was concerned, by his own neglect of the interests of people in the city of St. John, by his refusal to recognize their legitimate aspirations to have that port become the winter port of Canada, and his recognition apparently that it was quite proper to vote subsidies out of the people's money for Atlantic steamers which passed by the port of the city of St. John and made their terminus at a foreign port, assisted by the moneys of Canada, despite the pleadings of the people for some recognition of their rights, he would probably have no difficulty in discovering why so many of the best people there changed their politics and supported a party which is disposed to do justice to the maritime provinces. Now as to why I have not brought down plans here to-night, I would say that in these estimates we have some twelve hundred items and that it would be out of the question for me to instruct my chief architect and chief engineer to prepare the plans before the items were submitted to the House and voted. Does he suggest that I should have had the plans prepared before my colleagues had agreed to the estimates and before they had been submitted for the consideration of the House? These estimates were only prepared and approved by council a few weeks ago, and it would be utterly impossible to prepare one-tenth of the plans of

the various public buildings and wharfs for the consideration of the committee at present. Were I to attempt to do so, it would be utterly impossible to go on with the consideration of these public works within any reasonable time. What I have said is that such and such a building is to cost a certain amount of money; and when the amount is voted, I shall ask the chief architect to prepare the plans in each case accordingly. In the particular case under consideration, I have said that the building, in my judgment, ought not to cost over $35,000, and I shall instruct the chief architect to prepare plans of a building which will not cost more than that sum.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before the minister will instruct the chief architect to have the plans prepared would it not be advisable for him to have his site? Should he not first secure a site at Maisonneuve which would be of sufficient size to leave considerable space between the public building and any other adjoining building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As soon as I can get the site, I shall have the plans prepared for a suitable building. I cannot get the site without getting the money appropriated. I am only asking for $20,000. If the site should cost $10,000, that will only leave $10,000 for the building.

Mr. EDWARDS. When we see in the estimates an item such as this for a post office $20,000, we are justified in concluding that that amount, or very nearly that amount, is all that will be required. In the absence of any other statement from the minister, we are justified in coming to that conclusion; and I would say that when, as in a case like the present, the minister asks for an appropriation of $20,000, and knows that the building will cost in all probability $35,000 or $40,000 with the site, when completed, he should be fair enough to say that in all probability the site there will cost more than in some other places and that possibly we shall have to spend $35,000 or $40,000 for that building. That would leave us with an altogether different impression than we are justified in having when we see simply an item of $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister not think it would be better to take a vote for the purchase of the site and have his plans prepared and ready at the next session so that the House will know what kind of building will be constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would put the matter off a year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend can hardly plead that as an excuse because he has not yet got the site. I do not want to press too strongly the cogency of the speech delivered by my hon. friend. It had great influence on my own mind against the passing of this vote. Does not the minister think he will be better advised if he takes a vote for the site? He is asking for a vote for $20,000, and, if he likes, he can spend all that money on a site, a thing which, I think, the House would not justify. The minister has not told us what kind of building he is going to construct or what it will cost. He thought at first that a site could be got for $5,000, but now it is $6,000, $8,000 or $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not mention any amount for the site.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend's memory is not as good as his imagination. But 'Hansard' comes, fortunately, as a help to bad memories, and if he will read 'Hansard' to-morrow, I think he will see that I am right. But we are entirely at sea in this matter. The minister tells us $5,000 for a site, but the gentleman behind him who ought to know more about the matter, says that he cannot begin to get a site for that money. Before the committee is called upon to vote money for the building, it should know whether a site can be got at a fair price or not. The minister is committing us to an expenditure of $35,000 or $40,000 without a shred of a plan.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation). Mr. Chairman it seems to me that the suggestion offered by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is quite fair. I am personally aware that in a certain locality a site was bought along with a view to the building thereon of a post office and nothing so far has been done. In the town of Ste. Thérèse, in the county of Terrebonne, a site was purchased over two years ago at a cost of $5,000 for a post office, and I do not see that any vote is taken in the estimates for the erection of a post office in that town.

When a vote like this one is taken for Maisonneuve, I do not see why Ste. Thérèse should not enjoy a similar treatment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Though a site was purchased at Ste. Thérèse, we were not able to go on with the construction of the building last year. But we hope in the not distant future to see to the erection of a building there.

Mr. HUGHES. Why is there no vote this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At this moment, I cannot give my hon. friend the reason.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the superior intelligence of the electors anything to do with it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not think so.

Marieville public building—revote of $5,860 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Marieville as compared with Ste. Thérèse?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Marieville 1,306 in 1901.

Mr. FOSTER. And Ste. Thérèse?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not at this moment remember.

Mr. NANTEL. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Nantel) can give the population.

Mr. NANTEL. About 2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been used, in times past, to get some information showing the necessity for any proposed building. Does the minister propose to introduce some new plan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to give information, but I do not want to take up the time of the committee unduly. Parliament voted, two years ago, a sum for this building, evidently satisfied that it was necessary. But if the hon. member wants information I am glad to give it. The population of Marieville was 1,306 in 1901; postal revenue in 1908-9 was $1,396; customs revenue—it is an outport of Montreal—$4,061.56: money orders issued, $18,905.62; money orders paid, $14,396.42. The site on which the building is to be constructed has a frontage of 84 feet on one street and 61 on another. The building is for post office and customs purposes. The site was purchased from the corporation of Marieville.

Mr. FOSTER. What was paid for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We think this building should be erected for not more than $25,000, that to include site, heating, lighting and everything except furniture.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Postmaster General made a requisition for a building of this size to accommodate the postal service in Marieville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Postmaster General has not described the building required.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the request of the Postmaster General?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not find in the information before me any request from the Postmaster General. But the Board of Trade urged the erection of a public building as long ago as March 10, 1906.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what county is Marieville situated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rouville.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And who represents Rouville, please?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hon. Mr. Brodeur.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to raise my voice in protest against this vote. I notice that one or two members on the other side laugh. I wonder now, if they would conduct their own business in this way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member (Mr. Foster) will pardon me, there is one bit of further information which I wish to give. I stated the population of Marieville at 1,306. I should have added that there is also the population of Ste. Marie de Mannoir who use the same post office, that population being 1,054, so that there is a total population of 2,360 to be accommodated by this post office.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A village, I believe.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that Ste. Marie de Mannoir is a parish.

Mr. FOSTER. Ah! There is quite a difference, is not there? Marieville being in the parish, a post office built in Marieville will be in the parish, no doubt about that But there is equally little doubt that the $25,000 is spent for Marieville and not for the parish. Is there no post office in the parish outside of Marieville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the parish of Ste. Marie de Monnoir will also use the post office.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no request from the Postmaster General, and no approval by him of this expenditure of $25,000. The Board of Trade have asked for it, we are told. This is not the money of the Board of Trade, this is the money of the country, and if it is spent at all it should be spent for no other purpose than to meet the postal requirements. Will the minister say that he has the approval and request of the Postmaster General for this vote, that he cannot carry on the postal business of this country in a proper way unless he gets $25,000 for a building in Marieville? I have too much respect for the Postmaster General to believe that he would stand up in this House and make any such statement. The truth is that this is a matter of mere patronage, this $25,000 which has been raised from the taxation of the people is simply a matter of patronage at Marieville, nothing more and nothing less. I for one am going to voice my protest against Marieville having such an expenditure until I get good reasons from the Postmaster General to the effect that this expenditure of $25,000 is necessary in order to properly carry on the post office business of the country. I think we ought to make a very vigorous protest against any expenditure of that kind. The minister says in his bland way: Well, we think. Who are we?

The ministry. We think that a village of 1,300 people ought to have $25,000 spent on a post office. If the government thinks that, are you going to carry out the principle to its logical conclusion, and are you going to plant $25,000 of the people's money in every place in this country which has a population of 1,300? What is the post office revenue there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the post office, $1,396.59 ; from customs, $4,061.56.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the administration of the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postmaster's salary is $643. The money orders, savings bank and postal notes afford a revenue of $774.25. This building is to be used for customs purposes also, and the customs revenue must also be included with the post office revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I fancy the Minister of Customs will not say to this House that he wants $25,000 spent in Marieville in order to enable him to carry on the customs business of the country. So it is not germane at all to say that customs must be added in. Now you have a surplus on that transaction of about $500 or $600. Put your $25,000 building there, and what will be the standing and permanent charge upon the country? It is absolutely wrong and the minister knows it, and I think he would be well advised if he allowed this item to stand until he hears from the Postmaster General, and until this committee get sufficient reasons from the men who are conducting te business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Notwithstanding the judgment of the hon. gentleman, I do intend to endeavour to pass the vote—unless the committee should determine against it. But why does my hon. friend make such a dead set—if I may use the expression—against this item? He allowed the item of a public building at Hillsborough, which is a no larger place than Marieville, to go through without opposition. He made no protest against the vote for the erection of a public building in Athabaska, which I think is no more important than Marieville. Is it because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was elected in that constituency by acclamation, that my hon. friend makes such determined opposition to this item? I do not think he knows the importance of this town, or he would not make such a determined opposition. I gave the population of Marieville of 1901, when it was 1,306. In the parish of Ste. Marie de Monnoir at the same time the population was 1,054. My information is that both the parish and the village use the post office in Marieville. Now the building is required for both post office and customs purposes, and the revenue which the country receives from these two sources was upwards of $5,400 during the year 1908-9. Evidently a large business is being done there. The money orders issued amounted to $18,000, and the money orders paid to $14,000. My information is that Marieville is a progressive town, new industries are constantly springing up. There are two hat factories carrying on successfully a manufacturing business. While the population in 1901 was 1,306, it has been growing steadily, and according to a census taken in 1907 it showed a population of 1,671. That would be in addition to the population of Ste. Marie de Monnoir. Now Marieville contains in addition to the factories I have mentioned, a college, a Roman Catholic church, a Baptist church, an asylum for the aged and poor, a chamber of commerce, eleven stores, four hotels, one sawmill, a foundry, a threshing machine factory, a branch bank, and the ordinary express and telegraph offices. So it is a place of importance, and increasing in population, and I certainly do think that my hon. friend had better look around and find some other public building against which he can direct his opposition with better ground. So far as I know, this place has no public building, and we are simply giving to the people what they are fairly entitled to.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend think that he might just as well have left out one portion of his remarks when he asked the question, by way of insinuation, if I opposed this vote simply because a minister of the Crown happened to have been elected there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You let so many others go through.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that is a manly argument between a member and a minister? Does he really think so? I dare say he does or else he would not have used it. If he thinks so, I think very few people in this House will think so. Had he so poor a case that he had to appeal to his imagination and to a prejudiced imagination? Is that the kind of tactics my hon. friend has to use generally? Is his success due to that? He exemplifies it in this argument. I think my hon. friend would be better advised to leave insinuations like that out when we are discussing an important business matter of this kind. I have no doubt there will be a great many others that I might protest against just the same as this one here. When he attempts to put in places like this $25,000 of the people's money, where are we to end? I would like to have the Postmaster General's frank opinion in reference to this. I have found him a straight and honourable man and I would like to know whether he needs this. If he does

not that settles the question. I am looking into the eyes of people away out in the far distant districts that need things that they have not got, and why should we plant down $25,000 in these little places that are very well served now and leave the great development and progress of the country entirely unprovided for in so far as these extravagances in expenditure make it impossible to carry out these improvements? Are we not business men enough to look at it from a business point of view? Do we need to resort to petty insinuations to patch up a very bad case?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister give us the number of towns in the province which have not yet been favoured with post offices or public buildings whose population is greater than that of Marieville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the county seat of Rouville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Marieville.

Mr. WRIGHT. I took occasion last year, when matters of this kind were up, to point out that post offices were being built under the Public Works Department where they were absolutely unnecessary. I went into this question, looked up the history of fifty post offices, and I found that the cost averaged about $30,000. Suppose we place the interest on that at $1,200 and the cost of maintenance and repairs at $1,200; that makes $2,400 annually for keeping up these little post offices per annum. I found that prior to the new offices being built the government were paying less than $150 per annum each. The business interests of this country would be better served by the government in these small places renting buildings for post offices purposes. They would save a large sum of money annually even if they were to raise the rental. There is no doubt that there are many men in Marieville and other small places who would be very glad to rent their premises to the government for, say, $200 a year and give the service that the public required. While we have large towns that have no public buildings and have no attention paid to their needs with respect to post office facilities, I think it is wrong to be spending public money in these small places. We have towns in the country having 7,000 population and whose gross postal income amounts to $10,000 that have no public buildings in which to conduct the post office business. They cannot secure buildings from the government which is ready to expend hundreds of thousands of dollars in villages where they are not required at all. In my riding we have three towns with a gross revenue in each one of them running from $5,500 to $7,000 and yet they cannot get a post office. They are not considered large or important enough to warrant the government in the expenditure of public money upon the erection of a post office, but in other sections of the country, in little villages with a gross revenue of $1,300, buildings are erected because they are able to successfully besiege the minister and get money appropriated for that purpose. There seems to be a lack of any business plan or system to guide the Minister of Public Works in the distribution of public money. Every minister who is at the head of a department should make his application to the Minister of Public Works before he undertakes to erect a public building. The Minister of Militia should father the expenditure for the armouries that are erected under his department. The Postmaster General ought to make the recommendation and father the responsibility for the erection of a post office and the same should apply with regard to all the other departments that are under the charge of the government. It is utterly impossible for a Minister of Public Works—I do not care how well qualified he may be—to have that varied knowledge with regard to all the departments of the government which would warrant him in coming to a conclusion upon every application placed before him. He ought to throw that responsibility on the heads of the department and then he should confine himself to carrying out the instructions that they give him and curtail his expenditure in proportion to the needs of the public. When the minister states that there is a population of 2,300 in these two villages that are supposed to be served by this post office and when he states that the total revenue is something over $1,300 he makes a most remarkable statement indeed. Any of the towns in my riding with a population of 2,300 would have a gross revenue of over $5,000 and I think there is something radically wrong with the statement of the minister when he says there is only a revenue of $1,300 from a population of 2,300. There is evidently not that number of people or they do not use the post office and if they do not use the post office I do not think we are justified in spending $25,000 in erecting a building of that size.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the committee, whether it be any use or not, to two other points. In a young country like Canada with a very large area and sparse population greatly scattered, the need for postal accommodation in the way of the carrying of letters and papers fortnightly, weekly, tri-weekly and daily is very great, and from all over that immense territory we have prayer after prayer, petition after petition asking for mail routes in reasonable quantity, which are absolute necessities at the pres-

ent time. Post offices costing $25,000 where the revenue is only $1,300 are absolutely and certainly not. They are luxuries. No, they are not even to be denominated luxuries; they are examples of wasteful extravagance. While hundreds and thousands of people living back in our country places are asking for weekly, tri-weekly and daily mail routes, in order that they may have the visit of the mail carrier and communication with others, allowing them to do their business, what is taking place under the management of this government? The revenues derived from the postal system of the country are being spent in unnecessary buildings, costing $25,000 and more so that there is not sufficient revenue to aid in the development of the mail carrying routes in order that the people in the distant parts of the country may have the visit of the postal carrier more frequently than they do to-day. Take that very instance and multiply it. You have to-day a surplus which goes into the postmaster's till of over $600,000. That surplus should be expended in giving mail service to the people in distant parts of the country, and if you go on erecting post offices out of it, instead of a surplus you will have an absolute deficit. By this means the earnings of the post office are robbed of their legitimate sphere which is to extend the postal facilities of the country. Such a system is not carried out in the United States or in Great Britain. The British post office could not exist for a single year if it undertook the policy of erecting post offices in towns of 1,300 inhabitants more or less. The British post office is managed to facilitate postal communications between the people and it is managed economically, and instead of $30,000 post offices scattered all through Great Britain and Ireland you have inexpensive and sufficient accommodation by rentals and the like. The United States is a rich country with a population of 90,000,000 and the United States is supposed to be very generous with the distribution of its money, but it does not pursue such a policy as is pursued in Canada. It places great post offices in great centres but in the smaller centres it goes on a less expensive plan. Its purpose is to increase the postal facilities for the people of the country. Why should Canada carry on this policy of robbing the post office revenue from its legitimate purpose of giving, more particularly, the people of the remote districts, to whom the arrival of the postman with a letter is a kind of benediction, far more frequent mail service than they have now. I do not make this protest in the hope that it will have any effect on the Minister of Public Works, but I do appeal to the business sense of this committee and I ask that before the vote is passed we shall have the opinion of the Postmaster General upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is wonderful how the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) have changed since he was a member of the government and since he undertook the construction of a public building in the town of Marysville, New Brunswick, where the Gibson Manufacturing Company have their establishment, and in the constituency which I think he then represented, but of that I am not sure. In these days my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thought that was all right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I rise to a point of order. I want to know what this has to do with the case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am replying to the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) who has charged that we have engaged in a policy of extravagance and are depriving the postal revenue of certain of its moneys, and I am showing that the policy we are now pursuing is that which he himself pursued when in office.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point or order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Don't you think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) can take care of himself?

Mr. LENNOX. I will ask the chairman to take care of you just now. Assuming for the moment that what the Minister of Public Works says is true, what we are discussing just now is the extravagance of the government in regard to the item before the chair, and what the member for Toronto has done in the past can have no bearing on that question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has risen to a point of order, but what he is doing is discussing a point of order raised by another member. If he rises to a point of order he must state his point.

Mr. LENNOX. I am supporting the point of order raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I realize that many of the arguments used and much of the debate is not strictly relevant, but I have hesitated to endeavour to draw the line closer because I believe the opposition are entitled to a large amount of latitude and to a large amount of information when the government asks for a vote. But, so far as the hon. minister has gone, while it did seem to me that it was some distance from this item, yet, he was entering into a question of comparison, and I think I am not called upon to stop him until his argument develops sufficiently to enable me to see whether his comparison is close enough to be relevant to the question before the chair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought that were I able to quote the conduct of a gentleman so prudent and so economical as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) when he was Minister of Finance, as against his words now, it would be a strong argument to influence gentlemen on the other side. I thought I was making quite a strong point when I endeavoured to remind the committee that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) had justified in the strongest way the erection of a public building in Marysville, New Brunswick, which was not so important a town as Marieville, province of Quebec, in which we purpose erecting this building. But apart from that, I am quite prepared to justify the expenditure of a reasonable amount of public money in the construction of public buildings in the various towns and cities of the Dominion, and particularly so where it means the erection of only one public building in a county. It would seem to meet with the general approval of the House that it was not unreasonable to erect one building in the county town of a county, and Marieville is not only an important manufacturing and a growing town, but it is the county town of Rouville. With regard to the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that it is robbing the postal reveune, I say it is nothing of the kind. There is not one dollar taken from the postal revenue in connection with the erection of this or any other public building.

The Public Works Department pays not only for the buildings, but for the upkeep, the lighting, heating and all the cost of maintenance. Therefore the postal revenue in no way suffers. It is simply a question of policy whether or not we should erect public buildings where they are reasonably required. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) knows that he has made a demand that we should erect a public building in one of the towns of his constituency. I have not asked my colleagues to provide for it in the estimates this year, because we are spending public money in his constituency by building a much-needed wharf at the town of Gravenhurst, and I thought the matter of a public building might well stand over. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), who is always preaching economy, urged last year that we should erect a public building in the town of Milton, which is growing, and whose claims are no doubt worthy of consideration in the near future, and I do not think my hon. friend would support my hon. friend from North Toronto in the statement he makes that this is evidence of extravagance and waste of public moneys. I think I can very well justify this expenditure. I do not think we should go to a greater expenditure than is reasonably necessary; but when a public building is needed in this town, I think we can very well expend upon it between $20,000 and $25,000. It may be said that we could give a cheaper building. So we could; but the policy of the department is to erect buildings, whatever their size, of a substantial character, built of stone and brick, with solid foundations, and make them as fireproof as possible, so that they will last, and the cost of maintenance and repairs will be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the site been purchased yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, from the corporation, for the sum of $1,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister going to have space all around the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we can do so in this case, as the lot is 64 feet by 132 feet.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister has seen fit to refer to something which he alleges I said last year in support of his contention that a $25,000 post office should be erected in Marieville. If the minister will revise his recollection, he will remember that I stated that a gentleman who had been brought out from the city of Toronto, supported by the Minister of Agriculture, to contest a rural district, was the man who advocated a post office in the town of Milton and was going to have one if the people elected him. The people did not elect him, and the minister last year gave me to understand that the man had no promise from him of a post office in the town even if he had been elected. But, laying that aside, there is no comparison between the town of Milton and the village of Marieville either as to population or as to revenue. The revenue of the post office in Milton is about $4,000, that of Marieville about $1,300. True, the hon. gentleman adds in the surrounding country. If he did that in the case of Milton, he would get a population far in excess of that of Milton proper. This is a new departure; I think we had better stick by the old rule, when we want to know the requirements of a place, and take the population of the place itself without any reference to the suburbs. I would not have said anything on this matter if the hon. gentleman had not made a reference to the county I represent. I am not going to advocate a building, because if I did the minister would accuse me of being extravagant.

Mr. FIELDING. Then you do not want the building?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not going to say that. The people would like very much to have the building; they are entitled to have it; but the disposition of this government is not to give them the building. The

hon. gentleman talks about these two hat factories in Marieville. No doubt they are important industries, but right in the village of Acton there is one factory which alone employs about 300 people.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What do they make?

Mr. HENDERSON. Leather. We have no customs house there, and the people want one badly. But this government is not disposed to accommodate the people. It would rather fritter away money on a small place where there are few people living and a comparatively small business is being done, than give accommodation where a large business is being done. Not many years ago—and the business has increased very rapidly since—the stationmaster told me that for that one firm there were sixty-eight carloads of raw material between Boston and Acton at the same time coming into their large manufactory. That gives you an idea of the extent of that factory, but the Minister of Customs has never given us a customs house. There is another institution there which requires the use of the customs house practically daily, yet this government does not think it worth while to give these people a customs officer or make that place a port or even an outport. If the government do not think it worth while to accommodate the people—and people supporting them too—where large business is being done, they will take the responsibility; and when the proper time comes, no doubt these people will get a customs house and a customs officer. But what I rose particularly to speak of was this. The Minister of Public Works became very jocular a short time ago in his reference to a place down in New Brunswick called Marysville. He accused my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of having supported the erection of a building in that place and advanced that as an argument for the erection of this one. Well, I have some recollection of the discussion that took place on that item some fifteen or twenty years ago. The hon. gentleman was not here then but his friends were, and hour after hour—I was almost going to say day after day—they used up the time of this House in denouncing the erection of that building. Yet now he makes use of that very structure as a justification for the erection of a building in this little town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To meet the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. HENDERSON. And a very logical argument it was! I wonder what his friends behind him thought of it. True, I do not suppose there is a gentleman behind him who was in the House then, although possibly his colleague from Brome (Mr. Fisher) may have been there. But as he was out during one session, I am not sure that he either was present. I do not suppose there are more than eight or nine members in this House who were here then, and they have probably forgotten all about it. But I think the minister will admit that it was very illogical on his part to cite the erection of a public building in New Brunswick some fifteen or twenty years ago, which his friends then denounced as highly improper, as a justification for the erection of this one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say it was improper.

Mr. HENDERSON. But his political friends denounced it for many hours as highly improper.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. minister advances the argument that the parish of St. Marie de Monnoir is also served by this post office. Well, St. Angèle de Monnoir post office is only three and three-quarter miles from Marieville, and Rougemont is about four and seven-eighths miles from Marieville, and Richelieu four and a half miles, so that the place is pretty well surrounded by post offices and cannot give much postal revenue. But have they no rural mail delivery there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told there is none.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. minister has referred to my application a few years ago for a post office in one of the towns in my riding. I did press that matter very strongly on him. But as my riding gives a very large postal revenue, I thought that would entitle one of its towns to some consideration by this government. I was then met, however, by the same statement as that given to-night, namely, that on account of other public expenditure in that riding, the building of a post office could not be entertained. Two years ago there was an item to build a wharf in the district of Muskoka and the government carried that estimate through but they never built the wharf. Last year they left that item out; and when, at the end of two years, I ask for a post office, I am met with the same reply that they are going to spend $4,000 in building a wharf there. Well, we have been now waiting three years for that wharf, and I shall have to go back and tell my people that, although they contribute to the revenue of this country $200,000 per annum, the government can give them neither a wharf nor a post office. It seems absurd that they should be so parsimonious with respect to that county and then spend $30,000 in Rouville in one year. I would not venture to ask the minister for a post office in my riding for a village which only gives the government a gross revenue of $1,300. We have plenty of villages in my constituency that size, but I would never

dream of asking for a post office at any one of them, but where we have a good large town with a good postal revenue, I am justified in asking for such an expenditure. I would not want a post office costing $25,000 to be built in a little village which gives only $1,300 gross revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the House to the way in which the minister argues. I leave it to the chairman of the committee if I did not address myself to the question in point. I made two or three arguments, and the Minister of Public Works has never attempted to touch one of them. I asked him why, if Great Britain pursued a certain policy with regard to these general post offices, we should not carry out something like that policy here. I made another statement, that the United States does not indulge in this kind of expenditure, but carries on its post office in much more economical way by a system of rental and gives its great and widespread population all the advantages they require. It did seem to me that what was good policy for Great Britain and good policy for the United States in that respect might be good policy for Canada. Did the Minister of Public Works touch that argument? He did not. I used the other argument that there was a dissipation of the post office revenues in the construction of these public buildings, thereby reducing the surplus of the post office and preventing the furnishing of better postal facilities for the people. And how did the Minister of Public Works meet that argument? With a blank negative. He says: It is not true; my department pays all this expenditure. Why, the other night the minister led the House to believe that he paid his own laundry bills when travelling in an official car, but a question put to him later brought out the information that he put in his bills to the government—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member will excuse me; I did not make such a statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I find him figuring in the departmental accounts for large amounts for travelling expenses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. member (Mr. Foster) said that I figured there for my laundry bills. I say that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. FOSTER. I am bound to accept the hon. minister's statement. But what I have said was the understanding in the House at that time, it seems to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was not.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement and do not pursue the subject further. But the hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong when he says that the post office does not suffer a diminution of its revenue by the building of twenty-five thousand dollar buildings in such places as Marieville. The moment you put up such a building in such a place, the surplus of the post office is reduced by added expense. For, when you have a twenty-five thousand dollar post office, you have to pay your postmaster and his assistants more salary. Other expenses also are increased. The result is that the post office itself is affected in its revenue by this drain. But what an argument for the Minister of Public Works, a grown man, to use in this committee—that his department pays for it! Whence comes the money to meet the expenditures of his department? Part of it comes from the revenues of the Post Office Department. There is a yearly surplus of something up to $1,000,000 which goes into the general fund into which flow all the revenues of Canada. Therefore every useless expense that the hon. minister puts upon the country by paying $25,000 for a post office in a place with a population of 1,300 and with a revenue of $1,300 means just so much deducted from the revenues of the country and diminishes by that amount the possibility of a department like the Post Office extending its facilities as it otherwise might. Now, these are arguments addressed to the subject, and I call the attention of the committee to the way in which the minister does not meet them—or the way in which he thinks he meets them by going back twenty-five years or more to prove inconsistency on the part of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The inconsistency of the member for North Toronto is not in question; the question before the committee is the proposed post office at Marieville. I have presented arguments on that subject and I believe they are good ones, but the minister slid around them on a side issue not touching one argument that I gave. I also put to him the question whether he did not think that, as this was an expenditure for the benefit of the Post Office Department, we should at least have the approval and request of the Postmaster General. Now, a new policy is laid down by the Minister of Public Works. It is that wherever you find a district with 1,300 people, having a village of about 1,300 more—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Seventeen hundred in 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, give the minister the benefit of that—a district of 1,300 with a village of 1,700,—especially if it be a county town—you should spend $25,000 of the people's money in putting there a public building, no thought or question as to whether the public business requires that expenditure or not. But the moment you put up your building you saddle the country with an expenditure of 10 per cent annually for

depreciation, interest and so on. That is a charge forever upon the revenues of the country. Carry out this policy so that wherever you have this aggregation of 1,700 people with 1,300 around them and what is the result? Now, these, I think, were arguments, and the minister met them in his own peculiar way.

Mr. SEXSMITH. We have succeeded in getting quite a detailed description of the little village of Marieville which has been very interesting to me. I was glad to learn that it has manufactures, schools, churches and a population of 1,700. But the fact remains that the total post office revenue of this flourishing village is less than $1,400. In the riding I have the honour to represent there are a number of prosperous, thriving villages, each with its own churches, schools, manufactures, nice residences and so on, and each with a good country around it by including which you would have a population of 3,000 or 4,000. And in these places you have a post office revenue two or three times as much as that of Marieville. Yet these places never thought of asking this government to put up a $25,000 post office. I have no objection to this village, it being a county town, having a post office, but I do raise my protest against the spending of $25,000 to build a post office for a population of less than $2,000 and a revenue of less than $1,400. I consider it preposterous. If all the little villages and towns in the province of Ontario were to come down here thundering after the minister, and asking for post offices costing $25,000, places yielding a revenue twice the revenue of this little village, why, he would be overwhelmed. Now I enter my protest against the expenditure of $25,000 on a post office in a town of that size, with a revenue of less than $1,400. I can understand the minister wishing to build a post office there, but one costing $10,000 or $15,000 would be adequate. Why, we heard an hon. member of this House telling us last week of a town of 16,000 or 18,000 where the people were lined up outside waiting for their turn to enter and get their mail, and yet there is no effort to provide proper accommodation for those people.

Mr. SPROULE. For several years in succession I have drawn attention to what I consider to be a growing abuse. We have now a good example of that abuse in this proposal to build a post office in a place where the revenue is only $1,300. I have taken the trouble to look over the government returns, and I have found several villages and towns in the section of the country that I am acquainted with that have no post office, and every one of them have a revenue much larger than Marieville. Here they are:

Place.	Revenue.
Jarvis	$2,018
Keewatin	2,400
Huntsville	5,557
Iroquois	2,361
Kemptville	3,681
Lakefield	2,743
Lanark	1,800
Leamington	4,900
Little Current	2,235
Lucan	2,000
Lucknow	3,120
McDougall's Chute	2,212
Madoc	3,033
Markdale	2,706
Markham	2,170
Georgetown	4,020
Glencoe	2,050
Gore Bay	2,080
Grand Valley	2,309
Gravenhurst	5,015
Shelbourne	3,601

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have given Lakefield a very fine wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have not given any public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have just built a post office at Georgetown.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not so stated in the returns brought down by the government last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has just been completed. We have also just completed a post office at Glencoe.

Mr. SPROULE. Probably, as in the case of Markham, it was put there in order to carry the riding. None of these places that I have mentioned have a post office, though every one of them has a much larger revenue than Marieville. Then go out to Lethbridge, where people are actually paying for the right of getting into the post office to get their letters, one in front of another, a large place with five times as much revenue as Marieville, and no effort is made to accommodate the public there. But when you come to this small village called Marieville with a revenue of $1,300, they must have a public building costing $25,000. Does not the minister think that is very unfair to these places with more business and of greater importance? I think it is unjustifiable, it is more, it is an absolute waste of public money. I venture to say that to-day, for fuel, lighting and so forth, we do not pay more than $175 a year; but after we have built this post office we will pay $400 to $600 for a man to take care of it, we will have to pay insurance, we will have to pay for repairs, and then we will have to pay for fuel, wood and light in addition. Is that fair to other places with a much larger population and of greater importance? Is it a business way of spending the country's money? I say that no logical defence can be made on business

principles for spending this amount of money in Marieville.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think I can present very good claims for a post office in my town of Aylmer. I was disappointed in looking over the estimates to find that the minister had not set aside something for a post office in Aylmer. I have taken the pains to look up some points where the government has given grants. Aylmer has 2,300 inhabitants, and the revenue from the post office is $6,000 or nearly $6,500. The following statement shows the expenditures that have been made by the government on post offices in other places:

	Population.	Revenue.	Grants.
Aylmer, Ont.. ..	2,395	6,405.26	
Aylmer, Que.. ..	2,291	1,611.14	5,000
Chesley..	1,734	4,471.00	1,500
Dresden	1,613	2,897.00	1,500
Elora	1,187	3,275.72	5,000
Essex Centre.. ..	1,391	3,310.00	1,500
Harriston..	1,637	1,643.34	1,500
Leamington	2,451	4,903.34	23,000
Tilbury..	2,209	2,842.00	10,000
Tilsonburg	2,241	7,084.00	1,500
Fergus	1,386	4,009.00	5,000
Kincardine	2,077	4,522.00	6,000
Listowel	2,692	6,213.00	15,000
Mount Forest.. ..	2,019	4,873.00	15,000
Glencoe..	1,118	2,959.40	26,000

There are a number of small towns also in which grants have been made but there is only one town among fifteen in which the revenue is greater than in Aylmer. The customs collected at Port Burwell amounted, during the last fiscal year, to $100,000; at Port Stanley to $98,000 and at Aylmer to $10,000, making $208,000. I think I have established the claim of this place to a post office. I differ from some of my friends on this side of the House. I believe that the government is perfectly justified in spending money where it is needed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have not heard anybody on this side of the House object to that.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not think it is necessary to put large buildings and spend too much money, but I think I have established my claim for a post office at Aylmer. I have been in this House for four years and every year I have been trying to get a grant for a post office but I have not succeeded. I hope that when the Supplementary Estimates come down the minister will give us enough to start with.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon friend will find that in the estimates which are under consideration there are very few new items. There may be some exceptions to that but the great majority of the items asked for are in respect of public works which were in the estimates of two years ago. I think the claims of Aylmer, as presented to me now and as presented to me a year ago, are very strong and I beg to assure my hon. friend that they will have my most careful consideration. I am glad that my hon. friend takes such a reasonable view of this question. Without disparaging the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they have a perfect right to take any view that commends itself to their judgment, I must say that the view presented by the hon. gentleman is the only one which has been presented from that side of the House that appeals to my judgment. The hon. gentleman takes the correct view that it is not against the public interest to make reasonable expenditures for public buildings where these public buildings are reasonably and fairly required. I do not find that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) gets up and objects to the large expenditure in the city of Toronto. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman who represents the city of Hamilton will object to the large expenditures in that city. But we ought not to forget that the small towns throughout the country are as much entitled to reasonable and fair consideration as these larger cities. If it were not for the people in the villages and small towns these large cities would not be as prosperous as they are to-day. They are fed by the rural districts and the small towns and villages. We are not expending upon all these small buildings in all the small towns and cities as much in one year as we sometimes spend upon one of these large cities such as Montreal and Toronto. Therefore, I think the request that is made by the hon. member for a reasonable recognition of the claims of the smaller cities and towns throughout the country is fair and just, and it will afford me very great pleasure as Minister of Public Works to recognize these claims when they are fairly presented to the House as they have been presented to me this evening by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The question is all in the use of the word 'reasonable.' There has been no gentleman on this side of the House, that I have ever heard, object to any reasonable expenditure, but when the minister is satisfied to claim that a $25,000 post office in a little two by four village—

Mr. PUGSLEY. A growing town.

Mr. HUGHES. A little two by four village—that is all it is. I have half a dozen towns in the riding that I have the honour to represent larger than this and I would not insult the intelligence of the people of my riding or the House of Commons by coming here and asking for post offices to be scattered around like this. An ordinary building is ample in any one of these villages to accommodate the public as far as the post office is concerned. Twenty-five thousand dollars for a post office in a little

two by four town like Marieville is unreasonable and therefore the minister's argument does not hold good.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister advances the argument that many of these estimates were put in two years ago. They were just as unjustifiable then as they are to-day. Why were they put in? When there was an election coming on the estimates were padded by these large proposed expenditures and then after the election was over they were allowed to drop and the government did not go on with the expenditure. The minister advances that as a justification for voting this money now and going on with the expenditure. That is one line of defence. Another is that these small places are entitled to expenditure. I do not think his argument is worthy of the consideration of any intelligent man in this House. The first consideration that ought to engage the attention of this House is: What is required for the accommodation and service of the public? Where you can get a building for a rent that will be very much less than the interest upon the money which would build another suitable for the accommodation of the people, you are not justified in spending the money upon a public building. But if we are told that this is for the accommodation of the public, why not accommodate Lethbridge where there is such a large return?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are going to accommodate Lethbridge.

Mr. SPROULE. This has been going on for two or three years and a most urgent appeal has been made by the member for the constituency but it has fallen upon deaf ears. We are not here for the purpose of distributing money over the country for the sake of making an expenditure where it is not needed. That should not be the aim of parliament. Therefore there is no force in the argument of the minister. Nor, is there any cogency in the argument, that because the estimates were padded two years ago in anticipation of an election we must carry them out in some cases while in other cases they must be dropped. We must be guided by the requirements of the public. If the public can be accommodated at a less expenditure to the country than by putting up a public building it should be done in that way. If you are justified in expending money in a small place like that in the province of Quebec, by the same parity of reasoning you are justified in spending public money in every similar small place in every province of the Dominion.

Mr. EDWARDS. It was thought originally that this post office would be constructed for $5,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I never made that statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. There was $5,800 orignally voted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was only to begin.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is nothing in the vote to show that it was only to begin, and when your estimates contain no explanation it is reasonable to suppose that the vote would cover the cost of the building. On behalf of the people in my county I protest against the squandering of money in this way. Last year I went to the Postmaster General with petitions from residents in different parts of Frontenac asking for better mail facilities. In one of the oldest settlements in the province of Ontario about ten miles from the city of Kingston, the residents have a mail service three times a week and for years they have been asking for a daily mail service the extra cost of which would amount to only $50 a year, and when I presented that petition to the Postmaster General I was told that the government did not have the money to spare for that. In another part of my county the nearest post office is five miles away from the nearest of the residents and seven miles distant on the average and they have been asking not for a daily mail service but simply begging and praying for post office facilities and a mail twice a week, and the minister has told me that they have no money for that purpose. There are many like instances in the county of Frontenac and I presume in other counties throughout the Dominion where the people in the rural communities are suffering for lack of proper mail facilities. The Minister of Public Works has laid down a new doctrine to-night and one which may give some light to the people of my county, when he told a gentleman on this side of the House that the reason they did not erect a public building in a large town in his riding was because they spent some money on the harbour in that constituency. I suppose then that the people of Frontenac are to take it for granted that the reason they have to walk seven miles for their mail is because nearly $100,000 was spent on providing residences at Kingston for men drawing a salary of $400 a year. I suppose, had the member for Frontenac asked some years ago for better postal facilities, he would have been told that the government had already spent a large amount of money in that county for erecting stables for the military college, which, although erected five years ago have never had a horse inside of them yet. That is the way the money of the people is squandered.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is Kingston in the hon. gentleman's constituency?

Mr. EDWARDS. Kingston is not in the hon. gentleman's constituency, but it is in

the county of Frontenac and these stables are in Barriefield which is in my constituency, and I suppose because they have been erected in Barriefield and the money expended in the county, that is the reason why people in the county of Frontenac have to walk seven or eight miles to get their mail, although my constituents have not got any benefit from these stables, nor have the soldiers either.

Mr. HUGHES. Nor the horses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made no statement such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) attributes to me.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister gave as an excuse for not erecting a post office in a certain place where the revenue was far greater than it is in Marieville that the government had spent money in erecting other works in the constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is speaking of rural mail delivery.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not mention rural mail delivery to-night and the Minister of Public Works must be dreaming if he thinks I did. I am referring to the fact that there are people in my county who are not asking for rural mail delivery but who have to walk seven and eight miles to get their letters and who want a post office placed in their midst.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman pressed for the erection of a post office building in his constituency?

Mr. EDWARDS. Of a $25,000 building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of any building?

Mr. EDWARDS. No, I have not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman complain about?

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not responsible for your understanding if I cannot make it clear to you. What we ask is that you allow some person in that neighbourhood to keep a post office in his house so that the people will not have to travel seven or eight miles to get their letters. Does the minister understand now what I am talking about? To bring this matter to a head, and believing this vote is not a reasonable one I move that this item be reduced by $6,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has not given any reason why this item should be reduced. Marieville is a progressive town, factories have been recently erected there and a large number of people employed.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the figures the minister gave us, it has only grown during the last six years at the rate of fifty a year.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has increased from 1,300 to 1,600.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister has spoken of the population being up to 1,700. What authority has he for making that statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a census taken by the municipal authorities in 1907, and the population was then 1,671. It is estimated that now, including the students and attendants at the college, there is in the town of Marieville alone a population of 2,000, while if you add to that the population of the parish which immediately surrounds the town, you will have a population of about 3,000 people who will be accommodated by that public building. If we are going to erect a substantial building, I do not see how we can do it for much less than the amount named. Therefore, I hope the committee will see that it would not be reasonable to support the amendment of the hon. member for Frontenac.

Amendment negatived.

Megantic public building—revote of $4,900 lapsed, $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population and revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The population is nearly 2,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been purchased at $4,000.

Mr. HUGHES. When was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In January, 1907, from the Presbyterian congregation. The postal revenue is $2,637 and the customs revenue $10,777.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $25,000, including the site, heating and everything.

Montreal general post office—enlargement and alterations, $80,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for completion of the work which has been under contract. We are obliged to make considerable alterations to the old building so as to make it in harmony with the new building and more fireproof.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this intended to finish the work there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will be required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That depends on what we do. If we make the old building fireproof, it is going to cost considerably more.

There is a strong inducement to do so, as we have made the new building fireproof.

Mr. SPROULE. Should not the minister have his mind made up as to what he is going to do before he comes and asks for a vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we are asking for will just about complete the payments on the present contract. If we go on and remodel the old building and make it fireproof we shall have to come to parliament for another vote.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an insult to the intelligence of the people's representatives for ministers of the Crown to ask them to vote public money without giving them the information they are entitled to have. Twenty-five years ago the minister of the Crown would be shamed out of this House if he could not give more information than the hon. gentleman has given us to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have a great deal.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. minister has, he manages to keep it to himself most sedulously. He thinks he can jolly the House along without giving any information, and it is often to my mind a question whether he really desires to give the information even when he has it, and whether he does not think it infra dig to give information to members of the opposition. That conduct has so often shocked my sense of right that I cannot refrain from giving expression to my opinion concerning it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The trouble with my hon. friend is that he gets unduly excited. What information does he desire with regard to this post office building?

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know how much we are committing ourselves to in the expenditure on this undertaking, what will it cost when completed, what is the outline of the building we propose to erect, is it fireproof, is it of wood, stone or brick, and will it give the service required? If contracts have been let, have they been let by tender and has the lowest tender been accepted? If plans have been made out, what do they show? He says that I am unduly excited. Has he ever sat in this House and heard the right hon. the Prime Minister explain his estimates. I never saw an occasion on which that right hon. gentleman had any trouble with them. Why? Because he is perfectly frank and candid and courteous, and when asked a question immediately answers, and shows no desire to jolly the House along or keep back information. How is it that it takes the Minister of Public Works so much longer to get his estimates through than the Prime Minister? Because the Prime Minister, and I may say the same of several others, shows a desire to give all the information he can without reserve.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the hon. gentleman is an old member, I cannot allow to pass certain remarks and innuendos made by him without some reply, especially when he uses language so unparliamentary as to say that I am seeking to jolly the committee. When he does so, he shows that he has but a slight appreciation of the meaning of words.

Mr. SPROULE. What I said was that that was the impression left on my mind and what appeared to be the disposition of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not being able to look into the mind of my hon. friend to see what kind of a mind it is, I cannot know what gives him the impression of an attempt on my part to jolly the House. I have no desire to jolly the hon. member or any member of the committee. It is impossible for him to point to a single instance in which I refused to give all the information possible. He ought to bear in mind that there are some twelve hundred items in the estimates. I cannot keep them all in mind, but have to rely on my chief architect and my deputy and the memoranda I have for the information asked. On reflection my hon. friend will see that it was very unfair on his part to pass these reflections without asking a single question.

Mr. SPROULE. Did I not ask the hon. minister what he proposed to do with the $80,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I was considering the question of making that building fireproof and then said that this amount would just about cover the contract now had with Lyall and Sons. He asks why I did not tell him whether this contract was let after tender or not. Well, two years ago we made the contract for that building, and I then told him we would spend this whole sum on the building as then contemplated, but that if we decided to make it fireproof we would have to ask for a further vote. I think he will see on reflection that he does me a great injustice. I trust that he will let the item pass, and when he wants information be good enough to ask for it.

Mr. HUGHES. Who was the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. P. Lyall and Sons.

Mr. HUGHES. What contracts have they with the government other than this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. First, the main contract which was for rebuilding the new part, then the heating apparatus. The electric wiring was given to Dawson & Company, Limited, of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says I did not ask him a question. I asked him specifically whether this was all the expenditure that would be required, or whether he would require any more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that if we decided to make the building fireproof we would require to ask for more.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suppose that before undertaking the expenditure of money the minister would have made some calculation and be able to give the House some information as to what this building will cost the country when completed. He replied that would depend on whether more expenditure would be made after this vote. In seven cases out of ten when I put him a question, the minister will turn to something else and try to divert attention and apparently does not desire to answer frankly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen other Ministers of Public Works, I have seen Sir Hector Langevin, when Minister of Public Works, stand for hours with his book in his hand and his deputy beside him, and give all information regarding the item under discussion in advance without waiting to be asked. If anything were neglected or forgotten in his memo, he would ask his deputy. Sir Richard Cartwright, when he was in this House, did the same.

An hon. MEMBER. And the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. The only trouble with him is that he is so anxious to give information that a few questions will keep him going all night.

Mr. HUGHES. Has this firm any other contracts with the Public Works Department in any other part of Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, no other.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the amount of the contracts let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the addition to the main building, $487,527; heating apparatus, $18,407; electric wiring and fittings, $6,392.46.

Mr. EDWARDS. To whom are they let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the addition to the building and for the heating, Messrs. P. Lyall & Sons, and for the electric wiring and fittings, Dawson & Co., Ltd.

Montreal—new postal station 'D,' at Point St. Charles, $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I submit, we have done a pretty fair day's work, and the minister should let us go.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We ought to finish up Quebec; we have only a few items.

Mr. SPROULE. We are only about half through.

Mr. HUGHES. Finish Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $6,000 will complete this new building.

Plessisville public building, $2,000.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What is the population of Plessisville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 it was 1,586.

Mr. HUGHES. In what county is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Megantic. This amount will complete the building. It is under contract.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think it fair to go on with the succeeding items, for they are for buildings for militia purposes, and the Minister of Militia is not here. He ought to be here when these items are under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I'll tell you what we might do,—let us pass over these votes for military buildings and take the next five small items.

Mr. BLAIN. There are members from Quebec who are not present, and I think these items should be left over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had better take the item for Roberval.

Mr. BLAIN. No matter when a suggestion is made to stop, the hon. minister always has three or four more items that he wants to put through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have left over these military items. We might take Roberval.

Mr. BLAIN. No, Mr. Chairman. I think it time to close the House. I do not want to be over anxious, but I think it only fair to the committee that proceedings should close.

Mr. SPROULE. We get along better if, when we have done a reasonable day's work, we stop.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be sorry to keep my hon. friends here too late.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The first government order will be the French Treaty, and, if we reach other government orders, Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 30, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CO-OPERATION.

Mr. LLOYD HARRISS (Brantford) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 50) respecting co-operation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. HARRIS. I am introducing this Bill for the reason that our present laws do not appear to provide for the incorporation and supervision of co-operative societies. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) introduced the other day a Bill for the purpose of providing for the incorporation and supervision of co-operative societies confined solely to the loan and credit aspect. I had intended providing in my Bill for the incorporation and supervision of trading societies only. However, after consideration and consultation with my hon. friend, I thought it better to introduce a Bill which would cover both kinds of societies. Therefore the Bill I am introducing provides for the incorporation and supervision of all kinds of co-operative societies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved second reading of Bill (No. 12), respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the president of the French Republic. He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to obtain parliamentary approval of a small amendment which the government have agreed to make to the Franco-Canadian Treaty of 1907; an amendment which, from the Canadian point of view, is not of very great importance, though I will not say it is of no importance, but which nevertheless is somewhat important from the point of view of the French authorities, inasmuch as it served to disarm hostility which was manifested in the French Senate towards the approval of the treaty. I do not deem it necessary to discuss the merits of the main treaty. That measure was brought before parliament in the session before last, it was fully considered and fully discussed, and the House, by something approaching a unanimous vote, decided that it should receive approval. In due course that treaty was approved by the Senate of Canada, and an Act of parliament was passed accordingly. The treaty was approved within a reasonably short time by the French Chamber of Deputies, a body which corresponds to our own House of Commons. It then passed to the French Senate, and there considerable opposition arose, particularly from prominent gentlemen identified with the agricultural interest of France. They were very much alarmed by the concessions which were being granted by France to the Canadian farmer—possibly needlessly alarmed, certainly in some respects. At all events, the agricultural interest of France is one of the utmost importance, and any suggestion that the French government were agreeing to measures which would prejudice the agricultural interest found many listeners, and for some considerable time the treaty was delayed in the Senate. The French government were most loyal to the treaty which they themselves had made. By every reasonable effort within their power they were willing to have that treaty approved; but they had to realize the difficulties which were encountered in the French Senate. When I had the opportunity of discussing the matter with the French authorities in Paris, it was suggested by the French ministers that if we could make material concessions in the agricultural schedule, it would help them very much to obtain the approval of the treaty. I did not feel that I would be justified in consenting to any considerable change. As the negotiations proceeded, it became apparent that the item of cattle was one as respects which our French friends were particularly alarmed. Some paragraphs appeared in the French press about that time to the effect that certain American organizations were about to establish huge slaughter houses at one of the French ports, and it was expected that there would be a large importation of fat cattle ready for the butchers, and this would affect materially the French agricultural interest.

In the discussion, finding that the point was one which was regarded by the opponents of the treaty in the Senate as of the utmost importance, I thought we could find in it a solution of the difficulties between France and Canada in the matter. I found on inquiry that Canada had not been doing any considerable cattle trade with France, practically none, and that whatever we might hope for the future, it was not likely that we could in the early future send fat cattle to France ready for the butcher. And so, after due consideration, finding that the concession in regard to that particular class of things, would help to secure the French approval of the treaty, would be very agreeable to the French government, and would disarm to a very large extent, though not wholly, the opposition which had arisen in the French Senate, after communicating with my colleagues, I agreed that to the four items in the treaty which dealt with cattle we should add the qualifying words, 'to the exclusion of fat cattle ready for the butcher.' That is

to say, we still reserve the right to send in under the French treaty cattle which are not ready for the butcher, but which are to be finished in France before they pass to the slaughter house. The concession, as I have said, was one of only moderate importance from the Canadian point of view, but was regarded as a very important one by the French authorities, and was the means of disarming hostility to the treaty and ultimately obtaining the consent to the Senate thereto. We having consented to make this concession, a question arose as to what should be the method of determining the line of demarcation between fat cattle, which should be excluded and other cattle, which would be entitled to the privilege of the treaty. Our French friends proposed that the line of demarcation should be found by indicating what they called a percentage of neat meat, that is to say, the percentage of meat which an animal would produce ready to be placed in the butcher's stall, and excluding hides, horns and the various other elements which hon. gentlemen more familiar with the cattle industry will readily understand. While the proposal was not unreasonable in itself, I felt that it was a method not understood by our Canadian farmers, and that perhaps it would not be the best method of establishing the line of demarcation. Besides there was this further difficulty which arose in our minds, that if we should make a mistake by having a percentage of neat meat established which experience would show was not a correct one, which would be perhaps unfair to Canada, it would nevertheless be so definitely fixed in the treaty that we would have no right to revise it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this test capable of ascertainment while the animal is alive?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Expert buyers in the French market are accustomed to estimate, from the general appearance of the animal as it passes before them, and I have no doubt with a fair degree of accuracy, what percentage of neat meat that animal will realize. It is done in practice in France; but, as I thought the method was not understood by our Canadian people, and there was a bare possibility that in fixing the percentage at that time an error should be made, I thought it well that the percentage should not be definitely fixed in the treaty. And so, I proposed to the French authorities that instead of defining it in the treaty, we should declare in general terms that what was meant was that fat cattle ready for the butcher should be excluded, and that we would leave the interpretation of that to the French government. Necessarily each case would have to be determined promptly. If a shipment of cattle should arrive, it would be necessary to determine that point at once, and we recognized the right and propriety of the French government deciding that at once, and that their decision should be final. But, we said, if it should appear at any time that the decisions you are giving on that question were unreasonable and unfair and at variance with the spirit of the treaty, then we shall ask the privilege of going over to your French office and making our representations and relying on the French government to correct any error that may be found. The French authorities agreed to accept the amendment in that way, and we were strongly of the opinion that, while we are leaving the matter for the moment absolutely to the judgment of the Department of Agriculture of France, we might rely on the French government receiving our representations and correcting any error that might be found in the conclusions reached. Added to the treaty there will be found an exchange of letters which practically form part of the treaty. I beg to be permitted to read these two, because they contain the whole case on that point. The first is from myself to Mr. Ruau, Minister of Agriculture of the French Republic.

Paris, February 8, 1909.

Sir,—As a result of the recent negotiations between members of the French government and myself with a view to the recasting of schedule A of the Franco-Canadian Commercial Convention of the 19th September, 1907, by the exclusion, from the list of the Canadian products enjoying the benefit of the minimum tariff, of animals in fat condition for butchering, I have considered your suggestion to adopt a percentage of neat meat as a line of demarcation between animals to be admitted under the minimum tariff and those three excluded therefrom. I am of opinion that it would not be expedient to include this modus operandi in the convention itself, as it touches only the methods of carrying out what is proposed.

I would prefer that the proposed formula be inscribed in our agreement in general terms indicating our mutual understanding, and I would leave with the French government the duty of giving to this complementary clause a fair and reasonable interpretation by means of customs regulations. We would have no objection whatever to the adoption by the French authorities of the percentage method, should they prefer that method, as it could be changed or modified in case a trial of it were to demonstrate that it did not give satisfaction, and the Canadian government would reserve then to itself the right of making necessary representations to your government.

I am, sir, with the highest regards,

Yours very truly,

W. S. FIELDING.

That letter was replied to in the following terms by the French Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Ruau:

Paris, January 8, 1909.

Excellency,—The object of the negotiations which have been proceeded with for

these last few days between yourself and the French government was as far as my own department is concerned, to modify schedule A of the Franco-Canadian convention of September 19, 1907, by the exclusion from items 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the list of the Canadian products admitted to the benefits of the minimum tariff, of animals in fat condition for butchering. By your letter dated January 8, 1909, you were good enough to let me know that, without rejecting the suggested system of a fixed percentage of neat meat as a fair line of demarcation between animals enjoying minimum tariff and those submitted to the general tariff, you will prefer that the proposed change should be inscribed in our agreement in general terms; and you add to this that you would leave to the French government the duty of interpreting this clause as fairly and reasonably as possible by means of regulations. In case of the adoption by the French authorities of the percentage system above mentioned, the Canadian government would make no objection to said adoption, it being understood that should the experiment be found unsatisfactory, your government would reserve to itself the right of making the necessary representations to the French government.

In answer to your communication, I have the honour to inform you that we are fully in accord as to the following formula to be used in schedule A of the convention of September 19, 1907, as to the Canadian products enjoying the minimum tariff:—

No. of the French tariff products.

4. Oxen (1).
5. Cows (1).
6. Bulls (1).
7. Bullocks, steers and heiffers (1).

To the exclusion of animals in fat condition for butchering.

With regard to the system to be applied in order to ascertain what animals are to be subject to the minimum tariff and what to the general tariff the French government reserves to itself the right to follow the method of the percentage of neat meat or any other fair and equitable method, it being well understood, that, in order to avoid any dispute between the importers and the French government, the condition of the animals, as to the matter in hand, shall be determined by duly sworn special agents of the ministry of agriculture, whose findings shall be final.

I beg to add that, in the unlikely event of experience founded on a series of well authenticated instances, demonstrating to our two governments that the method adopted by the French government is defective, the governments of Canada and France would jointly seek another modus operandi.

May I beg you kindly accept, Excellency, the assurance of my high esteem.

(Sgd.) J. RUAU,
The Minister of Agriculture.

So it was agreed that we should make this concession and that, rather than adopt at once the French system of percentage of neat meat, we should agree to leave the matter in the hands of the French government, accepting their assurance that it would be administered in good faith, and that, should any difference arise, we might rely on a friendly adjustment between the two nations. So far I have dealt with all that is in the treaty. The treaty itself contains only a few lines, and these letters annexed are to be read as part of it.

There is another point to which attention was drawn and which was dealt with, not in the treaty itself, but in a friendly correspondence. It touches the question of direct importation. In the main treaty, article 8 reads as follows:

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the protectorate of Indo-China, shall be conveyed without transhipment from a port of those territories.

That is from a French port—or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff or intermediate tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

The latter part of the clause corresponds exactly, in reversing the order, and provides that a Canadian product shall be conveyed for transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port in a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France. When the main treaty was under consideration, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked what interpretation we put on that clause, and my answer was to the effect that, in the absence of any qualifying or modifying words, where reference was made to a country enjoying the intermediate tariff or a country enjoying the preferential tariff, we thought it would be held to mean a country enjoying the whole of such tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What article is that?

Mr. FIELDING. Article No. 8. We did not take any formal legal opinion on the point, but I gave at the time what seemed to be the general impression and what seemed to be the ground we, acting for Canada, should properly take. The question became of interest to Switzerland. Switzerland was a little impatient, hardly willing to wait until the treaty was ratified in due course, and desiring that an interpretation should be given the clause at an early date, made application, through the diplomatic channels, to know the Canadian interpretation. Switzerland is an inland country, ultimately determined to be one of the nations entitled to favoured nation treatment, and she was interested in knowing from what ports she should send her goods, these goods being of the same class as mentioned in the treaty. We did not, at that time, think it was desirable that we should undertake to interpret that in any formal and official way. We thought that if the matter was in doubt it ought to be the subject of negotiation with the French authorities before we should give any final

interpretation. What we understood from the reading of the treaty was that Switzerland might send her goods to Canada by way of England, because England enjoyed the whole preferential tariff. We were asked if we would care to give an expression of opinion. Having first pointed out that as the treaty had not been completed, was not yet ratified and had not gone into operation, we were indisposed to come to any official determination on that point and lay it before a third party, yet, in answer to the request of the imperial authorities, we stated the view which we had expressed in parliament in answer, if I recollect correctly, to the question of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). That interpretation was accepted and approved by the British government with, however, the remark that the point was not free from doubt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the nature of the answer to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier?

Mr. FIELDING. The answer was to the effect that the words 'a country enjoying the benefits of the preferential tariff'—or the intermediate tariff or the minimum tariff—would mean in each case a country enjoying the full tariff. We gave the interpretation that we thought, from the Canadian point of view at the time, we should uphold, and the imperial authorities concurred in that interpretation, but with the remark that the matter was not free from doubt.

The treaty having been disposed of by the French Senate, it had to go back to the French Chamber of Deputies which had passed the main treaty, but had to deal with the supplementary treaty. Again some difficulty arose with regard to the position of the treaty. Although the Chamber of Deputies had accepted the main treaty, the discussions which had taken place in the Senate had attracted attention. Very influential members of the Senate had taken strong ground against the treaty, and when the supplementary treaty had to come before the Chamber of Deputies considerable opposition was developed there. That opposition was, however, ultimately overcome, and the Chamber of Deputies passed the treaty. So that all that remains is that the parliament of Canada shall give its approval to the supplementary treaty, and then will follow formal ratification.

Under later negotiations which, in some cases, did not take the form of correspondence, though in some cases they did, our French friends raised the same question that had been raised by Switzerland. We presented the same view that we presented to the parliament of Canada—that shipment of goods by way of a country under the preferential tariff would mean a country enjoying the whole preferential tariff, and so with respect to the other tariffs. But the French authorities took a different view. They pointed to provisions in their own customs regulations, founded, necessarily, upon the French statutes, showing that they were in the habit of interpreting a substantially similar clause, so that where a third country enjoyed a favourable tariff as respects the particular article to be exported, that covered all the conditions. In other words, they argued that if, for example, France wished to send her products by way of any other country which had the benefit of the Canadian intermediate tariff as respects the particular item referred to, she should be free to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Free as regards that class of goods.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that was the point. Our contention, up to a certain point, was that, unless the country had the whole tariff, it could not claim that privilege. As I have said, they were able to show that, under somewhat similar conditions in the administration of their own custom laws, they recognized the principle that if there was favourable treatment as respects that one article the privilege should be given in relation to that article as though they had the benefit of the whole tariff. They urged us very strongly to agree to that. From our own point of view it did not seem a matter of very much importance. What we were aiming at was the cultivation of direct transatlantic trade. We desired the French goods to come direct from France to Canada. If they were to come through any other country, we would naturally prefer that they should come through Great Britain. But if the goods should come through the ports of any European country having a treaty with Canada, they would still be direct trans-atlantic shipments. While we preferred they should come by Britain, the vital matter, according to our views, was that the goods should come direct across the Atlantic to a Canadian port. According to our interpretation, Switzerland, being entitled to the benefit of the treaty, could only send her goods by way of Great Britain, because Great Britain alone had the complete preferential tariff. Under the interpretation which the French claimed, and which Switzerland was anxious to have, Switzerland could send any article under the treaty by way of Havre, a French port, because under our treaty France would have the benefit of the intermediate tariff as regards that article. If, for instance, Switzerland wanted to send a parcel of silks, under our first interpretation she would have to send it to a British port; under the later interpretation she could send it to a French port, because France has the benefit of our intermediate tariff as regards that article. Under either

interpretation, that would be accomplished which we principally desired—direct trade with Canada. As France thought it important, and as it did not seem to affect our policy in any material way, we came to the conclusion that we would accept the French interpretation. But I thought that, in view of what had occurred in this parliament, I should point out to the French government that we had given a different interpretation in parliament and that therefore the agreement I was disposed to make with them would be subject to the reservation that if on inquiry we found further legislation was necessary we should make the matter subject to revision by the parliament of Canada. However, on my return from France, having brought the matter to the notice of the Department of Justice in a more formal way, we asked if further legislation was necessary to enable us to accept the interpretation of that clause respecting direct shipment. After consideration, the department advised that it was not necessary to legislate on the question, that if the customs authorities saw fit to give that interpretation, they could do so and still be within their legal rights. Therefore, we have not proposed legislation on this point. It will be observed that the British government accepted our interpretation of the clause given in the first place as the correct one, though, at the same time, intimating that the point was not free from doubt. Seeing that it was a point to which our French friends attached importance, and that it did not affect our chief purpose of having direct transatlantic trade with Canada, we decided to accept that interpretation, and, under the advice of the Department of Justice, we have concluded that that can be done without further legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. One word before the minister sits down. He has given the theoretical part of it, will he kindly make the argument concrete and show us in how many ways, that is, by how many routes, French goods can get into Canada, and by how many routes Swiss goods can get into Canada and still come under the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. By a route through any country which has a favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain, and a list of such countries has been given to the House. Practically it is only the countries having well known sea-ports, but any countries possessing a favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain will receive the benefit of the French treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that a favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain would be of no importance at all in connection with this treaty unless it extended to Canada, would it?

Mr. FIELDING. Although we go through the form of passing legislation to give effect to it, it has been held by the imperial authorities that these favoured-nation treaties apply to the whole British empire, and consequently apply to Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But there is a marked distinction, as any one who has looked over the British treaties of the past twenty years will have discovered, between those which in terms cover the various dominions of the empire and those which do not. I would like to avoid any misapprehension. As I understand it, all the governments of Great Britain within the past fifteen or twenty years have made a distinction in framing their treaties in that regard.

Mr. FIELDING. In recent years of course, as every one knows, no treaty is made concerning Canada except with the co-operation and concurrence of the Canadian government, and any treaty made in recent years would not be included unless it is specifically made with Canada, that is, it would not apply to Canadian products. To-day there are a number of treaties which have been held to be binding on Canada, made many years ago, and it is these to which I refer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The vital part, the essential part of it is that the most favoured-nations clause practically is one applying in respect of Canada to the foreign countries alluded to.

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of the older treaties there is no specific reference to Canada, in some cases there is no specific reference even to the colony.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not speaking of specific reference at all.

Mr. FIELDING. Some of the older treaties, such as the Swiss treaty, which was a subject of some doubt, and which was made away back in the fifties, do not specifically refer to Canada, or even to the colonies. But I suppose in the general terms of all such treaties there was room for debate as to what that meant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend does not quite understand me.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon member for North Toronto put the question. What are the countries through which these goods may be shipped from France.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend, in answer to the member for North Toronto, defined it in respect to the United Kingdom. I say that it ought to be defined, so far as I understand the treaty, in respect to Canada, because there are some treaties that bind the United Kingdom and do not bind Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. My answer was that every one of the countries which, by virtue

of the favoured-nation treaties, become entitled to the privilege of this French treaty. Have I made the point clear?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what I have in my mind. I think I have met the question of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. DANIEL. Will that include the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. The United States has no favoured-nation treaty that affects us.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many other countries would receive similar advantages as France is receiving in this treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. That matter has been from time to time one of doubt; it is not as simple a problem as it looks. The language of some of these treaties is open to doubt, and there is sometimes a conflict of opinion as to what countries are entitled to favoured-nation treatment. But the countries which are recognized as entitled to the favoured-nation treatment are: The Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Russia, Sweden, Venezuela, Norway and Switzerland. Most of these are old treaties, in the framing of which Canada was not asked to take part. But the Japanese treaty is one which was made directly with the co-operation of Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There is another question I would like to ask the minister. I sent a question into the Clerk of the House, but it has not appeared on the Order Paper to-day, though it appears in the Votes and Proceedings, I wish the minister would be good enough to answer it before we proceed with the discussion. Is the government prepared to grant to Germany a similar treaty to the one accepted with France?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not mind anticipating the orders of the day for to-morrow. But a similar question was put a few days ago, and the Minister of Customs replied that it was not deemed expedient, while these matters connected with the French treaty were still unsettled, that we should enter into negotiations with other foreign countries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have very little to say wtih regard to the treaty at this stage. My hon. friend has very correctly pointed out the situation. We already ratified the main treaty two years ago, and there was a subsequent delay owing to the inaction of the French Senate. My hon. friend said that the amendments and provisions of the supplementary treaty are regarded as important by those interests in the French Senate which objected to the original treaty. He considers that they should not be regarded as very important by this House. I am inclined to think he is correct. Perhaps I will give his argument a more comprehensive application than he himself would be inclined to do, because I have serious doubt indeed whether the treaty will have any great effect upon trade between France and this country. The treaty entered into by the Conservative government of 1893 did not, I think, have any great effect upon trade. I do not think that this treaty will give us any very marked change, either in the imports or exports of this country from or to France. We have to remember that France is a highly protectionist country. If we look for a moment at the articles to which the Minister of Finance has alluded, and to the French tariff applicable to them, we will see what the situation is. In regard to articles 4, 5, 6 and 7, the maximum of the French tariff is 30 francs per 100 kilograms, the minimum tariff is 20 francs for 100 kilograms.

In other words, under the minimum tariff which is available to Canadian exports, provided the cattle are not fat cattle for butchering, an animal weighing 2,000 pounds would pay $36; under the French maximum tariff, a similar animal would pay $54. The figures which I have given are not absolutely exact, but they are sufficiently accurate for practical purposes. These duties are in my opinion practically prohibitive. I think, therefore, the Minister of Finance is perfectly justified in saying that he would not anticipate a very large export from Canada to France under the minimum tariff, and I am sure he can be absolutely positive that there will be no export whatever under the maximum tariff. So when he points out that this supplementary treaty does not bring about any amendment which is of importance, I entirely concur with him, but perhaps not for the reason that he suggested. I concur with him because I do not think that the treaty in its original form, in respect of this item or any other touching especially the agricultural interests of this country, will be of the slightest benefit to Canada in the immediate future.

Something may be said by way of emphasis in addition to what was said when the treaty was under debate two years ago. It is hoped by a great many people in this country and throughout the empire that we may have under the British flag some day in the not too distant future a system of mutual preferences. We at the present time give to Great Britain a preference in our markets, a preference which is very much cut down by comparison under the provisions of this very treaty, so far as France is concerned. I doubt very much the wisdom of complicating our tariff by treaty provisions which would prevent Canada

from fully entering into a system of such mutual trade preferences. However, I did not vote against the treaty on that ground two years ago, and I am not disposed to vote against it to-day on that ground for the reason that the treaty includes a very important clause by which it may be brought to an early termination in case of necessity. There is a provision in the treaty that it can be denounced, that is brought to a termination, at any time upon twelve months' notice. If that provision were not in the treaty, I would be disposed to vote against it for the reason I have lastly given, but as that provision is in the treaty, I think probably it will safeguard our interests, so far as the probability of a system of mutual trade preferences between Great Britain and the rest of the empire is concerned.

Has the Minister of Finance given us, in his remarks this afternoon, everything which is of importance in the correspondence brought down? It was my expectation that before this treaty was brought on for debate, the correspondence would have been printed and placed in possession of every hon. member of this House. That would seem to be the usual and wise course; but if the Minister of Finance has placed before us everything of importance in that correspondence, of which we are not in possession except in some returns in the hands of one of the officials of the House, I will not be inclined to object on that account. Otherwise I think the treaty ought to stand until we have the correspondence printed and placed in the hands of every hon. member so that we may thoroughly realize what we are doing when we ratify the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. If any intimation had been given that it was desired to have the correspondence printed, I would have had no objection. There is nothing in it as between France and Canada except a formal notice that the treaty has been, in due course, approved. But there is some correspondence which passed between the Canadian government and the British government on inquiries from Switzerland on the lines to which I have referred, not touching the treaty directly but raising this question as to the proper interpretation of one clause. I think I am correct in stating that the correspondence contains nothing between Canada and France with reference to the treaty, but there is correspondence incidental to it, respecting the inclusion of other countries, and that it will be found in the correspondence brought down.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I feel satisfied that the present treaty will complicate our trade arrangements with other lands. I am glad and willing to support any trade arrangement that will bring to Canada better trade facilities and means whereby we can get our products to the markets of the world, but I am satisfied that the present treaty, as it grants to practically every important country in Europe, except Italy and Germany, advantages similar to those granted to France, there is no doubt in my mind that it will create all kinds of trade disturbances.

In granting to France this treaty it seems to me that instead of our writing across it the title 'Franco-Canadian Treaty,' we might as well have entitled it 'The Switzerland Treaty' or the 'Austrian Treaty' or the treaty with any of the European nations.

I feel it my duty to place on 'Hansard' some statistics in regard to the effect it is likely to have on the agricultural interests of Canada. The total exports to France from Canada last year were $3,176,000. The exports of foreign produce amounted to $834,000, so that the total Canadian produce exported to France amounted to only $2,340,000. In looking over the Trade and Navigation returns, I find the following items of export which are interesting from a farmer's standpoint: Our exports from Canada to France of the following items of agricultural produce were: Butter, none; cheese, $81; eggs, none; animals, none; meats, viz. bacon, $40; beef, none; hams, $144; mutton, none; pork, none; poultry, dressed or undressed, none; meats, all others, not otherwise specified, none; milk and cream, condensed or canned, none; wool: none; dried apples, $3,000; green apples, $2,000; barley, none; buckwheat, none: Indian corn, none; oats, none; peas, $34,000; split peas, $3,000; rye, none; wheat, $105,000; other grain, none; bran, $6; flour of wheat, none; oatmeal, none; all other kinds of meal, none; hay, none; hops, none; clover seed, $730; flaxseed, none; grass seed, $1,120; all others, none; straw, none; trees, shrubs and plants, $2,500; vegetables, canned or preserved, $195; potatoes, none; turnips, none. It is quite an exception for Canada to export $105,000 worth of wheat to France because France is a large producer of wheat herself. In normal years our exports to France in wheat are very small. France is really an exporting country in farm products. Taking all the products of the farm last year the exports to France amounted to only $150,000. And yet the Finance Minister practically admits that Canadian farm products will not go in under any more favourable conditions and are not more likely to be exported to France under the new treaty than they were under the old. What you do by this treaty is to say to the steamship companies that you shall give them $200,000 per annum to trade with France directly when practically all the products exported from our farms to France

last year amounted to only $150,000. Let us see how you are going to benefit our trade with France. The imports into Canada from France amount to about $10,000,000 and you can depend upon it that the French manufacturers will be able to ship goods into this country in much larger quantities than they have in the past. But, are we Canadians getting any benefit from this treaty? Our exports of agricultural implements to France were as follows: Mowing machines, $184,000 worth; reapers, $62,000 worth; harvesters, $260,000; hay rakes, $4,000 worth; other manufactured agricultural implements, $194,000 worth; parts of agricultural implements, $44,000 worth; making in all $761,000 worth of agricultural implements that are being shipped by us into France. One other important item is canned lobsters and $990,000 worth of canned lobsters went into France last year. But with regard to canned lobsters the present treaty is the same as the old treaty so that our trade in that respect is not helped in any degree. However, these two items of export make a total of $1,750,000. and if you deduct this from our general exports you can readily see what a small amount of exports we have in other lines. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should have a definite tariff policy with regard to all countries in the world. Look at the sad plight our trade is in with the German empire. Surely it is time for the government to wake up to the fact that the time has come when we should improve our trade relations with Germany, and yet when I mentioned Germany a short time ago the Prime Minister indulged in a hearty laugh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let the Prime Minister look at the immense importations which Germany is making from the different nations of the world. Germany is today importing two billion dollars worth of goods, one billion dollars worth of which is in food products and over $300,000,000 worth of which is for just such agricultural products as we produce in the Dominion of Canada. Let the Prime Minister remember that Germany imported last year $96,000,000 bushels of barley, 41,000,000 bushels of oats, 25,000,000 bushels of rye, 73,000,000 bushels of wheat—not one bushel of which was from Canada—a total of 236,000,000 bushels of grain valued at $216,000,000 and yet Canada got into Germany out of that immense quantity only $2,619 worth. Surely the German trade is of some importance to the people of this country. France is self-supporting in the matter of agricultural products, but Germany is far from being so, and hence it is incumbent on the government to arrange a trade convention with the German empire and put an end to this trade war which has had such disastrous results for the last thirteen years. To-day we are supplying forty per cent of the British demand with the products of our farmers, and when you take into consideration that ten years hence our great western prairies will be producing 500,000,000 bushels of grain, must we not arrive at the conclusion that it is absolutely indispensable we should have a trade arrangement with Germany, which is the second best market in the world for agricultural products. Just take one other item; the United States sent into Germany 28,000,000 pounds of evaporated apples last year, valued at $2,400,000; 123,000 barrels of green apples, valued at $620,000 or an average of over $5 a barrel. The total quantity of apples imported into Germany was 2,839,000 barrels and Great Britain imports only about 2,500,000 barrels. Germany with its 63,000,000 of a population needs just such products as Canada produces and it is in our interest to trade with her. Look at some other figures which will be of interest: There was imported into Germany from Australia $42,000,000 worth, from Brazil $47,000,000 worth, and from the Argentine Republic $106,000,000, from Chili $46,000,000 worth, from the United States $16,000,000 worth, and from Canada a paltry $1,900,000 worth. The Prime Minister knows full well that perhaps eighty per cent of the exports of the Argentine Republic are agricultural products, and I would be safe in saying that at least $80,000,000 worth of her exports to Germany were agricultural products. The Minister of Customs told me that last year we sent to Germany $500,000 worth of agricultural products and that this year it would only reach $300,000 worth. When is this tariff war going to end? Should we not come here like business men and take steps to put an end to this disastrous condition. Does not the Prime Minister know that during the past few months there have been in Canada, speaking before our Canadian clubs and our Boards of Trade, representatives of the Board of Trade of Berlin, Germany, who realize that the tariff war between Germany and Canada has lasted long enough and who urge that some amicable arrangement should now be arrived at? I have met these gentlemen from time to time and I feel satisfied that were the Canadian government to make approaches to Germany their advances would be most cordially received. We have had enough of these tariff treaty blunders; the Minister of Finance has for years been neglectful of his duty in this respect, but I trust that now he and the other members of the government will realize the importance of making some sensible trade arrangement with Germany. Instead of more Canadian goods going into Germany from year to year, there are constantly less and less, and there are less German goods coming into Canada. We can not expect to obtain

control of a large portion of the German market in a short time, for it takes years to develop a trade in Germany. It is all very well for this government to spend thousands of dollars to try to develop a trade with Japan, when we have to educate the people of Japan to eat the products which we are producing. But here are 63,000,000 people who are importing a billion dollars worth of food products every year. It is time we got rid of this trade war with Germany and come to some understanding with this country.

Mr. LALOR. If I am not out of order, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs what brought about the misunderstanding with Germany? Was it our British preference? In what year was it that Germany placed a surtax on Canadian goods, and in what year was it that Canada retaliated?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has correctly stated the cause of the difference between Germany and Canada. When Canada claimed the right to grant preferential treatment to Great Britain, the point was raised that we were debarred from doing so, not by reason of what is called the ordinary favoured nation treaty, but by two treaties of a different character. The favoured nation treaty demands only that whatever favour is given to one foreign nation shall be given to another. But in the cases of Germany and Belgium there were special treaties which provided that in the British colonies German goods and Belgian goods should be received on the same terms as the goods of Great Britain. It was felt, therefore, that we were not free to carry out our desire to grant a preference to Great Britain unless those treaties were removed. As a consequence, I think I may fairly say, of the action of the parliament of Canada in declaring for that preference, and in putting it into operation as far as we could, the British government gave notice to Germany and to Belgium that those treaties would be denounced; and they ceased to exist, if my memory serves me rightly, in 1898. Thereupon Germany complained that they were not receiving from Canada the favours which they had formerly received. After the denunciation of those treaties our British preference had full effect. We granted the preferential rates to Great Britain, while, of course, the products of Belgium and of Germany paid the rates of the general tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The British preference had been granted before that.

Mr. FIELDING. The British preference was granted in the first instance in 1897. Out of that grew the discussion to which I am referring, and in 1908, on the first day of August, if my memory serves me, the German and Belgian treaties were denounced. I think the denunciation of the treaties took effect in the summer of 1898, and thereupon Great Britain received the preferential rates, while Germany and Belgium became liable to the rates of the general tariff. Belgium, it is only fair to say, never complained, but to her credit recognized the fact, apparently, that this was a family affair of the British empire, which we had a right to arrange as we pleased. Germany took exception to our action, and thereupon imposed her maximum tariff on imports from Canada. After the treaty was denounced, Germany entered into a new treaty with Great Britain, but from its benefits specifically excluded Canada, and from that time forward Canadian goods entering Germany were made to bear the maximum rates of duty. From that time forward we were obliged, under our policy, to impose the higher rates on German and Belgian goods. We entered on negotiations with Germany through the usual diplomatic channels, which occupied a long time. At a later stage we entered into negotiations directly with the German Consul General at Montreal, Mr. Bopp. Representations were made by the government of Canada to Germany, to this effect, that we were not denying to Germany anything that we gave to any other foreign country, but something that we were giving solely to the mother country; and we urged that Germany should not recognize what was a family affair of the British empire as discrimination against Germany. We urged that view of the matter in various ways, and several years passed before we reached the conclusion that nothing more could be done with Germany; and finally we imposed what is called the surtax on German goods imported into Canada. This was done because Germany claimed the right to interfere in the family affairs of the British empire, and that we would not agree to.

Mr. SPROULE. Sir Charles Tupper warned the government in 1897 that that would be likely to take place.

Mr. FIELDING. If we had not undertaken the step we did at that time, it is a moral certainty that the treaties would never have been denounced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My recollection of the dates is that the new treaty between Great Britain and Germany was made on the very day the old treaty ceased to have operation, or on the day immediately afterwards.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite likely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That treaty, then, must have been in process of negotiation for some months during the period imme-

diately anterior to the denunciation of the old treaty. Was this government aware that the British government was going to enter into a treaty with Germany from the benefits of which Canada would be excluded?

Mr. FIELDING. It might be understood that we would get the benefits of that treaty if we gave up our preferential policy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another question. Did the new treaty give to Germany the same rights in the markets of the other British dominions as the mother country had?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that Canada and one of the West India Islands were excepted. Otherwise the treaty applied to the whole British empire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not quite an answer to my question. The old treaty provided that Germany should have in the markets of Canada, Australia and all the other British colonies, the same rights as Great Britain herself had. In the new treaty, which must have been before the government, and the terms of which they must have been aware of, was there any provision similar to that?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had the treaty before me for years, but I remember that it did exclude Canada and, if my memory serves me, one of the West India Islands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not make myself clear to the hon. Minister of Finance. The new treaty might give the benefits of the minimum German tariff to Great Britain and all the British dominions without at the same time providing that Germany should have the same tariff rates in those dominions that Great Britain herself had. What I would like to know is whether that is the case. When the German minimum tariff is applied to all the British dominions except Canada, was that the consideration of the granting to Germany of the same rights in the markets of those dominions as Great Britain herself had?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not care to answer off hand as that applies to a matter now somewhat distant. As respects the other colonies, I would not care to say definitely how it affects them, but its relation to Canada we had clearly in our minds and that was as I have described.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the despatch which announced the denunciation of the treaty, Lord Salisbury said it was denounced in the interests of the whole empire. That was the principle he affirmed. But when a new treaty was being made by which the minimum German tariff was to be applied to the remainder of the empire, why should it have been withheld from Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. At that time Canada was the only portion which adopted a preferential policy and the others were not affected as we were.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That shows the importance of the other question I put. Unless Germany retained the right within the markets of every dominion of the empire to have the same privileges as Britain herself, the answer of the Minister of Finance is absolutely without significance unless that particular provision were made in the new treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. We were chiefly concerned in the provisions respecting Canada and of these we have no doubt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Still Canada has exactly the same right as any other dominion of the empire to be treated with consideration in a treaty made by the empire as a whole, particularly as that treaty was brought about under the circumstances to which the Minister of Finance has just alluded.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). My object in asking that question was in order that we might be put right as to what appears to be our present trade relations with Germany—whether Canada was in any way to blame for the surtax placed by Germany on Canadian goods and whether we are right in retaliating. My own view is that we were perfectly within our rights and that the government acted wisely and properly in placing a surtax on German goods to offset the surtax which Germany placed on our goods. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) appears very solicitous for our farmers in connection with the export trade of Canada to Germany. But we should not lose sight of the fact that notwithstanding the surtax, our trade with Germany is greater than it was previous to the imposition of that surtax. In 1890 we exported to Germany $507,000 worth of Canadian goods, both agricultural and manufactured. In 1891 we exported $532,000 worth. In 1892, $942,000; and in 1893 $750,000. And so on down to 1896 when we exported $757,000 worth. In 1898, when Germany placed a surtax on Canadian goods, we exported $1,837,000 worth to that country. When you look over the returns of the exports of this country to Germany, you will find that our trade with Germany has not been seriously affected by the German surtax, and I have no doubt that Germany, during the years previous to the present trade relations, was importing a large quantity of agricultural products. During those years their imports were just as great as to-day; and even though we had better trade relations then, our ex-

ports to the German market were not very great. I do not think that this is a question of much importance to Canada because our trade with Germany was very small even before the German surtax was placed on Canadian goods.

There is another side to the question. We know of the great advantages which Germany has in the way of manufacturing woollen and linen goods and a great many other lines of manufactured goods as well; and if we allow those goods to come into this country under any favourable arrangement such as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) advocates, we will have a slaughter market in Canada for goods made in Germany to the detriment of the Canadian manufacturer and the people who work in the Canadian factories and those who have their money invested in them.

I do not want to speak longer on this question. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) says we should not sit idle and should not allow this sort of thing to go on without expressing our views. Well, I do not propose to sit idle any longer on this question which the hon. gentleman raises from time to time. I do not see what else the government could have done than place a retaliatory surtax upon German goods. The only way by which we can get better trade relations with Germany is by cancelling our present preference to Great Britain, and I do not suppose that the Canadian people generally are anxious that should be done.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) not think it possible for the government to so arrange the tariff that they could protect the woollen industry in which he is interested?

Mr. T. CHISHOLM (East Huron). There is a very important question under consideration, the French treaty, and I think it would be well to give a little attention to that matter before taking up our trade relations with Germany. As one of those who voted against the French treaty on a previous occasion, I wish to put myself right. It has been said that I voted against it because it bore the name French. I wish to inform the House that such a statement is absolutely unwarranted, and I think I made myself very plain with regard to the matter on a previous occasion. But that is the only argument they can bring up to counteract what I have to say in opposition to the treaty. In any treaty to be made with France, we should be disposed to give it our most favourable consideration. Our French Canadian compatriots have been very kind in supporting us in giving the British preference, and I feel that if any favour can be done to them, the very name French treaty would induce me to swallow a great deal I would not otherwise accept. My objection to the French treaty was simply with regard to one or two items. I objected to the introduction of absinthe into this country, also to the introduction of imitation brandy, and my reason was that absinthe is one of the ingredients contained in those imitation brandies. To show the nature of the imitations, you can for about twenty cents buy a bottle of imitation brandy in France, while you have to pay twenty times that price for a bottle of the real stuff.

Now, I object to the introduction of these two things. When this matter first came up for consideration, I requested the government to make an effort to have these two things eliminated from the treaty. But I find them named in the schedule as receiving the benefits of our intermediate tariff. I hold that they should be prohibited altogether. It would appear that our French friends can get modifications made in the treaty which are expected to benefit them. They were able to exclude our fat cattle, and apparently our representatives were willing that these should be excluded. Could not our representatives seek modifications also and ask that absinthe be excluded from this country? When I last spoke I did not wish to take up the time of the House by reading from the documents then before me, not wishing to delay the House. But to-day I shall ask the House to listen to the reading of an article which appeared in the 'Daily Standard' of 23rd of November, in regard to absinthe. I believe the people of Canada do not know what they are doing in allowing this poisonous drug to be brought into this country. The article to which I refer says:

> Alarmed by the ravages of absinthe which is sapping the mental, moral and physical life of that nation, France is demanding a war of extermination upon the deadly drink.
>
> The trades unions of the country, leading members of the Chamber of Deputies, prominent physicians, business men and statesmen are organizing a national petition, demanding that the manufacture and sale of absinthe be prohibited. In France, this insidious poisonous liquor is held responsible, in great part, for the decadence of the nation, its falling birth rate, hundreds of murders and the appalling number of insane.
>
> Authorities among the petitioners assert that absinthe kills tens of thousands of people every year. More of it is consumed in France than in the rest of the world together, and it is causing epilepsy, tuberculosis, madness and crime.
>
> Formerly one of the soberest of men, the Frenchman has now become the heaviest drinker in the world. Brought to a per capita basis, he consumes each year liquors which contain no less than three and a half gallons of pure alcohol. The American consumes one and a third gallons.
>
> As this estimate includes women, children and many men who do not drink, the con-

sumption by the drinking population of France is, as may clearly be observed, somewhat startling. Alone, Paris swallows no fewer than 5,000 quarts of absinthe daily. It is estimated that at certain hours one-fifth of the entire population is engaged in drinking a liquor which is condemned by the entire medical world.

Belgium, long suffering from the same evil, has at last aroused. Its law-making body has just banished absinthe, in every shape and form from that country.

Absinthe is a liquor, the base of which is an alcoholic solution of certain essential oils derived from a number of plants. The chief source is a form of wormwood, or absinthium.

Other absinthe of inferior quality, is made from various herbs and essential oils, and adulterations are numerous and deleterious. As adulterants, turmeric and indigo, and, in some cases, sulphate of copper, have been used, chiefly for the production of the green colour in the lower grades.

And I may say that the green colour of absinthe has led to the name given to the liquor as 'the lady in green,' or, as some call it, 'the curse of France.'

When excessively used, absinthe gives at first a feeling of accelerating intoxication. Later, the digestive organs are deranged, the appetite destroyed, then thirst, giddiness, ringing in the ears, hallucinations of sight, heavy mental oppression, anxiety, loss of brain power and idiocy may succeed each other.– Encyclopædia.

Unquestionably, the effects of absinthe are far more harmful than those of whisky.

Alcoholic insanity, that is where the sufferer's mind is permanently unbalanced, is a comparative rarity. In France insanity from absinthe is common. For example, take fifty men and let them drink whisky steadily to excess, and fifty other men, under the same conditions, drinking absinthe.

I warrant that twenty or twenty-five of the latter will find their way to the madhouse, and I question whether in the same time one whisky drinker will have reached the insanity stage.

These statements were made a few years ago by Dr. Charles S. Potts, a specialist in nervous diseases. Dr. Horatio C. Wood, professor of materia medica and therapeutics in the University of Pennsylvania, had this to say: The effects of the decoction differ materially from those of pure alcohol drinks, though the percentage of alcohol in absinthe is greater than in almost any other intoxicant. This percentage ranges anywhere from 47·66 in the ordinary grades to 80·66 in the best Swiss absinthe.

You can judge what the effect will be when Switzerland also introduces her absinthe into this country, for in Switzerland, a great deal of absinthe is manufactured.

Effects manifest in an absinthe drinker constitute a series of symptoms designated as absinthism. Characteristic symptoms are restlessness at night, with disturbing dreams, great tremblings of hands and tongue, vertigo and the tendency to epileptiform convulsions.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM.

A strange feature of this national evil which has fastened itself upon France is the fact that it has developed within the memory of many persons now alive.

And I fear that some now living will see the time when Canada also will be cursed with absintheism as France is today.

The drink first made its appearance in the country upon the close of the Algerian war in 1847 or 1848. While in Algiers, the French soldiers adopted the custom of the natives in using the liquor to fight the low fever of that malarial climate, and they grew to like it so well that they carried it home with them.

Since then absinthe has been the steadily growing curse of the nation, says an authority, until now the French are the most nervous and excitable people under the sun.

Not only has the liquour its effect upon the drinker, but, through him, makes a marked impression on the succeeding generations. It is for this reason more than any other that the French as a nation are deteriorating.

Vast quantities of absinthe are used in that country. The annual importation from Switzerland alone reaches over 2,000,000 gallons, while the French distilleries produce many times that quantity.

In addition to the 5,000 quarts that Paris drinks each day, the proportion, according to figures given by the Minister of Finance, is almost as great in the provinces. It is estimated that every 5,000,000 of the population drink 10,000 quarts of absinthe daily—and there are many drinks in a quart bottle.

So it has come to pass that the Frenchman, with his annual consumption of liquors that put into his stomach three and a half gallons of alcohol, is now the hardest drinker in the world.

A much heavier statistical burden rests upon the shoulders of the actual drinkers, as the figures quoted as per capita, including men and women who do not drink, as well as children.

In point of alcoholic consumption the Swiss and Belgian come next, with two and two-fifths gallons each annually. The Spaniard gets away with two and a third gallons; the Italian with just a little less; the Englishman and German two and one-tenth, and the American with one and a third gallons. The most abstemious man in the world, the Norweigan, consumes only half a gallon in a year.

Not only then do the French people drink more than any other people, but they drink the most harmful intoxicant that is made.

Government officials and thinking men of the republic have long recognized the baneful affects and growing extent of the evil, but so far have been powerless to limit either.

Absinthe manufacture has become such a profitable, and even respectable, pursuit that the proposed legislation against it has always failed.

Visitors to Paris frequently remark that they see no drunkenness on the streets. Absinthe does not produce rowdyism or cause boisterous conduct. Its evil effects are subtle, quiet and insinuating.

One French characteristic of this drink habit, however, may be plainly noticeable to

the stranger, this is the arrival of the daily absinthe hour.

For the better classes—business men, clerks and similar workers—this is between 5 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon, when the man who has been confined at his desk or counter all day thinks he must have his appetizer on the eve of dinner.

Walking along the streets, if it be summer, one notices a warm, half-sickish, sweetish odour, somewhat resembling that of paregoric, filling the atmosphere.

Looking into the many cafes that line the street, the wondering visitor may perceive the source of this smell. Every drinking place is crowded; waiters rush about bearing bottles and glasses—Paris is busy drinking absinthe.

Those who take their liquor 'as gentlemen should' have the bottles brought to them as they sit about the cafe talking. Each man pours his drink—from one to three inches—into a tall narrow tumbler.

Over the top of this is held a perforated spoon, containing a lump of sugar. Ice water is dropped upon the sugar and allowed to trickle through into the liquid beneath until the glass is full.

Prepared in this way, absinthe is pleasant, and seems harmless to smell and taste. Nor are its immediate effects those of brandy or whisky. In fact, the immediate effects are scarcely discernible in any way.

For another class, the workmen—there are usually three drinking periods in the day, and these are recognized by employers.

At 10 o'clock in the morning the French labourer invariably lays down his implements of toil and hastens to the nearest drink shop for his absinthe. He does the same thing twice during the afternoon.

Wherever workmen are found in numbers there are generally plenty of drinking shops in the vicinity. Near where some large excavation is in progress or some big building being erected, it is not uncommon to see little canvas covered wagons or carts. Very often these may be presided over by women whose husbands are foremen in the nearest works.

The workman cannot take his absinthe with the degree of comfort enjoyed by the more prosperous or leisurely citizens. There are no chairs—he would not have time to sit down if there were.

One after another these men walk up to the cart, gulp down the poison which they erringly 'take for the good of the heart and stomach,' and go back to their labours.

Plenty of credit may be had until Saturday night, and he may take as large a drink as he likes. His 'bracer' costs him three or four cents a glass.

It is not good absinthe, as a rule, that these unfortunates drink, but the vilest and most dangerous imitations. They know this very well, saying that pure absinthe is not for the poor man but for the rich.

His drink does not make the labourer jovial or light-hearted, any more than it makes the wealthier consumer in the gilded cafes boisterous. He goes back to his work morosely, and labours in solemn silence.

Then come two more drinks during the afternoon, and a fourth, probably, as he goes wearily homeward at night. His legs are not affected, but horrible visions are forming in the weakened brain.

It is a curious thing that the absinthe drinker, especially among the lower classes, feels an acute sense of personal oppression under the spell of the insidious poison.

He hates everybody; the hand of every man is against him. Even his wife and his children are intriguing to destroy his peace and happiness.

When he passes the home of the wealthy man he mutters in anger—he is without a cent in his pocket because the rich steal it all. If he can jostle rudely a well dressed man or woman while on his way, the act gives him a savage sort of pleasure; ordered to move on by a policeman, an insane desire to kill the uniformed representative of law swells up in his heart.

Not long ago, labouring under the hallucination 'due to absinthe' that his wife was not faithful to him, a Paris labourer killed her and their child.

'Absinthe' said Senator Beranger recently, 'is responsible for the depopulation of the country and for more than two-thirds of the crime committed.' Even the judges who deal with criminal cases recognize the fact that to be a confirmed victim of 'absinthism' is a reason for almost any crime.

There are many dens throughout the poorest quarters of Paris where the wretched absinthe victim, sunk to the lowest depths of degradation, may have a glass of poison for two cents, and may be permitted the use of a dark corner in which to sleep.

Such haunts—and this is a sad commentary upon the gratification of human curiosity—are among the show places of that remarkable city. Professional guides conduct parties of tourists to these resorts in order that they may witness the fallen humanity at its deepest and darkest level.

As the visitors usually tip the proprietor liberally, he welcomes them with greater pleasure than he does the trembling wretches who come to buy his wares. They may gaze upon sin and misery to their heart's content.

One never sees evidences of merry-making or light-heartedness in these haunts of depravity. Everything is suggestive of hopeless misery. Men and women may be there—at least they were men and women at one time but are now simply absinthe drunkards through whose feeble brains the shadows of weird dreams are creeping.

But once in the grip of absinthe the victim is seldom able to set himself free. He will do anything to obtain money to purchase it. Not infrequently guides on the Alps have been known to murder tourists in their care in order to obtain money for this purpose.

Whether it is the result of bad example or not, the neighbours of France are drinking absinthe much more heavily than formerly, not without appreciable results. While the population of Belgium for instance has increased 30 per cent during the last 15 years, the consumption of alcohol has increased 37 per cent during the same period. Cases of insanity there have increased in number 45 per cent, suicides 80 per cent, and arrests for begging and vagabondage 150 per cent.

It was a recognition of the danger into which their country was steadily moving that

prompted the action of the Belgium legislature in banishing absinthe from that country.

Far-reaching is the Bill which passed both houses, by an overwhelming vote. It prohibits the manufacture, importation, transport, storage or sale of the liquor, or any substitute for it. Violations of the law are to be met with severe penalties.

Perhaps the most unfortunate result of the absinthe habit is the fact that its effect is so liable to be transmitted to children. Many of these who do not become drunkards themselves—which most of them do—give evidence of mental weakness, manifest a tendency toward epilepsy or become afflicted with some serious nervous trouble.

The lessons taught by the evils of absinthe drinking might well be labelled upon every bottle in the form of the Greek word from which the name of the liquor is derived, 'Apsinthion, that which must not be drunk.'

I was very sorry to take up the time of the House reading this long article, but it seems to me that the members of this House should know what they are voting for. I am not voting against the French treaty because it is French, I am voting against it because it allows that accursed drug to be introduced into this country, and my French Canadian friends would likely be the first to be injured by it. Instead of blaming me for voting against the French treaty, they should realize that I am trying to protect them from this cursed traffic. What has France done for the French Canadians? She deserted them in the hour of their need. What did a French king do? Why he, by a coup de plume, signed away the whole of Canada, adopting the words of Voltaire: 'Qu'importe quelques arpents de neige,' and here we are now because this has a French name, saying we will introduce this curse into this country. I am opposed to it and I hope there are men enough in this House to back me up in insisting on having this item expunged from the treaty. I do not object to the French treaty, because it is French, for although I do not think that it is going to be of any benefit to our farmers, I object to it on other grounds than this—and one of them is that I do not want to see our French Canadian friends go to the mad house through the use of absinthe.

Mr. J. J. DONNELLY (South Bruce). When introducing this measure to-day, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us in effect that after the representatives of this government and the representatives of the French government had arranged the terms of the treaty, the members of the French Senate were afraid that its terms would permit the finished product of the stock raisers of this country to enter into France and compete with the finished products of the stock raisers of France. They pressed for and secured an amendment which would allow only the lean cattle, or what you might call the raw material of the stock raisers of this country to enter into France. I was somewhat surprised that the minister passed over this change in the treaty as though it were of little or no importance. To me it appears that this alteration in the treaty removes the only part of it that might be of any benefit to the agricultural interests of this country. The fact that the members of the French Senate were so anxious to exclude our fat cattle is an evidence to me that under favourable conditions we might reasonably expect to find a market for our fat cattle in that country. I wish to enter my protest against having the agricultural interests of this country sacrificed in order that the manufacturers of our country may obtain an increased market for their output or in order that the people of France may find here in Canada a market for their wines, perfumes and other produce.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker this treaty is surely not above criticism, but we are told perfection is superhuman. Even admitting, as contended a moment ago by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm)—that in consequence, noxious liquors, such as absinthe and the like, will be introduced into this country, as a compensation we will have those good French wines. Although imperfect, that treaty has evidently its good points. On account of it we will be more favourably known abroad, and our business intercourse with France will be more active. At any rate, I do not think Canada will lose anything by it.

Now, that treaty is drawn pretty much on the same lines as that which as carried through by the Conservative government in 1893. If the treaty of 1893 was beneficial on the whole, I think this treaty also must have its good points. The fact of its having been negotiated by the hon. gentlemen opposite is not in itself an argument against its adoption.

It has been stated that it will stand in the way of the granting of the preference which we are seeking to obtain from the mother country. The preferential tariff as we have it to-day is a one-sided arrangement, of very little advantage to us. At all events, should the preferential arrangement be of any actual value, it will always be up to us, once it has been secured, to denounce the treaty. In fact, there is a clause in the treaty to that effect. Section 3 contains, among other things, the following:

It shall enter into force immediately after the carrying out of that formality, and shall so remain for a perod of ten years, unless however one of the contracting parties notifies the other of its intention to

cancel the agreement, in which case this agreement will cease to operate twelve months after the receipt by the other party of said notification.

Supposing a preferential agreement were entered into with the mother country, not a one-sided arrangement, but a preferential treaty actually on lines of reciprocity, it will be seen from the above quotation that there will always be an opportunity to cancel the French treaty which we are called upon to sanction to-day. To my mind, such an objection is without foundation.

Now, that treaty with France was concluded in good faith at a time when the Payne tariff had not yet been enacted in the United States. That tariff having been enacted in the meantime, I really do not believe that the ratification of this treaty would have the effect of inducing our neighbours to enforce their maximum tariff against our goods, not any more than the ratification of the treaty of 1893 brought about reprisals on their part. So that we should not be prevented from voting in favour of the ratification of the treaty by any fear of that kind.

As to our future intercourse with the United States, I may say that this government having at their disposal every means of getting information has no doubt in this respect taken the necessary steps, and should such reprisals on the part of the United States follow the ratification of this treaty, the government will bear the responsibility.

I am therefore favourable to the immediate ratification of this agreement, and I shall vote in its favour, not on the ground of sentiment, but on that of business.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, in considering a question of this kind, the paramount consideration should be the commercial advantage that we are to obtain by the ratification of the treaty—as compared with the injury that may be entailed. In determining this we should examine closely the present state of trade between the two countries and the possibility of increasing the same with an increasing advantage to this country. What is the present state of our trade with France? We have an export trade to France amounting to $3,176,000 and an import trade from France amounting to something over $8,000,000 a little over a million of which is on the free list. We start out with a handicap because we are going to conclude a treaty with a country which now sends us at least twice the value of goods we send them. And speaking generally, other things being equal, that country is going to attain a greater advantage under such a commercial treaty than we are. Another view which should enter into the negotiation of treaties is the prospective profit which may accrue to us, and in that connection let me ask what are we going to gain by the ratification of this treaty with France? Are we going to increase to any extent the exports of our agricultural products to France? I think not. Our export of wheat to France has not exceeded 60,000 bushels a year until last year and our export of agricultural implements has not increased by more than 25 per cent, and to-day it stands at about $850,000 worth. We export to France about $1,000,000 worth of lobsters and what advantage is this treaty going to give us in that respect? I should think none whatever, because if I am correctly informed we have now all the market we want for our product of lobsters and there is even a deficiency to supply the local demand. Under these circumstances, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me in what way we are going to benefit by the ratification of this treaty. We might have benefited had we been permitted to send into France our fat cattle, but the French republic recognized that if they applied the minimum tariff to Canadian fat cattle that was a matter in which Canada would get a benefit, so she immediately withdrew that concession and said that the maximum tariff should apply on Canadian fat cattle exported to France. I am, therefore, I think, fair in saying that so far as the agricultural classes of Canada are concerned they will get no benefit whatever from the ratification of this treaty. Now to the republic to the south of us we exported $92,000,000 worth of goods during the last fiscal year and we imported from the United States $192,000,000 worth of goods. I quite agree with the Minister of Finance when he says that Canada has reached such a stage in her nationhood that in making these treaties we should make them to suit ourselves. With that idea in mind it is our bounden duty to look first to the benefits we will receive. I do not know whether or not the passage of this treaty with France is going to entail an extra 25 per cent duty on all products exported by Canada to the United States, but I do say there is a risk of that, and I also say that the risk of having a 25 per cent duty put upon $92,000,000 worth of our exports is not to be compensated by the trivial advantage we may possibly attain from a possible increase of our present trade with France. And, there is another question looming up which should be considered by us. We know that for years in the motherland her statesmen have been worshipping at the shrine of the Manchester school and we know that twenty years ago any man in England who advocated anything but free trade would be considered a mental incompetent. However, a change has come, and we find that to-day there are seventy or eighty tariff reformers in the British House of Commons, and that there is a great

battle on between tariff reform and free trade. I make bold to say that while the tariff reformers may not succeed at the approaching election—and there is a possibility that they will succeed—they will succeed ere long, and then we will be in a position to obtain mutual preferential trade with Great Britain. Therefore it behooves us not to tie ourselves up with these treaties and not to put ourselves in the position of passing this treaty to-day which will give a number of other nations most favoured terms without any corresponding return. It is, in view of this possibility, of considerable consequence that we should be free from these restrictions. It is quite true, as has been pointed out, that the treaty may be denounced upon twelve months' notice being given, but we all know that when you denounce a treaty, a great deal more ill-feeling is caused than if the treaty never were made. Therefore, if we pass this treaty now, and later on when we have an opportunity of negotiating with Great Britain for mutual preferential trade, we shall have to denounce this treaty, a good deal of ill-feeling may be thus created in France. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether or not the ratification of this treaty which gives to all these other nations most favoured treatment in Canada, will make them give to us the same favoured terms on Canadian goods entering their markets? I would like to ask also whether or not since this treaty was passed in 1907, the French government have in any way interfered with or raised their minimum tariff, because, if they did, that would be another reason for us refusing to ratify the treaty now. If it is also true that these other favoured nations which get these favoured terms in our markets are not compelled to give us a corresponding advantage in their markets, that is another reason why we should refuse to ratify this treaty.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I do not know that I would have said anything on this question had it not been for the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) in reference to the importation of absinthe. I do not think any one disputes the evils of the absinthe habit, and I should think that everybody would prevent, if they could, the introduction of such an evil into Canada. The impression may be created by the words of the hon. member (Mr. Chisholm) that this treaty contributes to the introduction of absinthe into this country and that its ratification may lead to the evils which he described. Let me say, Sir, that that is an entirely erroneous conception of the scope of the treaty. There is nothing in this treaty which will facilitate the importation of absinthe into Canada, and there is nothing in this treaty which in any way hampers Canada in placing any duties upon absinthe which she may deem fit, or which prevents Canada from absolutely prohibiting in the future the importation of absinthe. I wish to make this clear, and I shall read the clauses of the treaty which bear on this matter. In clause three of the treaty there is this:

> The natural and manufactured products enumerated in schedule B of this convention originated in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories and the protectorate of Indo-China, shall enjoy on their importation into Canada the benefit of the intermediate tariff and of the lowest rates of customs duties applicable to like products of other foreign origin.

Now, schedule B of this treaty is the list of those French products which have the benefit of the intermediate tariff. That list refers to the different items of our tariff, amongst others to item 156, in which there is a long list of various spirituous liquors. Amongst those liquors is absinthe. That means that under this treaty absinthe, along with other spirituous liquors, will enjoy the benefit of the intermediate tariff of Canada. But when you come to examine our tariff, what is the duty on that particular item? It is this: The British preferential tariff, $2.40; the intermediate tariff, $2.40; the general tariff against all countries, $2.40. The item in the tariff includes the following:

> Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine, n.o.p.; gin of all kinds, n.o.p.; rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p.; amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy, n.o.p.; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.o.p.; mescal, pulque, rum, schrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages; and wines, n.o.p.; containing more than 40 per cent of proof spirit, per gallon of the strength of proof.

That is the item of our tariff, and the duties against these articles in all the three schedules of the tariff are exactly the same. They will be the same under the new French treaty as they were under the old French treaty, and exactly the same as they would have been if this treaty were not in existence. Therefore, the impression which has been sought to be created, I have no doubt quite honestly but entirely erroneously, that this treaty is creating a new facility for the introduction of absinthe and other spirituous liquors into Canada is entirely wrong. Furthermore, there is nothing in this treaty

to prevent this parliament raising or lowering those duties at any time; or, if we choose, we can prohibit the importation of any one or all of these spirituous liquors into Canada from France and all other countries. and this treaty does not hamper Canada or prevent us making such a prohibition. I think it well that this House and the people of Canada should understand that in this respect this treaty makes no change, so that no false impression as to the action of this government may be created. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that under this treaty fat cattle will no longer have the advantage of the minimum tariff on entering France. That is true. It is possible that may at some future day not facilitate a trade with France in fat cattle. But what are the conditions? For the last three years no fat cattle, no cattle of any sort, from Canada, have landed in France. In the future we are going to have the advantage, important or not important as the case may be, that cattle which are not ready for slaughter will have an entry into France under their minimum tariff. Without the treaty we would not have this advantage. If there is any benefit from that, we get it; if there is no benefit, it does not harm us to have the opportunity of that advantage. It happens that our greatest rival in France in that respect is the United States. It happens that until lately the United States have had a treaty with France, a small one it is true, which has lately been abrogated; and until they make another treaty which would give them the same advantages that we get, this treaty will give Canada an advantage over the United States in the French market, which may be sufficient to enable us to get the trade, instead of our neighbours to the south. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has talked of agricultural implements. It is true that in the last few years we have sent about $750,000 worth of agricultural implements to France. I have no doubt that if this treaty comes into force, immediately the splendid establishments for the manufacture of agricultural implements in Canada will be able to get complete control of the French market, and will be able to oust from that market their rivals in the United States. This is an advantage which the farmers and everybody else in Canada will rejoice to see.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what advantage we will have in the French market as compared with the United States, if this treaty is passed?

Mr. FISHER. We shall have the advantage of the minimum tariff, whereas the United States will have the disadvantage of the maximum tariff. This is a very substantial advantage to the manufacturers of agricultural implements in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to be somewhat divided in regard to the German treaty. I do not think the time to discuss that is when the French treaty is under consideration. Our conduct and action in regard to the German treaty has been abundantly endorsed by the people of Canada over and over again. And I do not see any reason to regret it, although at the same time acknowledging clearly, as I do, from my own personal conviction at all events, that the removal of the restrictions upon trade will be likely to redound to our advantage. And if we can remove restrictions upon trade with France or Germany or Italy or any other country with which we can make satisfactory trade relations, I personally will rejoice, because I consider that any restrictions upon trade are only justified where they are absolutely necessary for other purposes and other reasons. Fear has been expressed that this treaty may interfere with future possible mutual preference within the empire. I think that the action of the government of Canada with regard to preference within the empire was the right and proper one. I think that Canada took the lead in that respect, which the other countries of the empire are gradually likely to follow. I find that in England where to-day the tariff reform is under discussion, there is a tendency to minimize the question of preference to the colonies or outside dominions, and that straight protection is becoming more and more the watchword of the tariff reformers. Well, that is for them to consider and for them to decide and not for us to meddle with. But to my mind the Canadian plan of preference is the best one, and bargaining between the different parts of the empire is not likely to lead to satisfaction. Each dominion must deal with the other in accordance with its own views. That system, which was inaugurated in 1897 and which is maintained and carried out in Canada to-day, has received universal acceptance throughout the empire and is admitted to be the best and only sound plan of preference within the empire.

In answer to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro) I find that as regards agricultural machinery, the difference between the minimum and the general tariff is as nine to fifteen.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is it in dollars and cents?

Mr. FISHER. Six francs or $1.20.

Mr. HENDERSON. For how much?

Mr. FISHER. Per hundred kilograms. A kilogram is 220 pounds. I cannot offhand give the difference in percentage, but the minimum is to the maximum as three to five.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). With regard to this measure, I must say a few words in answer to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) because I do not take the same view of the matter. The hon. minister says that we should make our own treaties and have regard to what is best to the interests of Canada without worrying about what other countries may think. That is a very good theory but it is not carried out in this treaty. Nobody on behalf of the government has said anything about the merits of this treaty. All they say is that they made a bargain two years ago—which I thought was a very bad bargain and which I had the temerity to vote against—and that we should now ratify it. But the bargain is now still a worse one. The French Republic rejected the treaty we first negotiated and wanted better terms. They wanted to prevent Canadian cattle from being sent into their country. They wanted to put an additional embargo on our fat cattle. If that were the only reason, it would be a good one for voting against this treaty. But that is not the only trouble. If we are going to adopt the principle that we should make treaties in the interests of Canada, we should have some evidence that the well-being of Canada is being served by this treaty. But what do we find? We find that we made a bargain, and were called upon to vote for that bargain because the government saw fit to make it. But the French government asked for a modification of that bargain, and forsooth we must agree to it. In that respect we are not carrying out the theory of the Minister of Finance that we should make our bargains from a Canadian standpoint.

When the Minister of Agriculture spoke about certain intoxicating and other spirits brought in here, I was hoping that he would give us the whole information and tell us about the cheap wines to be brought in by virtue of this treaty at a reduced rate, and which will have the effect of putting out of business to a great extent the large interest of grape-growing. If we are to have cheap wines, it is worth something to know that we are drinking honest Canadian wine, made from grapes grown here, produced under our own eyes, inspected by our own government inspectors, which are not injurious, which cannot be fraudulently marked and packed, rather than foreign wines about which we necessarily know very little, but which we know are impregnated frequently with some of the very things the Minister of Agriculture says are injurious and are not interfered with in any new way by this treaty. Those are shortly some of the reasons why I opposed the treaty two years ago. What reply have we to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm), and South Bruce (Mr. Donnelly), with regard to the cattle industry? Simply this, that whether the bargain be a much worse one than two years ago or not, the fact that it is presented to us by the government ought to suffice. The Minister of Agriculture did not appear to be at all concerned about the merits of the treaty but appeared to think that as it has been negotiated by the government and as the government had consented to the modification proposed by the French Republic there was nothing more to be said.

For the reasons I have mentioned and because this is a much worse bargain than the one made two years ago I shall be obliged to vote against the second reading.

Mr. JOSEPH PIERRE TURCOTTE (Quebec County). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, allow me to explain briefly my personal views on the question which is now under consideration before this House. Two years ago the Canadian parliament ratified the main convention respecting the commercial relations between France and Canada. Since then, general elections were held in this country, and I do not think that a single one of the members who then voted in favour of the ratification of that treaty has been subjected to the least blame at the hands of the electorate.

Now, as this treaty is already ratified, there only remains to ratify the supplementary convention. I would be curious to know in what position we should find ourselves were we to refuse ratifying this convention. Is it not true that it would result in bringing again into question everything done so far by parliament and in putting an end to the treaty itself? I have come to this conclusion that it is our duty to ratify the measure voted upon by the House two years ago, a measure which the people did approve of at the general elections, and which the French Chambers themselves did sanction at the beginning of this year. Otherwise, we would have to fall back on the convention of 1893.

The question now under discussion is whether the supplementary convention which is before us is so detrimental to our interests that we should undo or abrogate what we have done so far in connection with the main convention.

It is true that the supplementary convention involves a change in the commercial convention of September 19, 1907, but should such a modification prevent us from ratifying the treaty? I do not think so. That modification is the consequence of the general policy of the French government. Their policy is one of strenuous protection, while we are living under a regimé of mitigated protection. It is easily understood that when it was proposed to give a preference to the products of the farm, as for example, in the case of animals in fat condition for butchery; the French agricultural interests were alarmed

by those concessions to Canada and they made representations to the members of the French Chamber of Deputies and of the Senate against that provision of the treaty which was threatening their interests. Such was the capital objection raised against the treaty. It was held, on good ground, that such a preference which was being granted to the Canadian agriculturists would result in creating a most detrimental competition to the French peasant. Undoubtedly, the shipping to the French market of cattle fattened on our farms would have dealt a very severe blow to similar products of the agricultural French industry. I see here a compliment paid to our Canadian farmer, to his enterprise and his activity.

The alarm felt was well grounded and justifiable. The granting of a preferential tariff to the Canadian farmer was withheld, in order not to trouble the economy of French agricultural interests. I believe that such a policy, considered from the standpoint of protection, such as it is being applied in France, is warranted. I am one of those who approve of the position taken by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), who both represented us in France, as concerns their agreeing to that supplementary convention.

As the withholding of assent to that convention would have resulted in bringing us back to the convention of 1893, our plenipotentiaries, as the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) has well said, have acted with wisdom in following the footsteps of their predecessors, and endeavouring to enlarge our commercial relations with France, in proportion to the immense development taken by our trade, our manufacturing and agricultural industries, during the last fifteen years. Our government have so well grasped the situation that they were the first to open negotiations and to take such necessary steps as were calculated to meet the needs of our trade.

On the other hand, we could hardly expect to reap all the benefits accruing from that convention, without giving anything in return. What we have received is some compensation for what we did give. I agree that we do not gain any new advantage as concerns the export of our cattle in fat condition for the butchery, but neither did we lose anything, seeing that we remain under the regimé created by the treaty of 1893, with the hope, as expressed by the minister, of bettering our position in a more or less remote future.

Meanwhile, we ought to benefit by the lesson which our French cousins have been teaching to such of us who represent here rural constituencies. Let no opportunity pass without our endeavouring to promote the interests of our constituents, of that agricultural class which constitute the sinews and backbone of the country and to whom are entrusted the primordial rights of our social and political economy.

Further, let us remember that this treaty confers upon us advantages which largely make up for the apparent loss of benefits as respects our farm products. If it be true that the failure to ratify this supplementary convention would result in placing us again under the regimé of the treaty of 1893, it is altogether out of the question that we would lose at once the benefits accruing to us from the main treaty as regards French literature, whether under that name come in sciences, law or political economy, whether it relates to works of fiction, &c. Thanks to our plenipotentiaries, under the new treaty we enjoy that advantage which Great Britain alone so far had been enjoying under the preferential tariff. Henceforward, the duty on literature of a lighter character, such as works of fiction printed in France are to pay 15 per cent, instead of the former rate of 25 per cent. As to works of a more serious character, books of science and political economy, the duty of 10 per cent is reduced to 5 per cent. It is then a foregone conclusion that henceforth French literature and English literature are to be placed at our disposal under identical conditions, and so we shall receive light from the two most powerful centres of intellectual activity in this twentieth century.

This provision is of an immense value to us from the standpoint of the intellectual development of our youth, the more so as nowadays those literary works of first necessity are out of our reach in this country. We have had so far to go to the fountain-heads of science, art and literature to supply our wants. Thanks to the lowered duties, all that wealth shall henceforth be within our reach.

I may be allowed to say further, in this connection, that outside of France itself, Canada is the only country in the world where those treasures of the French genius can be thoroughly appreciated. Therefore, in addition to such material advantages, we shall enjoy invaluable benefits in the intellectual sphere.

It behooves us therefore to ratify the supplementary convention to the French Canadian treaty, within the shortest time, so as to fully benefit by this treaty.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1908, during the debate concerning our commercial relations with France, I went over the grounds which induced me to give my support to the Franco-Canadian treaty. Consequently, in rising to address the House, I only intend to say a few words on the question.

The opposition discharged their duty in

calling the attention of the government to the dangers to the country from an undue haste in the ratification of the treaty. Should the attitude of the government be such as to disturb our commercial relations, they will have to shoulder the responsibility for such action.

I do not approve of the convention, as a French Canadian anxious to enlarge our trade relations with our old mother country, but I approve of it as a French Canadian, sincerely believing that this Franco-Canadian treaty will promote the growth of our trade with France.

In 1898, our trade with France amounted to $5,000,000. During the last fiscal year that trade reached as high a figure as $11,-204,902.

The Argentine Republic exports to France products to the value of $80,000,000. Does that same republic receive from France a more favourable treatment than is granted to Canada? Why should not our exports to France reach as high a figure as $80,-000,000?

I firmly believe that this convention shall result in promoting our trade with France and in increasing our relations with that country, from an intellectual as well as from a material standpoint, to quote the appropriate words uttered by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Turcotte). Should we increase our trade relations with France financiers will come over to Canada in order to investigate our natural resources, the great value of which they cannot fail to duly appreciate. French capitalists may also be induced to invest their capital in this country, for the development of our facilities of transportation between France and Canada. The development of our trade and our facilities of transportation, a wise investment of French capital, are efficacious means of promoting a sound French immigration. Such are the ideas and the opinion which I have formerly given expression to and nothing since has occurred to induce me to change my mind.

On these several grounds, I shall record my vote in favour of the Franco-Canadian treaty.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

AFTER RECESS.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ethier.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonald.

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. White.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

The order for Private Bills being exhausted, House resumed the debate on second reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the president of the French Republic.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I had no intention of taking part in the debate on this motion until I heard the Minister of Finance speak of the change that had been insisted upon by the French authorities in regard to the importation of cattle. I come here, Sir, as a farmer representing farmers, and I can flatter myself that perhaps I know as much about the beef industry as any man in this House. And knowing that, I know that the Minister of Finance should have had with him, at the time when he agreed to that change, a chaperone or a caretaker. I made a note of a question which I intended to submit to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). But when that hon. gentleman spoke, I expected that as the member of the Cabinet specially charged with the conservation of the interests of the farmers, he would have stated that he did not approve of this particular clause in the treaty. But I was surprised to note the airy manner in which the hon. minister put aside this phase of the treaty referring to the cattle industry. His argument is virtually this: In the past Canada has not entered into the market of France in the matter of beef cattle, and therefore it matters not that the maximum tariff is charged against the beef cattle we desire to ship to that country. The hon. gentleman surely did not consider for a moment the difference in duty charged under the maximum and the minimum tariff. The maximum is $27 per 1,000 pounds, and the minimum is $18, a difference of $9 per 1,000 pounds, or an average of about $15 per steer. Surely, no man in his senses will say that that is not a matter of very vital importance. Perhaps, coming as I do from the west, I realize more than the Minister of Agriculture does what the beef trade means to Canada. Let me point out what evidently the hon. member does not know. The export trade in beef cattle in Manitoba commenced in 1882, when one shipment was made of two cars of 42 head, of a total value of about $1,500. In the years from 1900 to the present day, the annual shipments from Manitoba and the west have been between 50,000 and 100,000 head, of a value of from $1,750,000 to $2,750,000. This trade, already of such

large proportions, is growing year by year, and it must be taken care of. To take care of it in the proper way it is requisite that the government should take every opportunity to find a market for our products, and here was an opportunity to open a market for our surplus beef cattle. Let me call your attention for a moment to what has been done in the United States, in Chicago alone. In 1865, the Chicago market handled only some 600 head of cattle. Last year the Chicago market handled over 4,000,000 head of cattle. The growth that has taken place in forty years in Chicago is only a small example of the growth that is going to take place in the Canadian west in the next forty years, for the Canadian west is growing very much more rapidly in every branch of trade than even the United States did. The Minister of Agriculture argues at one time in one way and at another time in another way. Where he is speaking to farmers instead of to the lawgivers of this House he would not for a moment advocate the doctrine that through this treaty Canadians would be able to sell in the markets of France their stocker cattle. By stocker cattle, I mean cattle that are not finished. If he were speaking to agriculturists in this country he would tell them that the proper way to get the greatest benefit in the cattle industry is to finish the cattle here, use Canadian feed, and put them on the market not one moment sooner than they are absolutely ripe, and will fetch the greatest possible price. That is what he will say to the farmers speaking as Minister of Agriculture. But he tells this House, and I think we are justified in saying that he misleads this House when he says it, that it is a good thing that the French stocker market is left open to us, and that we have an advantage in that market over our American competitors. He did not tell the House, when he was speaking of the American competition, that we are sure to be up against it, that three years ago Secretary Root and Ambassador Jusserand, the French representative at Washington, had made a provisional arrangement of a reciprocal character wherein France agreed to afford to the United States several advantages: first, the admission of American meats upon a guarantee of their purity and soundness made in compliance with the meat inspection laws; secondly, the admission of American cattle for slaughter within ten days after arrival; thirdly, authority to transport American cattle through French territory, more considerate treatment of American salt meat imports, and greater leniency in the regulations for the entry of American imports generally. This arrangement still holds good between France and the United States, so it means that without any treaty Secretary Root and the French ambassador have agreed that Americans should have just as good if not better terms for their farmers and their producers than the Canadian government have procured for our farmers by this much vaunted treaty. It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture, when he speaks on these subjects, should take the same stand at all times. He cannot prove to the farmers of this country what he tried to make good in his argument here to-day. I think he should be honest when he makes an argument in this House with regard to a matter of that kind. So, Sir, for that reason alone, if there were no other, I as a farmer, knowing the possibilities of the great west, will vote against this treaty if I have an opportunity. It is a matter of the greatest importance to the Canadian farmer, particularly in the west, that the future of this great cattle industry should be protected at all hazards. Why should we not follow the example of France in this matter? France saw the danger, and insisted on the protection of her farmers. Why should we not follow her example and insist on protecting our farmers when we make a treaty with France? Let me mention that in Chicago, the cattle industry of which I have already spoken, the live stock industry to-day exceeds in importance the grain industry of that great centre, the lumber industry, and the wholesale grocery business combined. That shows the immense proportions of the live stock industry in Chicago, which is the great centre of that industry in the United States, just as Winnipeg is of the Canadian west. Therefore I urge that care should be exercised in this regard by our government when signing treaties with foreign governments.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is that even under this minimum rate the Finance Minister had to admit that Canada had nothing whatever to do with the inspection of cattle when they land in France. Canada has nothing to say as to whether these cattle shall be considered as belonging to one class or another, it is left solely to the discretion of the French officials to say what treatment shall be accorded to shippers from Canada. Surely it would have been fair to provide that Canada should have a representative on the board of inspection, and I think the government was guilty of a great oversight in that respect. But knowing the record of this government in the past in the one treaty they have negotiated with a foreign country, the treaty with Japan, I do not wonder at their relegating to the authorities of another government the say-so with regard to what shall be or what shall not be done in the protection of our own interests.

In concluding, I desire to express a word of sympathy with my hon. friend for Centre Huron (Mr. Chisholm) in all he said of the

necessity of prohibiting the importation of absinthe. I intended to go fully into that matter, but as my hon. friend took up most of the points connected with it, I will add nothing more about it on this occasion. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out several strong reasons why I intend to vote against this treaty. I think it is up to every representative of an agricultural constituency to lay aside his partyism and to remember that he is here representing the farmers whose interests it is his duty to conserve, and the best way he can conserve them is to vote against this treaty.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). When this treaty was passed two years ago I thought that very slight benefits were likely to accrue to Canada under its operation. In sizing it up, however, I reached the conclusion that if it was likely to be of any benefit to the agriculturists of Canada, it was in the privilege of introducing into that country our fat cattle. I scarcely expected that we would ever succeed in establishing a trade in stockers with France, because of the distance and other disadvantages that we would have to overcome.

But I would think that there might come a time when from either the importation of cattle disease into Canada or its outbreak in Canada, our cattle might be shut out from England entirely and would also be shut out from the United States. It seemed to me desirable to have some other string to our bow, some other market to which, in case of extreme need, we might be able to send our cattle, and I thought that although it might not be of much advantage it might afford an alternative market for our fat cattle. For that reason and that reason alone I supported the treaty. I did so with a good deal of reluctance because from my casual examination and all I could learn I thought it was going to be of very little benefit to Canada; but now, since the French people have amended that treaty and our own Finance Minister and the government of Canada have been consenting parties to those amendments, to a practical repeal of the very clause in the treaty above all others that would be of value to the agriculturists of Canada, I do not see any justification for supporting that treaty. Looking over the whole field of possible trade with France, there seemed to be but one line in which we could hope to derive any benefit from this treaty, and that is in the exportation of agricultural implements and our manufacturers of implements are not doing a very large trade there now.

Examining this treaty and recalling the history of the present government's treaty makng, I do not wonder that Canada derives little benefit because all their efforts heretofore at negotiations with other countries for the purpose of extending the markets of Canada or securing for Canada better markets than she has, nave resulted in one-sided, jug-handled arrangements. In 1897 they started off by throwing off part of the duty on English goods, giving a preference to England. That action was proclaimed all over the world as some wonderful act of great statesmanship, great prescience, great knowledge that was to bring some wonderful financial result to Canada. What has been the practical result of that course? It practically killed our woollen trade in Canada, closed up nearly all our woollen mills, threw the artisans employed in these mills out of employment, reduced the market for Canadian wool and swept away the greater part of the hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in the woollen trade of Canada. Yet this government have absolutely refused since to do anything to help that crippled industry. Which side derived the advantage from that one-sided arrangement? Not Canada. It is true that England got an advantage but Canada received no advantage from it whatever. I was rather amused to-night to hear the Minister of Agriculture say: I was in England and I found everybody satisfied, remarkably well pleased with what we had done, it was the very thing that suited them. Why would it not suit them? They received the whole advantage and we got nothing in return. The Minister of Agriculture went to England and discussing reciprocal preferential trade said that what we did we did voluntarily and of our own free will and accord, we did it for England's sake, we did not want anything in return, did not ask for a duty on grain imported from other countries, while ours got the freedom of the market, or anything else, and he asked them not to give us any preference in their markets over any other country in the world. Is it any wonder that they were satisfied? They were satisfied and he was satisfied. He thought he represented the whole Dominion of Canada, when if he had gone among the farmers of Canada they would have regarded him as one of Mark Twain's innocents abroad.

Before the Liberals came into power they said that the Conservative party were trying to find markets everywhere in the world except right at home, at our very door, where there was a market of 85,000,000 people. They said that if they were returned to power they would secure, by their sunny ways and their statesmanship, this market of 85,000,000 people that would be more valuable than any market that could be secured anywhere else in the world. They were returned to power but did not make any effort to secure that market and apparently have no desire to secure it. Have they ever attempted to secure it except on the one occasion when they went to Washington, for which trip Canada paid

$35,000 or $40,000? They came home with their heads down and we never heard a word about it. They made no success of their efforts there and only demonstrated how unsuited they were for carrying on negotiations with any country in the world in the interests of Canada. The arrangement they made with England was one-sided and Canada sustained a great injury from it without deriving any benefit in return. They not only gave that preference to England, but by it lost the important market of Germany which was likely to be of much more value in the future than it had been up to that time. Yet they were warned. I remember Sir Charles Tupper, over and over again, warning the Finance Minister that as sure as they forced that through the House, they would get into trouble with Germany over the favoured-nation clause. They answered that there was no fear, they knew too much about it, they had ways of doing these things that Sir Charles did not know. Sir Charles said: We have considered that carefully and made sufficient inquiry in the past to satisfy ourselves that there is a danger of complications arising from these foreign treaties. He said that if we could have them terminated in a friendly way we would have been glad to do so, but if the Canadian government first entered into negotiations that would afterwards compel the denouncing of these treaties then they would be denounced in an unfriendly way and the result would be that when Canada wished to resume negotiations the country whose treaty had been denounced would not be prepared to treat with us on reasonable terms. Sir Charles Tupper did everything he could to persuade them to abandon the suicidal course they were pursuing. The preference was forced through, and in less than nine months it was brought home to them in a way they could not ignore. And what were they obliged to do? They were compelled to ask England to help them out. England denounced the treaty and Germany has been a commercial enemy ever since. Any effort made since then to negotiate a treaty has been a signal failure. Why? Because they had offended Germany when they need not have done so, and Canada to-day would be in possession of all the advantages she ever enjoyed in regard to German trade. Then they made a blunder when they put a surtax on German goods. I do not think they then took the right way to commence negotiations in a proper and conciliatory way with Germany, but of course they were in trouble and were seeking to get out of it by whistling to keep their courage up, and they were very brave. In connection with this treaty, there seem to be two or three dangers ahead of us. One is that we may come in conflict with the Americans in the change in their tariff under the Aldrich Bill. I agree with those who say that our first duty as a parliament in passing any law in this country, whether it be a tariff law or any other, is to have regard to the interests of Canada.

Let us act in the interests of Canada; let us act in the conciliatory spirit always, but let us not forget that it is the interest of our own country which should be our first concern. I remember very well that in 1887 when the Conservatives were in power the Liberals complained that we could not negotiate with our neighbours to the south because our tariff policy was irritating to them. To-day, however, these gentlemen on the government benches have changed their tune, and the Minister of Finance has told us that it was not the duty of Canada to wait and see what action the United States might take with reference to any question of Canadian policy. I agree with the Minister of Finance in that and I only mention the matter to show the inconsistency of his party. Now, it appears to me to be well worthy of our attention that there is a probability of our being able to negotiate with the mother country in the near future for inter-imperial preferential trade. The House of Lords will no doubt throw out the budget by a large majority so as to force the present government to appeal to the country, and I am very much mistaken if the people of England will not in the near future express their desire for a readjustment of the tariff so that the mother country may negotiate for inter-imperial preferential trade with her dominions beyond the seas. If we have a treaty of this kind on our hands we will be hampered and restricted in these negotiations, and therefore it is that I say there should be no hurry on our part in ratifying it. The more I study this treaty the more I am convinced that we will get no great advantage from it. In the past our cattle trade on the great western prairies was a thriving business, but, as has been recently reported by the veterinary inspector of the government the ranching business of the west has been declining for years, largely because of the difficulty in sending live cattle to the English market so far distant from the western prairies. The need of the hour is to establish abattoirs all over the west, so that we may export chilled meat to England, but neither the government nor the Minister of Agriculture has taken any action in that regard. Some years ago a commission was appointed to look into this question and an elaborate report was presented recommending that Canada should engage in this chilled meat trade, but the government paid no attention to the recommendation of that report. If by any accident our live cattle were shut out of the American market, and out of the British market as well,

then no market would be left for us and the ranching trade would be ruined and those interested in it bankrupted. The home market of Canada is not able to absorb the products of both the eastern and western provinces and hon. gentlemen can easily see what a calamity it would be if we could not export our live cattle. If we had abattoirs spread throughout the west and if we had steamship lines supplied with chilled meat chambers we might get some advantage from this French treaty, but until the government exert themselves to establish such a trade in Canada little benefit will come to us from this treaty. It would seem to me that the benefit of the treaty is all on the side of France, and while we cannot but admire the French statesmen for making the best bargain they could for their country, we must regret that our own representatives did not look to the interests of Canada in this bargain. I supported this treaty before, but in view of the changed conditions, if there is a vote called I shall now vote against it. I represent an agricultural constituency from which we ship a good many fat cattle and I thought that this treaty might be of some advantage to us, but now that there is no advantage given us in the export of cattle to the French market the treaty is of no benefit to us at all. Many of those interested in the cattle trade in my constituency have pointed out this to me and have stated that the treaty had better never be signed. There is nothing now in this treaty to induce me to support it, and I sincerely believe that Canada would be better off without it.

Mr. A. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I would not have spoken on this question were it not that the Board of Trade of Winnipeg have been giving it consideration, and it would seem that the opinion of that influential body of business men is that although we want our commercial relations extended in every legitimate direction yet there is a very grave question as to whether the beneficial results of this French treaty will be worth the effort and trouble bestowed on it. France is a country which grows practically all her own food stuffs and in that respect she is very unlike her neighbour Germany which is a large importer of just such natural products as we have to export. Germany has a population of 62,000,000; she imports about one billion dollars worth of food stuffs a year, and of that Canada supplies practically not one dollar's worth. Germany imports $56,000,000 worth of horses in a year and Canada does not send a horse. Germany imports $216,000,000 worth of grain in a year and Canada supplies the merest fraction of that. If then we cannot get back this trade without forfeiting our own national self-respect, there is an end of it. But the people are not thinking in that direction; they are beginning to look in another direction. The city of Winnipeg has a fairly active Board of Trade. Many of the officers of that board are known personally to the members of this government. On the 28th of October last, at a meeting of that board, reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of the 29th of October, I find that a resolution was moved by Mr. James H. Ashdown and seconded by Mr. F. W. Drewry, two of the most prominent members of that organization, and both engaged in trade in a very large way, as they have been for the last third of a century. Mr. Ashdown is a very strong supporter of this government, while Mr. Drewry is a good consistent Conservative. The report as given in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' is in these words:

The matter of Canadian trade with Germany, both import and export, was discussed by the meeting, which unanimously adopted the following resolution, moved by J. H. Ashdown and F. W. Drewry.

Whereas, in consequence of the late tariff legislation of the United States, there is a probability of increased restrictions being placed upon our trade with that country, and

Whereas, the increase in population, products and known resources of the Dominion of Canada is so large, and so rapidly increasing, that it is especially desirable that our trade relations should be extended as far as possible, and kept upon the most friendly basis, and

Whereas, the German government, forgetting our right to deal as we saw fit with our mother country, did impose an extra charge on goods from Canada, and as a consequence a surtax was placed on German goods entering this country, and it is advisable that the unfriendly relations brought about by these actions should cease;

Therefore, be it resolved, that this board would urge on the Dominion government the advisability of meeting in the most friendly spirit any advances made by the government of Germany looking toward again placing the trade relations of the two countries on a mutually satisfactory and friendly basis.

If the same efforts were expended in that direction, without any derogation to the honour or the self-respect of this country, I think the results would be much better than we are likely to obtain from the treaty which has been the subject of discussion in this House this afternoon.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, in speaking of the ratification of the French treaty it is not my intention to make any extended remarks, as the ground has been pretty thoroughly covered already by men more competent to deal with the subject than I can pretend to be. But as I had not an opportunity of voting on this question when it came up two years ago, and as I represent a rural constituency, I think it only right that I should express my views on this occasion. I have listened with a great deal of interest

to the addresses which have been given on this subject by gentlemen on both sides of the House. I was very much impressed the other day with some remarks about the necessity of Canada maintaining her dignity in her international relations, and not submitting to anything of the nature of dictation from the United States or any other foreign country. With that sentiment I am entirely in accord. In regulating our trade relations with other nations we should be governed solely by business considerations in the interest of Canada. I was especially struck with a remark made by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to the effect that we should maintain the dignity of Canada in such matters. But I could not help contrasting the present attitude of that hon. gentleman with his attitude previous to this government coming into power, when his motto was free trade as they have it in England or unrestricted reciprocity, or anything or everything that would enable him to get into power, and he was ready to cast the dignity of Canada to the winds. I congratulate him on the different attitude he assumes to-day. Since he got a seat on the treasury benches, a change has come over the spirit of his dream, and he has been acquiring a little of that dignity as a Canadian that he should have had years ago. There is a phase of this trade question which has not yet been touched upon, and to which I wish briefly to allude. Reference has been made by speakers on this side of the House to our trade with other countries. It is absolutely necessary that the people of Canada should look about for other markets for the products which this country is bound to produce in the years to come. But while we are seeking markets in France, Germany or any other country, to which I have no objection, I contend that we should consider the best market of all, that is, the home market; and in this respect I claim that the present administration has not shown either dignity or good sound common sense. Is it good sound common sense, for instance, for us to allow the Americans to bring their hay into Canada by paying a duty of $2 a ton, while they charge us $4 a ton on all the hay we send over there? Is it consistent with our dignity as a people that we should permit American bacon to come into Canada to the extent of over 7,000,000 pounds at a duty of 2 cents per pound while they charge us a duty of 5 cents per pound on our bacon? Is it consistent with our position as a nation to permit them to export to this country potatoes, barley, oats, peas, beans, wheat and other products at less duty than they charge us on similar products? Is it good common sense for us to subsidize steamship lines which traverse the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and hunt up foreign markets while we allow American products to come in at an advantage although by their tariff they shut out our farm products? I protest against that jug handle policy. If the government would impose duties on American agricultural products equivalent to those imposed by the United States on our products, they would be doing more for the farmers of the Dominion than they could possibly do by five hundred French treaties.

Surprise has been expressed at the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) with reference to our cattle going into France. I am sure there is not a member in this House who will not agree with me that, under the restrictions imposed by that treaty, not one head of Canadian cattle will ever enter the French market. Not one cattle dealer here would undertake to export cattle to France under the restrictions imposed by the French treaty. I am not surprised, however, at the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture because he has already stated in this House that the farmers of the Dominion are a slipshod set of people, that they are indifferent, that they lack industry and enterprise. That statement was made by him last session, as will be found on reference to page 2030 of the 'Hansard,' March 3 last.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman read the words he says are in 'Hansard?'

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly, I am most happy to oblige my hon. friend. On the 3rd of March last in this House the hon. minister said, speaking of the farmers of Canada and of their failure to take advantage of the work of the Department of Agriculture:

> If they would make use of one-tenth of it and carry one hundredth part of it into their every day operations, the result would amount to tens of millions of dollars more from agricultural produce than there is to-day.

Then he went on to say, and I presume this is what my hon. friend is so anxious to hear:

> It is the farmers' slipshod methods in this country which is the limit of our agricultural production.

I want to enter my emphatic protest against that statement. I protest against it as an insult to the farmer. I have given the reason why our farmers are not making greater progress. That is due to the fact that the duties we impose on American farm produce militates against the farmers of our own country and in favour of the farmers of the United States. The hon, minister said further:

> We are fortunate in Canada in having established a reputation in the world's market for a fine quality of agricultural products.

A very strange remark in view of the hon. minister's statement that our farmers are a slipshod sort of people.

And to-day the great market of Great Britain and Ireland is reaching out and demanding more of our finished agricultural products than we are sending to it, and the prices we get for those articles which we do send are such as to give the farmers of this country who raise the goods and export them splendid results, and the only pity is that the farmers are not doubling and quadrupling their exports every year. If they do not do it, it is not for lack of teaching or for lack of knowledge; it is for their lack of interest in their work, their lack of industry and largely, I believe, for the lack of that labour which is necessary in the carrying on of our farming operations.

If that is not a straight accusation hurled by the Minister of Agriculture, the man who is specially supposed to have the interests of agriculture in this country at heart—if that is not a straight charge by him that the farmers of Canada are a slipshod, lazy set of people, I do not understand the English language.

We have had a statement made here by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) as regards the effect that the carrying out of this treaty would have on the industry in which he is interested and which is one of the most important in this country. That industry benefits the farmers of this country, and I am prepared to accept the statement made by the hon. gentleman that it will be seriously damaged if this treaty is ratified.

Other statements have been made by other members. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) has expressed the opinion that the treaty will injuriously affect the farmers in the Niagara district. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) has clearly pointed out that it will have a bad effect on the cattle industry of the west.

I am just going to make one statement further as to why I think this treaty should not be concluded at present. I am not going to say that we should not have a treaty with France. On the contrary I would hold up both hands for such a treaty as would increase the trade and prosperity of Canada. But the treaty now before us was brought up two years ago. Is it not true that the French Republic has taken ample time to consider how it affects their interests? No one will find fault with the French government for that. As business men they have given the matter very careful consideration. They have cut here and carved there and made the treaty to suit themselves, and in so doing they exercised their right as business men. But if they have taken ample time to consider the treaty from their standpoint, what harm will result from our taking a few months to consider it? There is undoubtedly a spirit of unrest in England regarding tariff matters. I cannot predict what will take place there, but some change is likely in the course of the next few months, and I think it will be in our interest to wait a few months before ratifying this agreement. We ought to wait, because I believe that if we ratify the treaty now we shall pave the way for difficulties with regard to our trade with other countries which may result in very serious disadvantages to this country in time to come.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). As one of the farmers of this Dominion, I would like to say that I do not think we are going to suffer at all through our cattle trade not going to France. I am sure my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) will agree with me, because some of his own friends along with myself did try shipping cattle to France, and I only wish there had been some law against it ten or twenty years ago, for if there had, we would be all richer men to-day. It is impossible to ship cattle to France with any advantage to the shippers. I was struck, however, with the very unpatriotic speech made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It is quite unusual for him to be pandering to the United States as against the British empire. I could hardly believe my ears when I heard his utterances. Judging by his remarks, I can only come to the conclusion that he would prefer to have free trade with the United States rather than a preference for England. We certainly had one of the most unpatriotic speeches from that hon. gentleman that I have ever heard of anywhere, except some utterances at Lachine, in the riding of Jacques Cartier, a few nights ago.

With regard to the shipping of dressed meat our friend complains that there are no abattoirs. I can tell the hon. gentleman —and I am sure the hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) will back me up —that one of the best abattoirs in America is established in the city of Winnipeg and is under the management of good friends of his, Messrs. Gordon, Ironside & Fares. But the shipping of dressed beef from this country to Europe will not be a success owing to the climatic conditions and the short season.

Mr. SPROULE. How comes it, then, that this trade has been made a great success in shipping from Chicago practically along the same lines of communication?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows as well as I do about the cattle trade of this country——

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member answer my question?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I was going to. The reason is that their climate is so different from ours. They can ship cattle all the year round and you cannot do that from Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Why?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Because of climatic conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. If the cattle were killed and the dressed meat shipped in cold storage, could not that be done?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I am advocating.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. But we have tried it for years and the hon. member knows that it has never been a success.

Mr. SPROULE. Because we never had suitable cold storage.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. We have had cold storage, and, as I have said, one of the best abattoirs in America is in Winnipeg. I do not wish to discuss the question further than to say that we never can ship cattle from this country to France. With regard to our shipments to England, they are hampered by the embargo, the only excuse for maintaining which, is to shut out disease from that country. But if the cattle are diseased they will be shut out of France as well as out of England. And while I am on that point I may say that it is about time that England should remove that embargo. There is no disease in this country, and never will be so long as there are the checks upon the importation of cattle that exist at present.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. member, if we cannot ship cattle to France, why was France so anxious to prevent it under this treaty? Was not she trying to protect herself?

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion on the ratification of this treaty, and I think all who have listened to it will agree that the discussion has been exhaustive and very moderate and reasonable in tone. It seems to me that commercial arrangements of this kind need to be carefully examined. There is always something to be said pro and con. And I do not think that any one can complain of what has been said in this discussion. I do not wish to speak at length. I supported the treaty as it came before us originally, and voted for it—differing from my right hon. friend the prime minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, when we endeavoured to establish trade relations with France, marshalled all his forces against the treaty of 1893 and voted and spoke against it. What is the change we have to ratify to-day? It relates to cattle. I take the statement of my hon. friend from St. Lawernce, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike)—who, it seems to me, has not said all with regard to myself that he would liked to have said—I take his statement as that of a man of large experience in this particular line of trade. He said we could never do any cattle trade with France, and I cordially agree with him. In fact, it seemed to me, when this treaty first came before us, that its importance was very much exaggerated. It is, I am sure, a treaty of small importance, viewed in itself, and outside of all surrounding circumstances. It will not give us any great advantage, nor do I think it will give any great advantage to France. I do not believe it will interfere with the vine growers or wine makers of this country to any appreciable degree; and, with regard to the manufacturers in certain lines where we can give some advantage to France, as perfumes, scented soap, &c., I do not think the competition of France will have any lasting effect upon our industries. It is a harmless treaty, and it has been unduly magnified. When the treaty first came before us I had the misfortune to be misunderstood by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fieldnig). I was not opposed to the negotiation or to the agreement founded on those negotiations; but I wanted, in the interest of all, to reduce the treaty to its real value, to what it really was. Because what had been done in France was grossly exaggerated with a view to deceiving the people as to the effect. At that time, I mentioned the gorgeously expensive reception of welcome which was tendered to our Lord High Admiral—I mean the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). The whole of our fleet, such as it was then, was marshalled out to go down the river and meet my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur)—for I must say that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who had, I believe, a clearer notion of what had been done, abstained from taking part in that deceptive demonstration. Well, they went down. All our boats were out; there were refreshments galore, and fireworks and a great display. I turned out with the others to see the fireworks, and I have always questioned since who paid for that large display. Not the French government, not any individual or body that I know of. I assume that the expenditure, which was very considerable and quite unjustifiable, had been paid by the country. And for what reason? The alleged reason was that this was a great boon obtained by our plenipotentiaries for the agricultural classes; and further that we had affirmed before

the whole world that Canada alone, with no intervention, with no assistance, for the first time since its discovery had negotiated its own treaty. That demonstration was organized by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) for purposes of his own, and I believe that nobody was more surprised than the admiral himself when he became the recipient of all this upon his arrival in the St. Lawrence river. I endeavoured to reduce the thing to its true expression; there was no boon whatever for the agricultural classes; there was nothing in it—cannot be any thing in any treaty that we conclude with France. France is an immensely wealthy country, and agriculturally is the greatest country in the world. It requires no food products from other countries. France exports its agricultural products to England, to Italy, to Germany. It always has a superfluity of grain, it has wheat in abundance. I was surprised to hear this morning that we had sent some wheat to France.

An hon. MEMBER. Seed wheat.

Mr. MONK. Probably, because France exports wheat and always has, and it is the policy of France to keep immense stores of wheat in the country. Therefore, anybody who knew anything about France was surprised to hear the affirmation repeatedly made in the paper under the direction of my right hon. friend, that this treaty was going to make all the agriculturists of Canada rich. Particularly it was stated in 'Le Canada,' my right hon. friend's personal organ in Montreal, that in future we were going to export all our fat cattle to France and feed the French, they were going to eat nothing else but Canadian cattle. Then suddenly this difficulty arose in France, and the last hope that we might do something in the way of fat cattle had to be abandoned when the French public became alarmed and said they did not want to have our fat cattle there, and that item was struck out. The Minister of Finance has stated that the difficulty which occurred in France was in reference to fat cattle. He may be right, I do not think that is the whole story of the difficulty, as I understand it. What they discovered in the French Senate, when they discussed this treaty, was that we had handed them a gold brick when we offered them advantages which were not conceded to other countries. because they found out that not only Switzerland but twenty other countries had the same advantages. This led to further negotiations—that is what I understand—and finally we gave up the hope of exporting fat cattle, because it was discovered that we wanted to hand them a gold brick, and the fat cattle clause was struck out.

I say again that there is nothing of a serious character in this treaty. My hon. friend from Quebec County (Mr. Turcotte) gave up the agricultural boon that was to come to our province. I understood him to admit that from an agricultural standpoint there was nothing in this treaty that ever could be of advantage to Canada. He fell back on the advantages we might have in getting books from France. Certainly if this treaty was to open to us the admirable literature of France, I would hail it with great satisfaction. But as a matter of fact, it only comes to this, that those who wish for French books, which are very expensive, may have to pay some ten cents less for them. Although that is an advantage, I do not think it can seriously affect our trade in French books. If I thought the treaty would have that effect, that alone should commend it to us. We must not forget that the effect of these negotiations is to bring us into closer relations with France, which I consider, is a very great advantage. It will enable us to have here that in which the French excel, namely, the production of articles de luxe, of artistic industrialism, if I may use that expression, which cannot but be of great advantage to us, and which we cannot get from any other country. From the artistic point of view I think it is an advantage. Otherwise it seems to me, viewing the treaty in itself, it is of such a harmless character that we might accept it without much demur.

Very different, I must confess, would be the prospect of a treaty with Germany. There is no doubt in my mind that we can do a very large trade with Germany, for the very reasons that we cannot do that trade with France. Germany is a much poorer country, and has a much larger population. Agriculturally it is very poor, and it is certain that we would do an immense business with Germany if the unfortunate conditions existing at present could be eliminated. But with respect to France those very circumstances reversed become difficulties and objections, and I think that anybody who looks carefully at this treaty will see that there is not much element of harm in the treaty itself. I do not think we will do much trade with France in the way of agricultural implements. We may possibly do something in lumber and wood, but that is very doubtful. In the first place, France herself is abundantly supplied with wood, because it has an excellent forestry system, far superior to our own, and one which must ensure that rich country being well supplied with wood perpetually. She imports wood and lumber from the Black Sea, from Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Russia, and it is very improbable that we can compete with those countries in respect of wood. The only trade which I think we may ultimately develop with France is in

pulp; such a trade would be advantageous to ourselves if it could be developed. They use a great deal of pulp in France. It must be prepared in a special manner, and if we prepared pulp as they use it, we would possibly develop a trade with France in that article. It has been well said in regard to all treaties that very often they do not produce the effect they are expected to produce, while on the other hand they sometimes develop unforeseen and unexpected sources of interchange of products.

Now, Sir, I have heard it said several times this afternoon that sentiment has nothing to do with arrangements of this kind with other countries. I do not agree with that. I think sentiment has very much to do with commercial treaties, always has had, and I think properly so. We have not concluded a treaty, but we have established a tariff specially favourable to Great Britain, giving her a special favour, for which we receive nothing in return. It is a matter of sentiment. For my own part, I thought at the time, and have always expressed the view, that we were going very far. The results have demonstrated that those who raised that objection were right. Among the consequences has been the fact that our woollen industries have suffered immensely. In one or two instances our agricultural interests have been greatly affected in consequence. Take the pickle industry, because that touches the city of Montreal; the pickle industry, which was assuming very large proportions in Montreal, has been completely killed by the preferential tariff, and the agricultural population of my county and of the neighbouring counties has suffered extremely in consequence. The Ozon Manufactory, which cost the late Mr. Carsley over $250,000, and the adioining factory of great importance which manufactured boxes exclusively for the pickle industry, have both ceased to operate, and that particular industry which benefited manufacturers and agriculturalists has been ruined, at any rate in my part of the country. So this preferential tariff is a matter of sentiment, there is no doubt about that. The Minister of Finance says that we introduced this preferential tariff in order to favour the mother country. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Minister of Finance, when introducing it, stated in answer to a question from this side of the House, that this preferential tariff was open to the whole world. We all remember, I remember, although it is very long ago, our minister at that time, Sir Louis Davies, pretending that the variest tyro in legal matters, the first year law student, knew perfectly well that it could not affect in any way our relations with Germany or Belgium. The result showed that these gentlemen were absolutely mistaken and the treaties had to be denounced. In this particular case, viewing the treaty in itself, as I and many others outside of this House do as very unimportant in its results, there is the question of sentiment to be considered. France, one of the most powerful nations in Europe, after being separated from England for centuries by continuous strife has been brought by the stress of political events in Europe very close to England. They are allies, and in the conflict which must take place some day, they will be side by side. What has followed? The interchange of the most agreeable relations between the two countries, boards of trade from France visiting England and being received sumptuously, the aldermen of London visiting the French capital and there being received in the same manner. The relations are most agreeable and with respect to ourselves, if my view of the treaty is the correct one, and it involves no serious consequences, I think it would be a regrettable circumstance, from a sentimental point of view, to see us at this moment retroceding from the treaty because the element of fatted cattle has been removed from it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. It interests a large section of our population, who, from a sentimental standpoint, look with very natural favour on the renewal of our relations with that ancient country from which many of them sprang. An endeavour made in that connection to renew relations, if not absolutely detrimental to us cannot but be conducive to the very best results in every way. I think that is a consideration that might very properly have some weight with this parliament and this country in accepting the treaty in which, as I said before, I do not for my part see any very great possible injury to this country.

I said that the treaty in itself seemed to me to be unimportant. We cannot, as long as France remains a protectionist country and we a protectionist country situated as we are now, develop any very great commercial relations with that country. I do not believe that is possible. Allusion has been made here to the possibility of this treaty creating complications for ourselves in reference to our relation to other countries, and I must say for my own part that the Minister of Finance has seemed to me to be strangely lacking in not placing earlier before the House all the information possible concerning the different countries with which, as a consequence of this treaty, we place on the same favourable terms of commercial relationship. We have no information at all in respect to that and in respect also to the effect of the treaty in regard to our relations with the United States. It seems to me that we were en-

titled to fuller information upon that point. I asked the Minister of Finance very innocently the other day if he had taken the trouble to inquire as to the effects of this treaty in regard to our relations with the United States. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had not and would not. That seems to me to be a very faulty disposition on the part of the one who is engineering this treaty through the House, and I think it was a proper question to ask. Although I have been severely criticised outside the House for having asked that question, I say it was a pertinent question and one from which it could not be concluded that I was anxious to make our own dealings subservient to the dictates of any other country, and I maintain that position. The responsibility for this treaty rests with this government. Scanty or not as has been the information given us on that point, the responsibility under the circumstances of this treaty rests with this government and they cannot escape it, if evil consequences ensue on points on which we have been deprived of necessary information, easily obtainable.

I am led to state that it seems to me we ought to negotiate treaties with all countries that have any need for our products and with which we can deal advantageously. We have immense natural resources, there are markets in which we could advantageously dispose of these resources and these negotiations which we conduct for the purpose of business and the development of the vast possibilities of our trade are useful to us. The discussion of this treaty in the French chamber has made known this country to better advantage in France than all the money we have spent on useless immigration agents in that country. I desire to point out to this House that under the present system these commercial negotiations are extremely difficult, and that it is time for us to think of so adjusting or amending our procedure in that regard as to make these negotiations less complicated. At present, if we see prospects of trade with a country we have to present our representations to the chief imperial officer, to the Governor General of this country. He in turn forwards those representations to the colonial office in London, which turns them over to the foreign secretary, who afterwards communicates with the foreign secretary of the country with which we desire to negotiate. That foreign secretary turns over our representations to the Minister of Commerce of that country and any answer that we receive must come back through the same circuitous channel. That is an extremely disadvantageous way in modern times for us to negotiate our treaties and it is a great surprise to me that my right hon. friend who has attended the imperial conferences in London has not seen fit to bring this great disadvantage to the knowledge of the imperial conferences in order that some serious effort might be made to render more easy negotiations which, subjected to that particular procedure, become almost impossible and fruitless. We should also think seriously of removing another great disability which is found in the favoured nations treaties which are in considerable number and interfere with the extension in a profitable sense of our commercial relations. That can be done without any undue friction. We must get rid of those treaties if we are to extend our commerce throughout the world as we are justified in thinking we can do.

With regard to the German treaty, I was surprised to hear the Minister of Finance say that every possible effort had been made to prevent in the first place and then to remedy the state of affairs that exists at the present time. I remember asking the right hon. gentleman myself if at the time of the negotiation of the Anglo-Belgian and Anglo-German treaties this government had done anything for the purpose of intervening in the negotiations which led up to the conclusion of the new treaties. My recollection is that the Minister of Finance stated that nothing had been done, and in that the government were greatly in fault. A new treaty was being negotiated and we should have been notified to take part in the negotiations, or, if we were not notified, the duty of the government at that moment was to intervene and endeavour to secure the protection of our interests in the proper manner at the proper time. But, my hon. friend told me that nothing had been done then. If any correspondence has taken place it should be laid on the table of the House. The Minister of Finance stated afterwards that every possible endeavour had since been made to remedy that state of affairs, and I understood him to say that he had negotiated with the German consul here and that representations had been made, and we should have that correspondence.

Mr. FIELDING. That has been in possession of the House for years.

Mr. MONK. It cannot have been before the House for years because these are events of recent date. I would be very glad to know if there is correspondence between the imperial authorities and this government at the time of the renewal of the German treaty, and if there is has it been laid on the table of the House. There is none. There were no representations made and it is in consequence of the awkward manner in which the Canadian government acted at that time that our commercial relations with Germany were broken off just in the same way as this government, blind-

ly, concluded a treaty with Japan which obliged us, despite three warnings from the imperial government, to go on our knees to Japan a short time afterwards and ask them for favours which they conceded in a lofty letter in which they reserved their right at any time they deemed it necessary to insist on the full execution of the treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not have taken part in this debate were it not for the character which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) endeavoured to give to this treaty. In his opening remarks he paid some attention to me and he stated that I had spoken and voted against the treaty of 1893. That is a statement which I could dispute but I will pass it with the observation that if I spoke and voted against the treaty of 1893 I had the merit, which after all is not a very high one, of consistency. I remember very well that on the treaty, not of 1893, but of 1907, my hon. friend spoke one way and voted the other way, and I will be very much surprised if, although he spoke against this treaty tonight, he will not end by voting in favour of it. The hon. gentleman tries to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, but that is his own business and the business of the electors of Jacques Cartier. The important statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was that this is a mere childish treaty, that there is no necessity for it at all, that it is of no consequence to Canada whatever, and he gives as his reason that France is such a rich country that she does not need to import agricultural products. The hon. gentleman told us that France produces enough wheat, butter, cheese and other such commodities to render her independent of importations from other nations. Is the hon. gentleman serious in that statement? Why, he has not even read the blue-book which has been put in his hands and which gives the statistics upon which this treaty was negotiated. If he looks at his blue-book he will find that France imported in the year mentioned here, wheat to the value of 186,666,000 francs, or more than $27,000,000. And yet, the hon. gentleman says that France does not need to import one single bushel of wheat. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, further, that France imported flour to the value of 5,887,000 francs. But that is not all. If the hon. gentleman looks at this blue-book he will find that France imported oats to the value of 50,000,000 francs, barley to the value of 26,000.000 francs, maize to the value of 51,000,000 francs and other grains to the value of 25,000,000 francs. Still more, France imported horses to the value of 11,000,000 francs and eggs to the value of 36,000,000 francs. Now, it is true that France is an exporter of cheese, but France only exports certain qualities and in one year she imported 48,000,000 francs worth of cheese. These are the real facts and not the fancies which my hon. friend has given to the House. These are the facts which induced us to negotiate a treaty and to try to obtain some advantage in the French market for the products of Canada. Then, the hon. gentleman told us that France would not take our lumber because she has large forests of her own and a most admirable system of forest preservation. That is true, and in the preservation of her forests France is teaching us a lesson which I hope we shall soon learn. But though France takes good care of her forests and has large timber areas, France is a large importer of wood. If my hon. friend looks at the statistics in this blue-book he will find that France has imported:

Woods, common:

Logs, round, not squared with or without the bark, of any length and of a circumference at the thickest end of not more than 60 centimeters, 3,218,225 francs.

Wood, sawn or squared, 80 millimeters in thickness and above 10, 156,375 francs.

Wood, squared or sawn, less than 80 millimeters and exceeding 35 millimeters in thickness, 59,447,765 francs.

Wood, sawn 35 millimeters in thickness or less, 46,502,530 francs.

Stave wood, 26,461,770 francs.

In all, France imported about 200,000,000 francs worth of wood and yet the hon. gentleman says that the market of France is of no advantage to us.

Mr. MONK. I did not say that France did not import wood; I said that she imported wood from the Black Sea, from Russia and other countries, but I said that I did not think we could send her any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, if France imports wood from the Black sea there is no reason why France cannot import wood from Canada, and if we have an advantage in the markets of France then I think the French people will buy their wood from Canada rather than from the Black sea. It is because France now imports her timber from the Black sea that, having the benefit of the minimum tariff, we will send her wood from Canada. Then, my hon. friend stated that he had no confidence that in agricultural implements we could make any impression on the French market or that we would have any advantage at all from this treaty. That is not the opinion of the manufacturers of agricultural implements. On the contrary they have been pressing for the ratification of this treaty, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture did not exaggerate this afternoon when he said that we had a good hope of capturing that market. Sir, this is a most important treaty. My hon. friend is convinced of it, so much so that

I am pretty sure that I shall not be a false prophet when I say that although he has damned it with faint praise, he will end by supporting it with his vote. I have but one word to say to my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). He appeals for improved trade relations with Germany. I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that for my part I am not satisfied with our relations with Germany; they are not natural or what they ought to be. But the fault is not ours. We have been compelled by the action of Germany to defend our own position, and we have succeeded. My hon. friend has told us that German agents are very anxious to open negotiations with us. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has stated that as soon as we have disposed of the present treaty we shall be prepared to consider the other treaties. But let me warn my hon. friend that if we make a treaty with Germany, he will have difficulty, not with this side of the House, but with the other side. His own leader has told us that he has agreed to the ratification of this treaty simply because there is a provision in it that it can be terminated at any time on twelve months notice. If it were made for ten years, he would not vote for it, because later on it might complicate our relations with Great Britain. Therefore if the hon. leader of the opposition and those who support him vote for the ratification of this treaty because it can be terminated at any time, my hon. friend from East Lambton will have some difficulty in persuading his own friends to support a treaty with Germany. In my opinion, we should endeavour to push our commercial relations in every part of the world. We have opened our doors as widely as possible to British trade in the hope that at some time or other we shall have preferential treatment in the British market. But, Sir, I shall not complicate this matter. It is possible to have preferential arrangements with Great Britain without injuring our relations with other countries.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on this question, but I wish to utter my protest against some reflections which have been made on the opposition side of the House in regard to the agricultural interests of this country. Some hon. gentlemen have sought to convey the idea that the farmers of this country are not in a prosperous condition, and that this government has not been doing what is in their interest. I wish to dissent from that. We know that the cattle industry of this country has developed at a marvellous rate in the last few years, owing largely to the way in which this government has fostered the English market, and we know that to-day cattle are bringing a better price than they ever did before in the history of western Canada. Indeed, never in the history of Canada have the farmers obtained such high prices as they are getting at the present time for all their products, whether beef, pork, butter, cheese, eggs or any other product. A few years ago, when this government entered into a preferential trade arrangement with England, the opposition criticised them on the ground that they were not getting any preference from Great Britain in return. But what did we find? Immediately after that preference went into operation, the British people bought very largely of our agricultural products and paid for them a higher price, and they found that our goods were worthy of a better position on their market than they had hitherto obtained. The more they bought, the better they appreciated what we sent to them, so that our exports to England doubled in value in a few years after 1897, when the preferential arrangement with Great Britain was entered into.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. To what other country can we send our agricultural products at the present time?

Mr. SCHELL. We send some to the United States; but so long as we have captured the British market, which is the best market in the world, and are maintaining a position of supremacy there against all competitors with the exception perhaps of Denmark in one or two particulars, we need not worry about our trade with other countries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the hon. gentleman tell us whether we are getting in the British market any better terms than any other country in the world? Are we not all on the same footing?

Mr. SCHELL. That is quite true. We have no tariff arrangements in our favour, but we have the sentimental benefit upon which considerable stress was laid by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) a few moments ago in regard to the French treaty. There is in our favour the power of English sentiment and the appreciation of a people who are willing to trade. And that brings out another thought in connection with this treaty with France. It opens up a larger field and a wider opportunity for the Dominion of Canada in the matter of making treaties with other countries. There is something even broader and more important than the effect of this treaty on our trade with France. I believe that it will make Germany desirous of negotiating with Canada a treaty by which our trade relations may be improved, and I want, not merely as a representative of an agricultural constituency, although representing as rich an agricultural county as there is in the Dominion of Canada, but as

a Canadian, speaking from a broader standpoint, to express my appreciation of the treaty that has been negotiated with France. I speak as a representative of manufacturing industries, of which we have a considerable number in the county of Oxford. I know that there is a large industry in Ingersoll that is very anxious to have this treaty ratified in order that it may obtain the advantages that will come to it as a manufacturer of agricultural implements. This will give that industry the advantage of some $6 or $7 per machine exported to France as compared with the American manufacturers. And we know that the trade in agricultural implements now amounts to $800,000 practically per year in round figures. Under this treaty there is reasonable prospect of that trade being more than doubled in the very near future unless possibly arrangements be made by which the United States may obtain entrance into that market on a somewhat similar basis.

I am surprised at the attempts which have been made to belittle our preferential trade with Great Britain and at the efforts of several speakers opposite to show that we should cultivate the United States market instead of the British and other foreign markets. Why, the English market is certainly the best in the world, and we obtain the benefit of it as already intimated. And in connection with the French treaty, I believe that we shall also obtain from it a benefit even greater than appears on the surface in the matter of concessions to us on the exports we may send to that country, besides the better feeling which will prevail and the advantages given to us of buying cheaper the French goods which we require. If there is something we want to buy and we can buy it more cheaply, that is quite as much advantage to us as getting better prices for the goods we sell. Several hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the danger of our getting French goods into the country. Sir, I consider it an advantage to buy cheaply something I want, and I look upon that treaty as advantageous which will enable us to buy cheaper the goods we require and give us better prices for the goods we sell. The government are to be congratulated on this arrangement and the people of this Dominion will appreciate, and appreciate thoroughly, this treaty which has been negotiated with France and which I believe will be ratified by this parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly to say that there never was a time in the history of Canada when the cattle trade was growing so much as of late years and the farmers getting such good returns?

Mr. SCHELL. I said that the prices of western cattle were never better than today.

Mr. SPROULE. How then does the hon. gentleman account for this fact that whereas in 1896 we shipped out to England and all foreign countries 211,000 head, in 1908 we only shipped 150,000; and that whereas in 1901 we got $1,500,000 for what we shipped out, last year we only got $1,300,000?

Mr. SCHELL. I would say that the mortality which took place among cattle in the western states three years ago, owing to the very severe winter, materially reduced their shipments.

Mr. SPROULE. These were not shipped from the western states but from Canada.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). Possibly I would not have arisen to say anything had it not been for the somewhat extraordinary statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I was surprised to hear repeated, perhaps for the hundredth time, that worn out argument that we got a preference from Great Britain for the preference we gave, and the statement in support of that argument that we were shipping a larger amount of produce than ever before to Great Britain. Why, we produce more. Look at our great Northwest with its many million bushels of wheat going out and increasing year by year, how would it be possible that our exports to Great Britain should not increase? We are producing more cheese and more pork, how then would it be possible that our exports would not increase. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about sentiment. Did you ever see an Englishman who would give you more money for an article or buy it simply out of pure love. I take an Englishman to be a man of business. They do not do business over there for the fun of it, but on business principles and I admire them for that. An Englishman gets all he can out of the preferential tariff. He knows that we cannot buy a yard of linen in this country outside of Great Britain unless we pay a duty of thirty per cent, or five per cent higher than it was before the preferential tariff was introduced. Do you mean to tell me that the Englishman would not increase his price by about four per cent or five per cent to the Canadian purchaser? Where is the sentiment? All on the side of the Englishman. Well, the sentiment he has is for his own pocket.

An hon. MEMBER. Or the Scotchman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, just the same as the Englishman. Instead of saying the Englishman, I should have said the people of Great Britain. Do you mean to say that

under the preferential tariff, the manufacturer of Great Britain or the exporter does not charge the people of this country more for the goods we buy than he did before. I have before me a document which to my mind proves the whole question. We have heard a great deal about the increase in the cost of living in this country. What was it brought about that increase? Why, we had to come to the rescue last year of our civil servants and grant them increased salaries because of the enormous increase in the cost of living. I was not surprised at these men asking for an increase of salary. The policy of this country has compelled them to pay more for what they require. Here is a table prepared by the officers of this government. There can be no disputing it. At any rate I am not going to dispute it. Let me give a few examples from that table to show the actual increase in the cost of living. And where does that increase come from, if not from this double tariff which we have? I know I shall be charged with disloyalty if I say one word against the British preference, and consequently I am not going to speak along that line, but I do say that I am not one of those who approve of a double tariff. I do not approve of a double French tariff or a double tariff with Switzerland or Japan or any other country. I do not approve of one tariff to fix the amount of money that shall go into the treasury and another to fix the price of the goods which the purchaser shall pay. That is what we have under the British preference. The minimum or preferential tariff simply declares how much should go into the treasury of this country on goods imported into Canada. But the general tariff fixes the prices of those goods to the consumer; no doubt about that. The British manufacturer knows how much to charge for his linen goods, for instance, for he knows we cannot buy from the United States or any other country except Britain unless we pay the highest tariff. The same applies to cotton and any other classes of goods. And we have the evidence of this in the statement. I would not like to detain the House at this time by reading a very large number of items, but I will give hon. members some illustration of how the cost of living in this country is increased and how this increase has been brought about under the double tariff which has existed for some twelve years:

Article.	Increase.
Shirtings	27 per cent.
Sheetings	45 "
Factory cotton	60 "
Prints (crums)	25 "
Muslins	25 "
Denims	25 "
Ticking	36 "
Cashmeres	20 "
Linen (brown holland)	20 "
Table linens	33⅓ "
Towellings	25 "

I might go on by the hour enumerating these increases that have all taken place under the preferential tariff. If under the double tariff that we have had the result is what I have pointed out, what is going to be the consequence of the double tariff that we are to bring into force between Canada on the one side, and France, Switzerland and fifteen or twenty other countries on the other?

Now, I wish to refer for a moment to the remarks of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Seldom indeed do I attempt to criticise what that right hon. gentleman has said. Nor do I seek to criticise now, but merely to make reference to it, and point out something that the right hon. gentleman neglected to give to the House, when he spoke of the large agricultural imports of France and the opportunity that would be afforded to Canada under this new treaty. How are we going to increase our exports to France under this treaty? No preference is given to our farmers under it. On wheat we do not get the minimum tariff; on wheat flour there is only the general tariff, not the minimum; on oats, whether grain or meal, there is only the general tariff; on barley, grain or meal, the general tariff is charged just as in the case of this grain from any other country. In the case of rye, both grain and meal, maize, both grain and meal, buckwheat, both grain and meal, malt and beans, the same is true. Chick peas are admitted free into France in any case. And in other grains we have only the French general tariff. How can we expect to increase our exportations to the French market when we are subjected to the same duty that every other country has to pay? I fail to see how the right hon. gentleman made any point on the exportation of grain to France under this treaty. After this treaty is ratified, we shall stand in exactly the same position as to-day, unless my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell) will induce the people of the French republic to become very sentimental and pay more for our grain than they pay for grain from any other country. A good deal has been said about the cattle trade, and I do not think I can add much to the discussion of that subject. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) speak as he did. I always listen with respect to the hon. gentleman's discussion of these questions, because I know that he is deeply interested and well informed with regard to such matters. Cattle will be imported into France under this treaty at $3.86 per 220 lbs., the maximum being $5.97 per 220 lbs. But we do not get the benefit of this lower duty of $3.86. The very cattle we want to send to France are to be excluded, and the treaty, so far as the cattle trade

is concerned, will be of no advantage to us whatever. And why should we wish to send our stocker cattle to France to be manufactured into beef? We have abundance of coarse grains for feed and every opportunity to finish these cattle for the market. Reference is made to the fact that it is not left with us to say when an animal is fat or when it is lean. The Canadian shipper sends a cargo of cattle to France as lean cattle, and as such to come under the minimum tariff of this treaty. It is the Minister of Agriculture in France that determines the class of cattle, and if he says they are fat or they are lean, that will fix the rate of duty to be paid. We give away the whole thing. An hon. gentleman just reminds me that after the cattle get there the French Minister of Agriculture determines their class, when there will be no alternative but to accept the terms the French government would impose. Now, whilst they have been very careful to cut out of the treaty of last year—for which I voted—but having cut out that clause this year I shall vote against it. I have no hesitation in doing that. I am the farmers' friend, and anything that savours of unfair dealing with the farmers of this country I am going to oppose. I take that stand without fear and without hesitation. I would not be justified in committing an act such as that against the farmers of this country.

Agricultural machinery, we are told, will be exported very largely to France. How extremely kind our friends are to the manufacturers of this country, extremely kind—the men from whom they draw their support in election times, the agricultural implement men who keep them in power; how extremely kind they are to them. They say: Never mind the farmers, they can send their lean cattle to France the people of France don't want their fat cattle; never mind, we will strike that out. Did they strike out anything in connection with the agricultural implement industry? Not at all. But under this treaty they are to have a preference over and above other countries of forty per cent, a larger preference, almost one of the highest preferences that are granted in any case.

Now some hon. members have made reference to local matters, and I think I may be excused if I make a reference to a local matter by way of illustration. This question is so broad that any man might talk on it by the hour. I submit that this treaty has been very crudely prepared. I do not mean to cast any improper reflections upon the admiral and his coadjutors who helped him in France, but I do mean to say that they have not fully considered the whole question. By that I mean that when they give a special preference to a manufactured article they should at the same time have given a preference to the raw material of which that manufactured article is made. That would be fair play; and to reduce the duty on manufactured goods coming into this country from France and fail to reduce the duty on the raw material of which those goods are made, I say is unfair. I will take the case of gloves, manufactured largely in the town in which I live, and manufactured in other parts of the country. I am not speaking for the village of Acton alone; but my attention was drawn to that matter from the fact that I knew it was a very important industry. You will find the industry carried on in other places, in the province of Quebec and they will be affected in the same way. Now the duty on gloves from France to Canada, under this treaty, will be reduced 14 2-7 per cent, that is a very considerable reduction; and the manufacturer of gloves in this country who has hard work to compete at the present time, will find it a very difficult matter indeed to compete with other countries, with these 15 or 20 countries that are brought under the operation of this treaty after it has been ratified. I fear it may be very disastrous to some of those who are engaged in that industry. Now had the government given a similar reduction on the raw material of which those gloves are made, I would not have blamed them so much. I will take the article of glove leather. Glove leather, dressed, coloured or uncoloured, when imported by glove manufacturers for use exclusively in their own factories in the manufacture of gloves, the duty in the intermediate tariff is 7½ per cent, and in the general tariff it is 10 per cent. Do you believe, hon. gentlemen, that these men, in the interest of the people of this country, actually left that clause of the tariff entirely out? It has no place in the French treaty; consequently the raw material of the glove manufacturer—and mind you a great deal of it can be obtained in France, France is a glove country—they did not even offer to admit the raw material of which gloves are made into this country at a lower rate of duty, but they said to the people of France: Whilst we won't admit the raw material into this country, either from France, from Switzerland, or from any other of those 15 or 20 countries, we will admit the finished article. Is it fair? I do not think it is and I do not believe the Minister of Finance, strongly opposed as he is to protection—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—as he was years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is becoming a free trader, he has been complaining to-night of the duties.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I do not think the Finance Minister should blame me very much if I did turn a little along the

line of free trade. I do not think that I am advocating a free trade policy when I say that if you reduce the duty on a manufactured article you ought to reduce the duty on the raw material of which that article is made. That is not free trade, that is fair trade, but it does not seem to be part of the policy of this government. Fair trade is what the people of this country want. I will undertake to say that the glove manufacturer to whom I referred would not so seriously complain of the reduction in duty, of the advantage given to the French glove makers in the markets of this country, if he got a similar advantage in his raw material; the one would balance the other. But when you make it harder for the man in this country to carry on his trade, I think you ought at the same time to do something to help him carry on that trade.

Mr. FIELDING. We don't need a treaty to do that, the man can do it of his own motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the use of this French treaty if you can do it of your own motion? I will tell you how the hon. gentleman tried to do it last time the tariff was revised, he actually tried to put through this House a change in the tariff raising the duty on this raw material, this kid leather, from ten per cent to thirteen per cent. That is the way he would do it by Act of parliament. I remember well appealing to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, whom I always found fair; when I showed him the various samples of glove leathers and made my appeal to him, he saw the point, and came down, and said: Well, put it at ten per cent; and it is at ten per cent still, although in the first issue of the tariff of 1907 it was put at thirteen per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That only proves how fair we are.

Mr. HENDERSON. Fair when you couldn't help it, fair when you were found out. The hon. gentleman became fair when he saw there was no justice in what he was doing. He was found out. Had he not been found out and exposed, I have no doubt it would have been thirteen instead of ten per cent. Sometimes I am accused of being a high tariff man. I advocated a low tariff in that case and I felt justified in doing it. I believe in a low tariff when a low tariff is the best for this country, and when a high tariff is justified and in the best interests of the country I am prepared to support it. Reference has been made to the question of wines. I have the honour of representing a county that grows a very considerable quantity of grapes from which a very good quality of wine can be made. I feel that I would only be voting in the interests of my constituents by declaring that I do not want these French wines to come in at such a largely reduced rate.

Mr. SPROULE. In the interests of temperance as well.

Mr. HENDERSON. The question of temperance I need not put before the Minister of Finance, because he understands that thoroughly. I do not think it will make much difference as far as temperance is concerned, whether the wine pays 25 cents or 15 cents a gallon. I am not opposing it on that ground, but on the ground of fair trade, fair play. The people of those counties in the Niagara district and along the north shore of Lake Ontario have invested very largely in expensive lands. They have planted these small high-priced farms out with grapes and are producing an excellent quality of grape. These grapes are being manufactured into wine and I say it would be unfair to these people now, after they have made their investment, to bring about such an enormous reduction in the rate of duty on wines, so that this country would be invaded by the products of France while our farmers are getting nothing in return to compensate them.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite representing largely agricultural constituencies have said that they are bound to look at this question in a measure from the agriculturists' standpoint, and so, representing that very important class in the community, I have come to the conclusion that I should support this treaty in their interests. The Prime Minister has pointed out that many million dollars' worth of farm products are imported into France with which country we are making this treaty. The last speaker (Mr. Henderson) thought there was no force in that argument because he said we were not sending any in there.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. PATERSON. —and because of the duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, that part of it.

Mr. PATERSON. And because the duty was the same, there being no difference between the maximum and the minimum tariffs, therefore, to secure that for the farmers was of no value to him. He forgets this point, that that is a market into which the products of the farms of other countries find their way to the extent of millions of dollars, and the government in negotiating this treaty want to secure for the farmers of this country that they shall have access on the very best terms that that country gives to any other country for these millions of dollars worth of produce, that is to place them on a fair basis of competition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They had that before.

Mr. PATERSON. But they may change that at any minute, and on these millions of dollars' worth of farm products they may reduce their minimum tariff by treaty to another country which produces these farm products in competition with ours. What position would we be in then with this treaty in force? One of supreme ease because for every cent they take off the duty to any other country they have to take off a cent to our farmers. Is that nothing? That is where we are, that is the position we are in, and in the interests of our farmers, I think I would assume a great responsibility if I should lift my voice or give my vote against a treaty which secures to them that advantage. It is admitted that some of the manufacturers will derive very great material benefits. Have hon. gentlemen opposite discarded all their notions of a lifetime that I have heard advanced in this House, that if you can enlarge your manufacturing industries in this country you therefore enlarge the market for the farmers' products? Under a treaty that will give from $6 to $8 advantage to our agricultural manufacturers on a binder giving them the market of France, as against their American competitors, thus doubling the produce of our factories, according to the arguments I have heard advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite time after time, the farmer is benefited as it enlarges his home market. What he wants is men to work in the factories, to be consumers of his products. What do hon. gentlemen, speaking in the interests of farmers, propose when they suggest voting against this treaty? What does the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) say? He says: Do not legislate in that way, what does that amount to? What you want to do is, when the American charges you six cents on your butter, to raise your duty on butter from four cents to six cents and when he charges six cents on your cheese to raise your duty of three cents to six cents. That is the way he wants to benefit the farmer? What will that amount do? The American sends into Canada 473,805 pounds of butter in the course of the year, and this he says is ruining our farmers. What does it amount to? Multiply those pounds by 16, turn it into ounces and divide by seven millions, the number of people in Canada and it will be seen that the butter coming into Canada is one ounce for every man and woman and child in the country, enough to spread one slice of bread a year. That is the theory that we have set up against our policy of securing for the farmers of Canada the certainty that France, which imports millions of dollars worth of farm products, never can admit the products of any other country at a lower rate than ours. But then there is cheese. We import from the United States 231,811 pounds of cheese and we are going to save the farmer by raising the duty from 3 to 6 cents on cheese. Calculating as we did in the case of butter you will find that the Americans send into Canada about half an ounce of cheese for every man, woman and child a year. That is the Conservative way of benefiting the farmer. The member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) can go to his constituents and say: I voted down the French treaty. If they say to him: Are there not some good points about it, he will say: Well I do not know, we did not get any advantage. They may say: Were we not getting an advantage by securing the mimimum rate of duty allowed to any other nation? He will answer: Oh, but I think that the plan I have advocated is better, to have a higher duty to shut out the Yankee butter that comes into this country. How much comes in? There is an ounce in the year for every man, woman and child. But they say to him: We are in the county of Frontenac and you are representing us and there are hundreds of thousands of farmers in the other constituencies throughout the Dominion as well as in this, and we will be all scrambling to get a share of that ounce of butter. Just fancy the idea of talking to the farmers that way and voting down a treaty that secures for them entrance to a market that takes millions of dollars' worth of their products.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the hon. gentleman advocate it on bacon and other things?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I will take the whole list, but I did not want to make my remarks too long. Our farmers after producing every pound of cheese that is used by our own people have over 160,000,000 pounds to export to other countries.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of that do they send to France?

Mr. PATERSON. They want to send some of it to France and that is why we are negotiating this treaty.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I asked him if he made the same remarks with regard to bacon and I asked him that because his argument was so oily.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman spoke of cheese and butter.

Mr. EDWARDS. And also bacon.

Mr. PATERSON. He will find that we produce as much bacon as we required in this country and that we exported some too.

Mr. EDWARDS. We import over 7,000,000 pounds from the United States,

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, I know all about the imports and exports; it is my business to look after them all the time. The way to benefit the farmer is not the way the hon. gentleman recommended, but it is to ratify this treaty and get the best terms you possibly can in the export market for that which we produce a surplus of, and I think we produce a surplus of almost every agricultural product. And now, as to subsidizing the steamship line, I am not a prophet, but I do know as a business man that when you make transportation more certain, cheaper, and more frequent, you will extend your market as you could not extend it in the absence of such facilities. It may not come in a day or it may not come in a year, but once that steamship line is established and you have better transportation and lower rates, then I am hopeful that our live grain merchants and our farmers will avail themselves of that market which offers to them the best terms that are given to any other nation. That is what we secure by this treaty.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I rise, not to discuss the treaty but to correct the wrong impression that the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) left upon the House and perhaps upon the country. We all know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) is one of the most extensive cattle exporters in the Dominion.

Mr. LANCASTER. He said he was a farmer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I suppose he is a farmer also. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that owing to the climatic conditions in Canada we could not be successful in the chilled meat trade, but the hon. gentleman knows very well that practically all the chilled meats exported from Chicago pass over the Grand Trunk railway through Canada and go to England via Boston, which is a very much warmer route than via the St. Lawrence. In view of that fact how could the hon. gentleman possibly be under the impression that we cannot compete with the United States in exporting chilled meat, unless it be that he himself wants to continue in the business of exporting live cattle? I believe that we can export chilled meats just as successfully as the Americans can and I know that the climatic conditions are more favourable in Canada than they are in the United States for that trade. Every day we see train loads of Armour's beef coming from Chicago to Coteau Junction and the cars re-iced there and sent to Boston. If the Minister of Agriculture will introduce this cold storage system that he has been talking about for years, we can bring our meat from Winnipeg to the east, re-ice the cars in transit and deliver the meat in England just as well as they can deliver it from Chicago.

House divided on the motion of Mr. Fielding.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Loggie,
Aylesworth,	Lovell,
Béland,	MacNutt,
Bickerdike,	McCoig,
Black,	McColl,
Blondin,	McCraney,
Boyce,	McGiverin,
Boyer,	McIntyre,
Brodeur,	McLean (Huron),
Brown,	McMillan,
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carrier,	Martin (Montreal,
Carvell,	Ste. Mary's),
Cash,	Martin (Regina),
Champagne,	Meighen,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Meigs,
	Michaud,
Clarke (Essex),	Miller,
Congdon,	Molloy,
Conmee,	Monk,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Nantel,
	Neely,
Daniel,	Oliver,
Delisle,	Osler,
Demers,	Papineau,
Doherty,	Paquet,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ecrément,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Rivet,
Foster,	Roche,
Fowke,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Roy (Montmagny),
Geoffrion,	Rutan,
German,	Savoie,
Girard,	Schell,
Gladu,	Sealey,
Gordon (Kent),	Sifton,
Harris,	Sinclair,
Hodgins,	Smith (Stormont),
Hunt,	Talbot,
Jameson,	Taylor (Leeds),
King,	Taylor (New
Knowles,	Westminster),
Kyte,	Todd,
Lachance,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lafortune,	Turcotte
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	(Quebec County),
	Turgeon,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Verville,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Warburton,
Lavergne,	White
Law,	(Victoria, Alta.),
LeBlanc,	Wilson (Laval).—107.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Lake,
Arthurs,	Lancaster,
Beattie,	Lennox,
Blain,	McCall,
Bradbury,	Magrath,
Burrell,	Marshall,
Campbell,	Middlebro,
Chisholm (Huron),	Russell,

Crothers,	Schaffner,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sexsmith,
Edwards,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Elson,	Sproule,
Goodeve,	Stanfield,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	White (Renfrew),
Henderson,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Hughes,	
Kidd,	Wright.—33.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Smith (Nanaimo),	Owen,
Rankin,	Clare,
Parent,	Wallace,
Turriff,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Guthrie,	Thoburn.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is a well-known rule of parliament, often applied in England, that when the finding of the Speaker on a vote is questioned, those who asked for the vote are obliged to vote negatively. This has very often been held in England by Mr. Speaker Denison. I noticed that the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, rose and questioned your findings so that under this rule these hon. gentlemen must be recorded as voting against the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand, from a rapid glance at the authorities, that the precedents are contradictory in the matter. The only guiding rule which we have in our rules is No. 8, which says:

Upon a division, the yeas and nays shall not be entered upon the minutes unless demanded by five members.

This does not indicate whether the members should vote on one side or on the other.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read a third tome?

Mr. FIELDING. Now.

Mr. FOSTER. At the next sitting.

Mr. LANCASTER. I object to the Bill going on to-night—railroading this thing through altogether too fast.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 1, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending March 31, 1909 —Sir Frederick Borden.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 51), respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Manufacturers Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. C. Roy.

Bill (No. 52), to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 53) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The sections of the Railway Act which I wish to amend are numbers 254, 294, 295 and 427. Section 294 is the one which governs the liabilities of railway companies for damages in the event of failure to erect fences, gates and cattle guards and maintain them. Section 295 refers to the same matter. Section 427 is the general section which involves a general liability in the event of failure to comply with any of the provisions of the Railway Act. Read alone, section 427 would seem to be sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this Bill, but by reason of the specific language of sections 294 and 295, the courts have interpreted the liability of railway companies, under section 427, in the event of failure to comply with the provisions respecting fences, gates and cattle guards, as limited only to such loss as may be sustained through the killing of cattle by trains and engines. The purpose of this Bill is to amend all three sections so as to extend the liabilities of railway companies to all direct damages suffered by reason of their neglect to comply with the law. Section 427 is wide enough in every respect except as regards fences, gates and cattle guards, but in that respect it is held not to be as wide as was intended, and the purpose is to make the railway company liable in case of default in that connection as they would be in any other.

QUESTIONS.

GRAIN EXPORTS FROM MONTREAL.

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. What quantity of grain of all kinds was exported from Montreal each year for the past ten years ending 1908?
2. What quantity of grain of all kinds was exported from Montreal during the year 1909 up to the present time?

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

1. The quantity of grain of all kinds exported from Montreal during the fiscal years from 1899 to 1908, inclusive, was as follows:

Years.	Bushels.
1899	34,313,023
1900	28,644,850
1901	32,742,243
1902	22,078,573
1903	21,960,416

Years.	Bushels.
1904..	22,233,248
1905..	14,617,221
1906..	23,266,716
1907 (9 months)..	19,422,524
1908..	27,071,331

MICHIPICOTEN DOCK.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Have plans and estimates been prepared for the construction of a dock at Michipicoten river? If so, what is the estimated cost of the completion of the work?

2. Were any persons employed by the department to obtain at Michipicoten information with respect to the site of the dock, and to take soundings, &c., or to procure other information with respect to it? If so, who were so employed, when were they employed, for how long did they work, and how much were they paid?

3. What amount, if any, has been expended to date in preliminary work chargeable to the dock?

4. Have tenders been invited for the construction of the dock? If so, when were they invited, and what was the lowest tender?

5. If tenders have not been invited, is it the intention of the department to invite tenders at an early date, in order that the work may be proceeded with?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Yes.
(b) $19,000.

2. An engineer from the department's office at Toronto made a survey and examination and took soundings, and employed to assist him, Mr. Kimball and his son, of Mission river, on the 17th and 18th June, 1907, and they were paid, including boat hire, $7, being $3.50 for services and $3.50 for boat.

3. $356.84.

4 and 5. Tenders invited from 31st October to 27th November, 1908. Lowest tender D. P. McPhail & Kenneth Wright, $21,550, upon which no action was taken. There is an amount for this work in the estimates now before parliament.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK:

What was the total amount expended by the government in connection with the Imperial Defence Conference, including travelling expenses and all other disbursements generally?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

For Department of Militia and Defence, $3,656.38.

INDIAN LANDS SOLD.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. What is the total number of acres of Indian lands sold by this government since 1896?

2. What is the total amount of money received from the sale of Indian lands since 1896?

3. What is the total number of islands owned by the Indians and sold by the government, and the total amount of money received for same since 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. 725,517 acres of Indian lands were sold between the 1st of July, 1896, and the 31st of March, 1909.

2. The total amount of money accruing from the sale of Indian lands from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of March, 1909, amounted to $2,156,020.

3. The total number of islands owned by the Indians and sold from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of March, 1909, amounted to 1,020, including 242 rocks or islets situate in the Georgian bay, upon which the surveyor placed no value, but which the purchasers of larger islands were allowed to acquire at a nominal consideration. The total amount of money received for the same was $74,353.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Are locks furnished the patrons owning rural mail boxes? If so, at what cost, and where can they be purchased?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Locks are not furnished.

THE ROYAL MINT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. What is the amount of loss to Canada in the operation of the Royal Mint since it commenced?

2. What is the total amount of silver on hand in the Royal Mint at present?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING:

1. The profit on coinage since the opening of the mint has been greater than the cost of operation, including reasonable allowance for interest on capital.

2. On November 30, the silver on hand in the mint was:
Coin, $37,500.
Bullion, 119,000 ounces.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not seem to be an answer. The hon. gentleman has not given the amount of the loss.

Mr. FIELDING. What does the hon. member mean by 'the loss'?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount lost, over and above the amount expended.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think the hon. member has made the difficulty quite clear. I have stated that the receipts on the coinage is greater than the cost of operation, making a reasonable allowance for interest on capital.

Mr. FOSTER. But still we do not get any amount. Is it $1,000 or $10,000?

Mr. FIELDING. From my point of view, the inference I would draw from the facts and the opinion I would express, is that there is no loss. The question of gain or loss of manufacturing anything in Canada is an economic question. But taking the operation of the mint, we find that we have paid out certain money and that we have received certain money; and on the basis of this comparison, we have not lost anything but are largely the gainers.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might give the amounts he gained.

Mr. FIELDING. I will bring down a general statement of the mint, which, I think, will cover the whole matter.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Is this government prepared to grant to Germany a similar treaty to the one accepted by the government with France?

Mr. FIELDING. I answered that question in the course of yesterday's debate. The hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) anticipated the question and it was answered.

ARTILLERY HORSES.

Mr. MONK:

1. How much did the Department of Militia and Defence pay for the transport of artillery horses from the headquarters of the various batteries to the Petawawa and other camps of instruction for the years 1908 and 1909, both going and coming?

2. What amount was paid by the Department of Militia and Defence for the hire of artillery horses for the various batteries at the camps held during 1908 and 1909?

3. What amount was paid by the Department of Militia and Defence as compensation to the owners of artillery horses for animals injured during transport to and from the artillery camps during the years 1908 and 1909?

4. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to change the present method of providing artillery horses for the militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) cost of transport artillery horses to camps, 1908.

Camps.	Corps.	No. of Horses.	Amount of Transport.
			$ cts.
Savard Park	6th Brigade Field Artillery	68	469 20
" "	7th Brigade Field Artillery	75	342 50
Charlottetown	4th Regiment Garrison Artillery	18	59 40
Niagara	2nd Brigade Field Artillery	168	415 40
Sussex	4th Brigade Field Artillery	113	1,491 10
"	19th Battery Field Artillery	60	233 00
Guelph	1st Brigade Field Artillery	132	17 20
Aldershot	7th N. S. Regiment Artillery	93	499 20
"	17th and 18th Batteries Artillery	124	404 00
Kingston	5th Battery Artillery	66	122 50
"	14th and 24th Batteries Artillery	114	500 10
Goderich	6th Battery Artillery	56	297 00
Tercentenary Review	A. and B. Batteries, R.C.H.A.	152	1,464 00
Petawawa	A. and B. Batteries, R.C.H.A.	165	528 00
"	Detachment of R.C.G.A.	35	420 00
		1,439	7,262 60

(b) It is impossible at the present time to give the cost of transport to the various camps for 1909.

These movements of troops and horses are all covered by transport requisitions, which are handed over by the commanding officers of the different corps to the railway companies to be claimed in one general account from the department.

These claims are often six months in arrears. At the present time not more than half of the bills for transport of 1909 camps have been received.

2.

1908	$18,940
1909	16,751
Total	35,691

3. (a) In 1908 $141 was paid as follows:

To F. Roop for horse used by 7th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, injured en route Aldershot to Digby, N.S., 1908, $125

To P. Hanrahan for horse used by 18th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery injured en route Aldershot to Antigonish, 1908, $16.

(b) Nothing paid to date for such injuries in 1909.

4. No.

INSURANCE BILL—DECISION OF JUDGE LEET.

Mr. MONK:

1. Is it the intention of the government to institute an appeal from the judgment rendered at Montreal by Judge Seth P. Leet on the 24th November, 1909, in the case of the King vs. Willis Faber & Co.?

2. Pending said appeal, if such is taken, does the government propose delaying its projected legislation upon the subject of insurance?

3. What counsel represented the government in the suit recently decided by Justice Leet?

4. Has the government obtained the opinion of other counsel upon the question decided by Justice Leet? If so, who are said counsel?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. The government was not a party to the proceeding in question and is not advised to intervene in it.

2. It is not intended to delay the measure now before parliament on the subject of insurance.

3. None.

4. None.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS COMMISSION.

Mr. MONK:

What is the total amount expended to date by the government in connection with the Quebec Tercentenary celebration, including the celebration itself, the cost of the commission, battlefields improvements, and all other incidental costs?

Mr. FIELDING: The total amount contributed by the government to date in connection with the National Battlefields Commission, for all purposes of the commission, including the Quebec Tercentenary celebration, is the sum of $300,000, authorized by section 8 of chapter 57 of the Statutes of 1908.

POST OFFICE SITE AT STE. THERESE, QUEBEC.

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Has the government obtained a site for a post office in the village of Ste. Thérèse, in the county of Terrebonne?

2. If so, when and from whom was the ground purchased, and how much was paid for it?

3. Have there been other additional expenditures in connection with this post office project?

4. When does the government intend to build it?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. $5,000 paid to Wilfrid Desjardins on the 6th April, 1909.

3. Yes, $121.35, divided as follows:

Legal services	$ 44.85
Travelling expenses	76.50
	$121.35

4. I regret that I am unable to give my hon. friend definite information as to the time when construction will commence. There must first be an appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. MONK.

ARMOURIES AND DRILL HALLS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. At what places in the province of Manitoba are armouries and drill halls erected?

2. What price was paid for site in each case, and the total cost of buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. Brandon: Site, $3,100; building, $63,759.14; total, $66,859.14.

Virden: Site given free by city corporation, cost of building, $11,827.65.

Winnipeg: Built upon Crown land, cost of building, $27,492.07.

CHARTERING OF SS. 'LEEBRO.'

Mr. COWAN:

1. For what length of time was the steamship 'Leebro' in the employ of the government, and from what date?

2. What was the total amount paid for the services of the steamer?

3. Was the steamer employed by the day or by the trip, and at what rate?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1908-1909.

1. From the 4th June, 1908, to the 15th December, 1908.

From the 16th January, 1909, to the 11th March, 1909.

1909-1910.

From the 12th May, 1909, to the present time.

2. $57,105, including wages of crew, coal and provisions.

3. The steamer was chartered from the 4th of June, 1908, for a period of three months at $135 per day, including wages of crew, coal and provisions, with the privilege of employing her from day to day after the termination of the charter, as long as required at the same rate.

From the 16th of January to the 11th of March, the steamer was employed from day to day at the rate formerly paid.

The steamer was chartered from the 12th day of May, 1909, at the same rate for a period of two months with the privilege of employing her from day to day after the expiration of that time at the same price.

GOVERNMENT LAND AT NEW WESTMINSTER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Have steps been taken to terminate the existing lease of a lot owned by the Dominion government situate at the northeast corner of Columbia and Begbie streets, in the city of New Westminster?

2. If so, what disposition, if any, is it intended to make of the lot?

3. If it is to be sold, will the sale be by public auction or by private arrangements?

4. Will the government, before sale, take steps to ascertain the value of the lot by reference to the price recently obtained for properties on opposite corners?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Existing lease of lot owned by the Dominion government at the northeast corner of Columbia and Begbie streets, in the city of New Westminster, expires on the 31st day of July, 1910.

2, 3 and 4. The government will consider at the expiration of the lease what disposition will be made of the lot.

FENIAN RAID VETERANS—RECOGNITION OF SERVICES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is it the intention of the government to in any way recognize the services of those who took part in the repelling of the Fenian Raids of 1866-1870 by way of land grants or otherwise?

2. If not, have previous deputations in that behalf been so informed?

3. Is the government aware of arrangements having been made for the reception of a delegation in the matter on the 3rd proximo, and is it prepared to reconsider the question and to give a favourable ruling in the matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. The services of those who took part in repelling the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870 were recognized by the granting of a medal under the authority of Her Majesty, the late Queen. That medal was awarded to all those who took part in repelling the raids.

2. I am not aware that any promise has been made beyond that to which I have referred and which has been fulfilled.

3. The government is aware that a deputation is coming to Ottawa, and the representations made by the deputation will be most respectfully heard.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—MONTHLY BULLETINS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What is the number of monthly bulletins or monthly statistics distributed by the Department of Agriculture?

2. What is the number of monthly bulletins translated into French and distributed by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Total number 19,400.

2. Total number 2,400. By the Census and Statistical Branch, 7,200 English, 1,200 in French. By the Dairy and Cold Storage Branch, a monthly fruit crop report is published from May to September in each year. 12,200 copies of each issue in English are distributed, and 1,200 in French.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

Mr. PAQUET:

Does the Commission of Historical Manuscripts, established in 1907, continue its work? If so, who are the members of that commission, and what work has been accomplished by them?

Mr. FISHER:

The Historical Manuscripts Commission for Canada established in 1907 is continuing its work. Four meetings have been held. The members of the commission are the Minister of Agriculture, chairman; the Abbé Gosselin, rector and professor of history, Laval University; C. W. Colby, professor of history, McGill University; G. M. Wrong, professor of history, Toronto Universit; Adam Shortt, late professor of Queen's University; the Dominion Archivist; and Jos. E. Roy, of the Archives Branch.

The commission has investigated methods of classification and made recommendations on the following subjects: Publication and editing of documents, translation, classfication and indexing, quest for documents.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN FRANCE.

Mr. MONK:

1. What is the total amount expended during the last fiscal year for immigration purposes in France?

2. Is the report of Mr. Paul Wiallard, immigration agent in Paris, printed with the last report of the Interior Department, the only report received by the department on immigration in France?

3. What is the date of other reports made during the year, by whom were they made, and will they be laid on the table of the House?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $25,892.30.

2. No.

3. Arthur Geoffrion, July 20, 1908; February, 1909; March 2, 1909. Edouard Montpetit, December 15, 1908; January 31, 1909; March 15, 1909. L. Eauclaire, June 9, 1909. Abbé Le Floch, June 25, 1909. Copies of these reports will be laid upon table upon the order of the House.

NATIONAL PARK IN SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Is it the intention of the government to establish in the near future a national park in Saskatchewan similar to that of Wainwright, Alberta?

2. What disposition as to distribution does the government propose to make with the herd of buffalo located at present at Wainwright?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The park at Wainwright was selected as the most suitable buffalo range available at the time in the three prairie pro-

vinces, and the government has not yet considered the advisability of establishing a similar park elsewhere. Although in Alberta the Wainwright park is only thirty miles from the western boundary of Saskatchewan.

2. It has not been thought advisable to adopt a policy of disposition or distribution of the buffalo at Wainwright until the whole of the Pablo herd has been secured, which it is hoped will be next spring.

WAR VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers and letters in respect to the agreement between Great Britain and the United States for the maintenance of war vessels on the Great Lakes, including the agreement itself, the several requests made for permitting United States war vessels to pass the canals, and the outcome thereof, and a list of vessels which have passed the canals, with description and armament, the places where they are stationed, and the purposes for which they are used.

He said: I desire to lay before the House some information and facts so far as I have been able to gather them, with reference to the question implied in the resolution. I find that on April 28, 1818, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States of America as follows:

Whereas, an arrangement was entered into at the city of Washington, in the month of April, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventeen, between Richard Rush, Esquire, at that time acting as secretary for the Department of State of the United States, for and in behalf of the government of the United States, and the Right Hon. Charles Bagot, His Britannic Majesty's Envoy and Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, for and in behalf of His Britannic Majesty, which arrangement is in the words following, to wit:—

The naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is—

On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden, and armed with one eighteen pound cannon.

On the upper lakes, to two vessels not exceeding like burden each, and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden, and armed with like force.

All other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.

If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

The naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such services as will, in no respect, interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

And whereas the Senate of the United States have approved of the said arrangement, and recommended that it should be carried into effect, the same having also received the sanction of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, acting in the name and on the behalf of His Britannic Majesty.

Now, therefore, I, James Monroe, President of the United States, do, by this proclamation, make known and declare that the arrangement aforesaid, and every stipulation thereof, has been duly entered into, concluded and confirmed, and is of full force and effect.

Given under my hand, at the city of Washington, this twenty-eighth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighteen, and of the independence of the United States the forty-second.

JAMES MONROE.

By the President:
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

This proclamation, therefore, brought into effect and made in every respect equivalent to a treaty, an exchange of notes that had taken place a little previously. It is interesting to find that the matter was first brought to the attention of the British governmen by Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States, who addressed a note, on the 2nd of August, 1816, to Mr. Bagot, to which Mr. Bagot replied on the 28th of April, 1817; and on the 29th of April, 1817, Mr. Rush accedes to the terms laid down in Mr. Bagot's communication, and the proclamation of the President took place thereafter. as the final act. The first fact then that confronts us is that in 1817 a treaty was made—I should call it that, because it has to all intents and purposes the effect and force of a treaty—a treaty was made upon the initiation of the United States of America between that country and Great Britain, which was in effect so long as that treaty lasted, to dominate, and control and condition naval construction and the maintenance of naval armaments on the Great Lakes.

Needless to say that this supervened upon the war of 1812-14 and was intended to prevent any cause for collision between the two countries on the Great Lakes and also to prevent any cost of armament as between these two countries. It was a condition of that arrangement that all armed vessels which, at that time, were maintained on the lakes, were to be dismantled and taken out. We were to commence, as it were, with a clean sheet of water in all of that vast region and from that time onward, so long as this treaty lasted, that clean sheet of water was not to be dotted by armed vessels excepting under the limiting conditions of the treaty. As will have been seen from the limiting conditions of the treaty the armaments which were supposed to be possible were very small and insignificant. On Lake Ontario there was not

to be more than one vessel not to exceed 100 tons, and to be armed with not more than an 18-lb. cannon; on the Upper Lakes two vessels having the same burthen and the same armament, and on Lake Champlain one vessel not exceeding 100 tons and armed with a like force. This certainly was an agreement which was not only wise in every respect, as it seems to me, but was also exceedingly economical. Now, let us place alongside of that, for this treaty has never been disturbed and is in existence to-day, the exact state of affairs as regards the armament on the Great Lakes so far as I have been able to gather it. I have not, of course, all the information; otherwise I would not be asking the House to pass this resolution and the government to bring down more information. But, in so far as I have been able to find from looking through the reports of the naval authorities of the United States the following table shows the condition of things to-day on the Great Lakes:

UNITED STATES WAR VESSELS ON GREAT LAKES.

Name.	Tons.	Type.	Speed, knots.	Horse-power.	Officers.	Men.	Battery.	Station.	Date of assignment.
Dorothea	594	Single screw, triple expansion	15	1,558	4	63	4 6-pr. 2 1-pr. 2 Colts.	Illinois	1901
Hawk	375	Single screw, quadruple expansion.	14½	1,000	4	46	Removed	Ohio	1900
Wasp	630	Single screw, triple expansion.	16½	1,800	4	32	2 6-pr. R.F 4 30 cal. A.	New York State	1908
Don Juan de Austria (gunboat).	1130	Single horizontal compound.	12·20	941	7	139	6 3 in. R.F. 4 6-pr. R.F. 2 1-pr. R.F. 2 30 cal. A.	Michigan	1907
Gopher (formerly Fern).	840		9	300	....	....		Minnesota	1905
Yantic	900		8·30	310	....	....		Michigan	1897
Sandoval (gunboat).	103	Single screw, vertical compound.	.....	.....	....	23	2 3-pr. R.F. 2 colts.	New York State, (Rochester).	1906
Nashville [gunboat).	1371	Twin screw, vertical quadruple.	16·30	2,524	11	171	8 4-in. R.F. 4 6-pr. R.F. 2 1-in. R.F. 2 30 cal. A.	Illinois	1907
Essex	1375		10·40	800	....	....	6 4-in. R.F. 4 6-pr. 2 1-pr. 2 colts.	Ohio	1904
Wolverine (gunboat).	685		10·50	365	....	75	6 6-pr. R.F. 2 1-in. R.F. 1 30 cal. M. 1 30 cal. A.	Great Lakes	....

The 'Wolverine' is a training ship belonging to the United States, not in the service of the state naval militia as the others are, and its duties are the drilling of the naval militia, recruiting, generally perambulating the lakes and showing the flag. All except the 'Wolverine' are vessels which have been transferred to the naval militia on the Great Lakes and all have been passed up—most of them within the last few years—through the canals under the authority and with the permission of the Canadian government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would be state militia.

Mr. FOSTER. State naval militia. So that we have as a total ten vessels of 8,000 tons displacement, 30 officers and 549 men, as far as I have been able to get the number. There were several vessels, the names of which I read but the complements of which I could not find stated in the reports. There are 24 6-pounder rapid-firing guns, 10 1-pounder rapid-firing guns, 14 4-pounder rapid-firing guns, 8 3-pounder rapid-firing guns, 9 30-calibre 'A', 1 30-calibre 'M' and 6 colts.

I find that the 'Wolverine,' in the course of the last two years, has been visiting most of the ports of the Great Lakes, has been busy recruiting for the United States naval reserve, drilling, manoeuvering and generally showing the flag. This naval state militia is kept up in two ways. The states themselves make an appropriation

and the United States also makes an appropriation which is distributed amongst the states for the different stations and vessels. Something more has been done for amongst the accounts I find these items: For naval training station, there was an appropriation in 1909, of $1,095,600 and an estimate for 1910 of $413,400. There was expended in 1907-8 a total of $1,939,611, as far as I can get at the figures. That was expended by the United States government in erecting buildings and equipping a naval training station on the Great Lakes. I find also that there was a coterminous appropriation by the United States for a naval hospital building, of $250,000 and that that building is now progressing. These then are the two contrasting pictures: First, there was an agreement between the two countries, absolute, in force until to-day, without a shred of correspondence, so far as I can learn from either country, looking towards its abrogation and yet under that condition of a solemn treaty and agreement, there is a very considerable naval force consisting of state naval militia and of buildings and naval training stations, hospitals and other things contributed to or maintained directly by the United States of America. I find from what correspondence has come down that the larger part of these vessels have gone up within the last eight years. Some correspondence was previously brought down to the House and from it we learn two or three things: For instance, that when the United States wish one of these vessels to go up, having come to the conclusion to lend it to the naval militia of a state, they make application to the British Minister who makes application to the Dominion government to take it into consideration and that the Canadian government in every case, so far as the correspondence that I have seen goes, have granted the permission and have done so speedily and with very little reserve. I notice that in 1907, when the 'San Juan d'Austria' asked to go through, the British minister refers back to the case of the 'Essex and says:

> In 1904, the 'Essex' was passed on the assumption that the United States government did not contemplate departing in any way from the existing treaty stipulations relevant to the maintenance of warships on the Great Lakes. It is presumed, therefore, that the Canadian government would, in the present instance, wish a similar condition to be made.

From the correspondence I do not find that any similar condition was made and the vessels were passed up on two conditions. One was that they should not be armed while passing through the canals or water-reaches of Canada to reach their stations and the other that they were to be used for training purposes. That is, no armament was allowed whilst they were passing through Canadian waters and the general condition was attached that they were to be used for training purposes and confined to that use.

In the case of the 'Nashville' on February 15, 1908, what appears to be another step was taken, for we find the British Minister says:

> The whole question of armed vessels on the Great Lakes has been referred by His Majesty's government to the Imperial Defence Commission and His Majesty's government will further consult your government (that is the Dominion government); but pending results of the discussion, do your ministers, in the case of the 'Nashville,' see any objection to permission being granted?

The 'Nashville' was passed through in 1909, and, it is said, received her armament at Buffalo after she had safely passed the dangers and difficulties of the canal passage. I do not propose to make any criticism with reference to this matter at present, but wished to draw the attention of the House to the existing state of affairs which had not come to my attention until I looked into the matter, and possibly many other members of the House may not have been aware of it; certainly I do not think the Canadian public is quite aware of the situation as it has developed. I find that the state naval militia or naval reserve of the United States on the great lakes is of the following enrolled strength:

Illinois	629
Michigan	177
Minnesota	117
New York	583
Ohio	143
Total	1,649

It may be that a portion of the New York militia is at New York on the Atlantic side, but I was not able to ascertain that definitely. Thus there is a body of men trained as a naval reserve, 1,649 in number, that would be available on an hour's notice for any work on the Great Lakes in connection with the purpose for which they are organized. Of course the United States maintains revenue cutters on the Great Lakes, but they are not within the terms of the treaty, and I cannot find that any larger number are kept there by the United States than are necessary for their customs work, nor do I find that they are at all formidable vessels.

If it was good policy in 1817 to mitigate the cost of maintaining vessels and decrease the probabilities of armed collision on the great lakes by a treaty between these two great countries, a solemn engagement to keep their expenditure within a certain amount and their armament and vessels within a certain limit, it certainly ought to be good policy to-day. I am not, of course, oblivious to the fact that great changes have taken place. An 18-pounder

then might have been a formidable gun, but to-day it would not be considered in a very high class as regards armament. A vessel of 100 tons was the same size then as it is now, and if all that was required at that time was a vessel of that size, possibly all that is required for the same work to-day would be a vessel of that size. I do not imagine that the waters of the lakes are any more stormy or their navigation any more difficult than in 1817, and as there is no armed force threatening our neighbours in the United States, they did not need to have either heavier vesesls or heavier armaments in order to protect them from danger. But even if it be argued that the times and circumstances have changed, there is one way to bring about a change in respect to the subject I have mentioned, and that is for the two countries to agree upon the amount of change that is necessary and, having agreed upon that to modify, if necessary, the old treaty to that extent. But it certainly cannot be argued that so long as the same intention exists, and so long as the same treaty exists, either party would be justified in going beyond the terms of the treaty without first striving to have a new arrangement made to permit what they might call the improvements that are necessary owing to the progress of things. There has been a vast growth in wealth and in population since 1817. That is just where the importance and possibly the danger of the position arises. I speak with bated breath in the presence of the coming Lord High Admiral when I say that I do not imagine that our equipment on the Great Lakes is at present very formidable. I do not think that all the bristling guns and towering decks that we have there for the purpose of either defence or training have caused a shudder to run down the spine of Uncle Sam in the last few years, and so led to the extension of his naval defences and armaments on the Great Lakes. I am not sure that the little boat which we have there has a gun on her at all. I think at one time she had one, but it seems to me that I have heard a rumour that men were apt to injure themselves with so unusual piece of machinery, and so it was removed. However that may be, I am safe in saying that we have not been threatening our neighbours in that respect. Now, if population and business interests have increased, if trade has grown and great cities have arisen, on the Great Lakes, so far as the United States is concerned, this is also true of Canada; and what I want to bring to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people of Canada to-day is this, that as matters stand to-day in actuality, our whole lake population, our whole lake wealth, and our whole lake trade, are absolutely at the mercy of the armament which the United States has on those lakes to-day. I read the armament and the vessels; and if it did so happen, as I hope it never may happen, that difficulty arose, within 24 hours the whole lake trade, with all our improvements for the conveyance of trade, would be absolutely at the mercy and in the hands of the United States of America. If you take into account the relative equipments of the two countries on the lakes, Canada has absolutely nothing, while the United States has the armament which I have mentioned. While we may be all advocates of peace and may be all believers in peace, most of us believe in some sort of insurance, and if hostilities did arise between the United States and Canada, what protection would we have under present circumstances that would be worth a single rush leaf? We have none, and from the top of the Great Lakes, where our great continental railways make their connections with the water, all down through the ports and harbours, with their docks and other equipment for trade, our canal system at the Sault and our canal system between Lakes Ontario and Erie, our cities on the lakes of Ontario down to Kingston and the Thousand Islands, and still further our communications along the River St. Lawrence—all of these would be absolutely at the mercy of a force under the flag of the United States. which is quite sufficient to annihilate for the time being our trade. This is a state of things which evidently ought not to exist; and though we be the greatest advocates of peace and the most optimistic believers in peace, there is absolutely no insurance in that respect. No business man would put his business in such a condition of risk, and Canada itself surely cannot feel that it ought to do so. But a strange thing took place, to which I must refer. Although we have not had information in this regard. the government has had plenty of information, and that information has been collated and the Minister of Marine has evidently gone pretty particularly into it. He has made calculations and has raised a claim for non-participation in the naval defence of the empire by telling the empire, at the conference in London in 1907, what risks there were to Canada and what a burden Canada had thrust upon her, and what a burden the minister had specially thrust upon himself, in order to safeguard our interests on the Great Lakes. I think it is well that I should read the portion that refers to this matter, although I read it the other day. Although no such information had been given to us in Canada, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made this statement at the conference:

> We have to-day on the lakes a boat which is an armed boat.

I can understand how the members of the conference pictured in their minds this contribution to the imperial navy, being used to seeing in the Thames the great 18-mile procession of warships, the armed boats of the empire. No doubt their imagination flew easily to the turreted ship or the armoured cruiser which the minister was talking about as a great burden economically and a great engine of defence.

We have to-day on the lakes a boat which is an armed boat, which is looking specially after the protection of our fisheries against the American fishermen, not only for the carrying out of the local regulations, but mostly and I may say almost exclusively for preventing the Americans from coming and fishing in our waters. We have on the Great Lakes (large seas, properly speaking) American states bordering these great lakes, and they are having navies of their own now. I think that three states bordering on the three great lakes, Ohio, Michigan and Illinois are spending not less than $15,000,000 themselves for keeping up a navy on these lakes,——

One unit that Canada was asked to present would cost that amount, maybe a little more—

—and are drilling their men on the shore of the lakes. Besides they have some ships which are not on—because it would be against the conclusions of the treaty—but built in order to be prepared in case of emergency.

So that the minister himself there makes a statement tantamount to this, that we have been allowing these vessels to pass through our waters provided they were unarmed, but with the perfect knowledge that after they got into the lakes they were ready for a case of emergency. My hon. friend says:

Besides they have some ships which are not on—because that would be against the conclusions of the treaty—but built in order to be prepared in case of emergency. As far as Canada is concerned one of the first duties we shall have to look after is our protection in connection with the great lakes. I may say that the wars we have had since 1763, since Canada has become part of the British empire, came from the United States. We had an invasion in 1775, we had an invasion in 1812, and we had the Fenian Raid in the 60s. All those invasions came from the United States, so we have to look especially in that direction to protect ourselves, and I may say we have been doing it as far as the Great Lakes are concerned, not to a very large extent it is true, but to the extent of spending a sum of money which is quite important for a country of the size of ours.

It seems to me that proves a very thorough and complete knowledge on the part of the government of just what has been going on in the Great Lakes; and whilst we have been asking in this House for information, we have never got anything so full as the minister communicated to the imperial conference in 1907.

It also shows that in the minister's opinion so great was the burden thrown on Canada to make proper provision for protection against possible enemies on the Great Lakes, that it was sufficient to put that forward as an excuse for not making a contribution or should be counted as an important contribution to the naval outlay of Canada.

My whole purpose is to call the attention of the premier to this matter and particularly the attention of the government. I do not say that it may be found practicable that modifications should take place on both sides as regards the keeping of armaments on the Great Lakes, but any armament maintained there should be in accord with treaty arrangements and not in violation of the terms of the treaty now existing. It may be that there is some argument for reasonable modification, but I do hope that as between the United States and ourselves, on these border-line waters, consisting of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, it may never become necessary for the two countries to spend large amounts in vieing with each other in the building of warships. But the present condition of things is one which I think should give us some cause for reflection. When we look at the immense value of property along this line of Great Lakes and realize that, in contravention of the treaty, there is a formidable armed force on the other side and absolutely nothing on ours, that condition is sufficiently grave to warrant our making some move in the matter. What action has taken place I do not know. I am told that negotiations have been going on and the right hon. the Prime Minister may perhaps be in a position to give us more information than we have had up to the present. It may be that there are confidential communications, and of course I am not asking that confidential papers be brought down, but simply that we should be given such information as can properly be divulged and to which we are entitled, and if the resolution passes, it will pass with that understanding.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The observations of my hon. friend would have been more apposite if, when following the attention of the country to a condition of things which must cause anxiety to everybody and certainly to the government, he had been able to suggest a remedy. My hon. friend premised his remarks by stating that we have a convention with the United States since 1817 limiting armaments on the lakes. Under its conditions, four war vessels only are allowed in what waters are between the two countries. This agreement has been in existence nearly one hundred years and has served a very good purpose. Since the United States have reached their present

development, the states which border on the Great Lakes, have been pressing the Federal authorities to participate in the war expenditure which has been going on from time to time in these states. The Federal government could not do so unless the conditions of the convention of 1817 were interfered with, and I shall not say that although perhaps they have not been absolutely maintained, they have been unfairly interfered with. My hon. friend knows that the tenure of life of that convention is a very slender thread. It can be put an end to in six months time:

If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

If the American government so desired, they could put an end to the treaty in six months' time. They could give that notice to-day or at any time. Under the circumstances, what are we to do? My hon. friend says we should have a modification of the treaty. That is more easily said perhaps than done. He may say put an end to the treaty, but that would be worse. In that case whatever armament might be established on the one side, we would have to follow suit. My hon. friend will realize that the condition of things is one in which we ought to be very careful as to what we do and what we say; and I do not think that perhaps he has served as good a purpose as no doubt he had in his mind in bringing this matter to the attention of the country as he has done. It is a matter which has been engaging our attention again and again. When we were at Washington in 1899, at the time of the Joint High Commission, it engaged the attention of the two parties. There were modifications suggested then but we could not agree, and the matter was left as it stood. Even had that conference resulted in an agreement, I do not know that it would have come to a conclusion on the point in question. There is correspondence of a nature that can be brought down and I shall be glad to lay that on the table, but there is also other correspondence of a confidential nature, but such papers as can be brought down I shall submit to the House.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all papers in connection with the alleged securing and sale or distribution of passes on the Intercolonial railway within the last two years, and also of all papers of every kind in connection with the alleged padding of pay-lists on the Windsor Branch railway, and the resale of mutilated railway ties to the government.—Mr. Foster.

Return showing all casualties and accidents attended with danger or loss to human life that have occurred in the Marine and Fisheries Department owing to the operation of Pintsch and acetylene gas as an illuminant for each year since 1880, together with a copy of all papers and reports in connection therewith.—Mr. Foster.

PRIVILEGE—REPRESENTATION OF QUEBEC EAST AND OTTAWA.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House and of yourself to the position of a member of the House, the right hon. the first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in connection with his dual capacity, sitting as he does for Ottawa and also for Quebec East. I take it for granted that if I were to ask the right hon. the first minister whether he has yet made up his mind for what constituency he will sit, I should receive the same reply as did my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) a week ago. If I am wrong, I can be corrected, and in that case there is no need of my proceeding further. I propose, however, to argue that—

Mr. SPEAKER. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) how he desires to bring the matter up?

Mr. MEIGHEN. By putting the question to you, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the right hon. the first minister can, at the present time, refuse longer to elect for which seat he will sit.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to hear an expression of opinion on the subject. I do not know that the argument can proceed at this stage.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I cannot express an opinion without reference to the authorities—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) is clearly out of order. He cannot argue the question at this stage. Possibly, in a few minutes, the House will be moved into Committee of Supply when he will have an opportunity. But, at present, he knows he cannot speak.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is it not a question of privilege?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No privilege that I can see.

Mr. MEIGHEN. As I understand the rules, it is a question of privilege. A matter referring to the seat of any member of the House is a question of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER. Had I had prior notice, I should have looked up the question. But, unfortunately, I was not notified. I cannot allow the discussion to take place at this stage. We have a rule which says that

no matter of this kind may be brought up in this way.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to cite the authorities.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member invokes the rule, he must do it by motion. There is nothing before the Chair, and we cannot proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot the hon. member proceed on a question of privilege?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER. As a question of privilege, I will not—

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is well known that the first minister does sit at the present time for two seats. It is true that his election for one of the seats was contested, and, as a consequence, until that protest was disposed of or dissolved by the courts, no election could be made. The protest related to the seat for the city of Ottawa. It was brought up by motion on the 29th of June last in Toronto, and the right hon. the first minister was confirmed in his seat. It would enable me, perhaps, to make my remarks briefer if I were to put the question to you, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you have received from the judges, as provided under section 58 of the Controverted Elections Act, any certificate or report as to how this election protest was disposed of? Under this section of the Act, the judges are bound, immediately at the conclusion, to certify, to you, by way of report, the result of their finding. I trust I have made my question clear, whether or not you have received, in pursuance of sections 58, 59 and 60, of the Controverted Elections Act, such a report as to the disposal or dissolution of the protest respecting the status of the right hon. first minister in regard to the seat for the city of Ottawa?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can inform the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) that anything I have received is on the records of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That was all I could expect.

Mr. SPEAKER. Had I been notified of the question, I could have prepared myself to give the information exactly. I think a matter of this kind should be given notice of and that we should not be taken unawares.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Your answer, Mr. Speaker, is quite sufficient for me—that if the report has been received it is on the records of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It suits the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), but it does not suit the Speaker to be taken unaware. I think that, by the rules of the House, the hon. member might be required to give notice of his question.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But the answer, I apprehend, can be given without notice. The answer is quite satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER. But the Speaker is not required to answer. It is a matter of the records of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That being the case, it must be that, the election protest never having come to trial, the judges did not certify to you, Mr. Speaker, the result which they found on the 29th of June last. However, whether or not that is the fact, or whether or not it is necessary under the Controverted Elections Act that it should be received, does not, as it seems to me, affect the status of the right hon. Prime Minister. Under the rules of the House, and under the statutes, there is no regulation in force in this country in the way of a time limit within which a member who has been elected for two seats must elect which he will sit for. Consequently, the matter comes under the provision of rule 1 of the House of Commons, which brings into force in all such cases the rules, regulations and orders in force in the British House of Commons on the 1st of July, 1867. Now, the rule in force in the British House of Commons on the 1st of July, 1867, was this: That, in case of a member being elected for two seats, he should, within one week, elect which seat he will sit for or, in the event of protest, that he should make his election within one week after the disposal of that protest. I would refer you to page 424 of Bourinot, where the rule of the British House is very clearly laid down. It is also clearly laid down in May, at page 652; and in May particularly it is shown that this rule which is now in force in the British House of Commons comes into force by sessional order at the commencement of each session, and has done so since at least 1842, and was therefore in force on the 1st of July, 1867. A case is pointed out in May where Mr. Daniel O'Connell, on the 24th of May, 1842, was compelled to elect as to which of two seats he should sit for. Consequently it has evidently been in force since the 24th of May, 1842, and was consequently in force on the 1st of July, 1867. Therefore, in the absence of any sessional order of this House, and in the absence of any statute, we must follow the sessional order of the British House, which was in force on the 1st July, 1867, and which would have required the right hon. gentleman who leads this government to make his selection within one week after the disposal of the protest, and after the meeting of the House of Commons. That is to say, that following the correct practice, the right hon. gentleman should have made his elec-

tion as to which seat he would sit for within the first week of this session. The first week, of course, is now past. The question of privilege, therefore, I have now spoken to. I had purposed, Mr. Speaker, asking for your ruling as to whether the right hon. gentleman is now properly withholding his election as to which seat he will sit for; but if you prefer my question to stand as a question until to-morrow, I am willing. But I do purpose asking for your ruling as to whether the right hon. gentleman can longer withhold his election in this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is that I must make my election, of course I shall have to do so at once. But I might give you my views; I do not know if you have any ruling to make on this point. For my part, I have no objection at all. I may say to my hon. friend, however, that I was particularly anxious to make a choice between Quebec and Ottawa, but so far no one in the city of Quebec and no one in the city of Ottawa has asked me to make a choice; therefore, I was waiting until I was prompted by some of those gentlemen who have done me the honour to elect me to both seats. But if I am not within the rules of the House, I shall have to put myself within the rules when I know what your ruling is.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will give my ruling to-morrow.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT — INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHTS.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: A year ago, among the amendments introduced by the Minister of Justice to the Criminal Code, I suggested this amendment. At that time the Minister of Justice, after taking time for consideration, was of the opinion that the amendment was a good one, I presumed, at all events, he offered no opposition to it, and it passed. The amendment is to secure those persons who have valuable copyrights in dramatic productions against the unwarranted infringement thereof. At present they have no remedy except to bring action against the person who infringes their copyright, and as the person who steals the copyright has usually no worldly substance the aggrieved persons are practically without remedy. I am instructed by the parties who wish me to bring this matter before the House, that in many instances those dramatic productions are worth a royalty of $500 or $600 a night, and notwithstanding that a spurious imitation is presented to the public by some wandering troop, the head of which has no substance by which he can answer in damages, and therefore the party entitled to the royalty is defrauded of his rights and is practically without remedy. At the time when I brought this matter forward last year, not only the Minister of Justice but the Minister of Agriculture as well, who is interested in matters of this kind, were in the House, and as I recollect the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture at that time, he did not see any objection to it. But I must add that he also said that he had not had an opportunity of studying carefully the wording of the clause I introduced. I have no personal interest in this matter, though I think it is a matter of public importance. I understand that the copyright laws are defective in this respect, as well as in some other respects, and I offer this amendment as an improvement upon the law as it now exists. At the time I presented this amendment last year, the Minister of Justice had then, as an amendment of the same section, a provision in reference to musical competitions. That, I understand, emanated from the Minister of Justice himself and this was a further subsection to the same section of the Criminal Code. The subsection of the Minister of Justice with reference to musical compositions went to the Senate with this subsection that I introduced with reference to dramatic compositions. As you will recollect, Mr. Speaker, both of these amendments were introduced in the last days of the session, they went over to the Senate and, as I am instructed, without any reasonable consideration, these two clauses were struck out. I therefore move the second reading of this Bill in the hope that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture will consider the matter, and in the hope, from what took place last year, that they will see the advisability of having this amendment again enacted and sent to the Senate.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I note what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) says and I can say quite frankly at once that I quite agree with his amendment to the Criminal Code for the purpose of dealing with dramatic copyright. I am not lawyer enough to say whether the wording here is exactly correct, but I believe it is, and I am quite willing to leave it to my hon. friend on the other side of the House and the Minister of Justice who says it is correct. My hon. friend is quite correct in saying that last year my colleague, the Minister of Justice, introduced an amendment to the Criminal Code in regard to musical copyright. Both of these amendments were sent to the Senate but the Bill did not pass. I do not think that these clauses were in any way objectionable to the Senate, but some other clauses proposed were. I think it would be well therefore that these clauses should be incorporated

in a Bill independent of other amendments to the Criminal Code. I would like, before the Bill advances beyond the committee stage, to suggest that a clause with regard to musical copyright should be included with the clause proposed by my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. I should be very glad.

Mr. FISHER. We would then have an opportunity of dealing in this way with this amendment to the Criminal Code in so far as the question of copyright, including both of these points, is concerned. Therefore, I am quite willing to ask for the second reading of this Bill.

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

On section 1,

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend says that these are the exact words of the amendment last year?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, they are.

Mr. FISHER. Before we proceed further I would ask that the committee rise and report progress until we can secure the other amendment which I suggest inserting in this Bill and which will be prepared for a future sitting of the House by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be quite satisfactory.

Progress reported.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT—AMENDMENT.

House went into committee on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend 'The Inspection and Sale Act,' so as to provide that when potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the barrel, the barrel shall contain one hundred and sixty pounds.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Prime Minister, the other day raised the question that this was interfering with provincial rights as far as the weighing of potatoes was concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part I saw no difference between potatoes and bread, but this House saw differently, because I find some years ago there was a Bill passed on this very same subject of potatoes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then, is it all right to proceed with bread? Are you going to object to bread?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, we will stick to potatoes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps we might get the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture as to whether this does invade the rights of the provinces.

Mr. FISHER. I am not prepared to give a legal opinion upon that point. I find in other statutes the same kind of provision, and that being the case I take it that parliament is acting within its legal rights.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister be disposed to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon the point?

Mr. FISHER. I shall certainly do so.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEED CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient to amend 'The Seed Control Act,' (a) by making regulations determining the standard of vitality of seeds; (b) with regard to the freedom of certain seeds from weeds; (c) prohibiting the sale, offering, exposing or having in possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding, any seeds of alfalfa, if there are present in any mixture any noxious weed seeds in a greater proportion than five to one thousand of the seeds sold, offered, exposed or had in possession for sale; and (d) prohibiting the sale, offering, exposing or having in possession for sale, for seeding, certain seeds not having the standard percentage of vitality, unless every receptacle containing such seeds is marked with the name of the seed and the percentage capable of germination.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to add to section 2, subsection 1 of the original Act, which defines what regulations the Governor General in Council may make, another clause authorizing us to make regulations determining the standard and vitality of seeds, fixing a minimum percentage of vitality. It is also proposed to bring Alfalfa under the provisions of the Act in the same way as other clover and grass seeds. The percentage standards of vitality for good seed are made by regulations of the Governor in Council under the Act. The following are the percentage standards of the various kinds of cereals, grasses, clovers, forage plants, field roots and garden vegetable seeds:

Kind of Seeds.	Standard.
Cereal grains (including indian corn).	95 p. c.
Peas and vetches..	95 "
Beans..	90 "
Clovers (including alsike and alfalfa)	95 "
Flax..	95 "
Millet..	95 "
Timothy..	95 "

Cocksfoot, brome, meadow fescue, blue grass	85 p.c.
Rye grasses	80 "
Mangels and beets	90 "
Turnip, swedes, rape, radish	95 "
Cabbage	93 "
Cauliflower	90 "
Carrot	80 "
Parsnip	65 "
Celery	60 "
Curcubits	90 "
Onion	90 "
Tomato	90 "
Lettuce	90 "

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister whether in the proposed Bill any provision is made for stamping on small packages of seeds the date when the seeds were put into the package? This is a matter of considerable interest in the province of Ontario. For example, a wholesale seed merchant puts small packages of seeds into a box and sends them to the retailer. The retailer sells a number of the small packages during the season, and in many cases returns the unsold packages to the wholesaler. There is a complaint that the wholesale merchant continues to send out these packages, year after year, without any investigation as to whether any vitality is left in the seeds or not; and it is suggested that the wholesale merchant should be required to put on all small packages of seeds he sends out for sale the date on which the seed was put into the package, so that the farmer or gardener buying it would have some assurance of the vitality of the seed.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right as to that point, except that the provisions of the Act cover it and more. When the standard of vitality is fixed, it does not matter whether the loss of vitality is due to the age of the seed or to any other cause. By the amendments to the Act, the percentage of vitality in the seed is fixed. In the case my hon. friend refers to, there are some seeds which are perfectly good for many years, while others are not good for more than one year. The average buyer is not usually aware which seeds are good for many years and which seeds are good for only one year; but the law, as we propose to make it, will require a certain percentage of the seeds in each package to be vital. In that way the buyer is protected better than he would be by having the date put on the package. I may say that in the discussion which occurred before this amendment was decided upon, with the seed growers and the seed users, especially in Ontario, where the seed commissioner met these people, that point of the date was not insisted upon or asked for.

Mr. BLAIN. I can understand very well that those engaged in the seed trade would not ask for it.

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking of those who buy the seed.

Mr. BLAIN. But the legislation of the government does not always meet the requirements of the farmers. The minister's explanation is satisfactory to those who understand it; but the farmer or market gardener would have to wait one year to find out whether there was vitality in the seed or not, whereas it would be a plain measure of protection to him if the date were on the package. As my hon. friend knows, these seeds are sold by every class of merchant: the druggist has them on his counter, and these people do not make any pretense of knowing anything about them. A child comes in and buys a package of seeds for five or ten cents and takes it to the gardener, who plants it. I do not see any objection to requiring the date to be put on the package, and I think it would be of great value and quite satisfactory to the purchasers of seeds. I am quite sure that many of these seeds are kept in warehouses for years until every particle of vitality has left them.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend must not suppose that we have been discussing this matter chiefly with the men who sell seeds. The representations that have come to us have been largely those of the association known as the Vegetable Growers of Ontario. They are the purchasers of seeds in large quantities, and they are especially interested in the seeds being right. They have not asked that the date should be put on the packages and do not think it necessary. I am afraid it would be a delusion rather than a protection. There would be nothing to prevent false dates being put on packages of seeds offered for sale. Of course, we could make that a criminal offence. But at the same time it would be almost impossible for us to prove it. No analysis we could make would prove that they had actually put the old seeds in. All we can prove is whether the seeds are vital or not.

Mr. BLAIN. The one would not interfere with the other.

Mr. FISHER. There is no objection to doing it if there be any way of doing it which would be of use to the purchasers. The purchaser might think he was getting protection, whereas he really was not. I would not trust the date on a packet, but the testing of the seeds in the laboratory will show whether they are vital or not. If they are vital, I do not care in what year they were grown.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not referring to the case of farmers who buy seeds in large quantities, but I am speaking of the thousands of small packages sold in small towns where they have small gardens. A

merchant lays in a stock of some hundreds of small packages of seeds. At the end of the year he puts the unsold packages away to be sold the coming year. His customers are buying the old seeds, whereas if the Act were altered so as to compel the wholesale man to put a date on each packet, the consumer would know how old the seed was which he was purchasing, and would not buy seeds which had probably lost their vitality through age.

Mr. FISHER. I am not adverse to the suggestion, and am quite willing to look into the matter. In the majority of cases at the end of the season, the packages which are not sold by the country store keeper are taken back by the wholesale merchant. There would be nothing to prevent the wholesale merchant from putting seeds taken from the package of one season into a package dated the following season.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does it work out in actual practice? Suppose the seeds are sown after they have lost their vitality through age, how is the standard enforced?

Mr. FISHER. The Act provides that any purchaser may take a sample and send it to the government laboratory and get it tested, and the results are lawful evidence in a court of justice. We prosecute in many instances, and the individual has recourse under the common law for damages. We always ask purchasers to buy their seeds long enough before seeding time to be able to send them to be tested and have a report back before they are sown. If they do not do that, it is difficult to prove the lack of vitality in the seeds.

Resolution read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 55) to amend the Seed Control Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT—IMPORTATION OF CIGARETTES.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). What difference will this Bill make in respect of the sale of cigarettes in Canada?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It will have no effect that I can see.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, why the change?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We are providing for the admission of cigarettes in packages of twenty-five. There is no provision now, and we have no inland revenue stamp to put on packages of twenty-five. Consequently, when such packages come in, they have to be broken up at the custom House and repacked, so that we may put stamps on them in conformity with the law. Whether the change will have any effect on the sale of cigarettes, I do not know positively, but I do not think it will.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). It seems to me that it might have a very material effect. To reduce the size of the package, the minister will see, will be to facilitate the sale of cigarettes which the minister does not desire to encourage.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think the hon. member's argument is sound. There are already packages smaller than twenty-five—the package of ten is probably the commonest package. The sale of cigarettes has decreased by about 30,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not a cigarette smoker and am not informed as to the handling of them.

Mr. BLAIN. At whose request was this change made?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. At the request of the importers. Hon. members will see that it is quite lawful to import cigarettes, and the law provides in what sized packages they shall be stamped. There is no provision for a package of twenty-five, and when such packages come in there is the expense and trouble of repacking. The importers request that this should be changed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Without wishing to delay the House, at this stage of the Bill, I would like to present a few considerations with regard to the treaty generally and also to refer briefly to one or two remarks made on the second reading by hon. members opposite. The Prime Minister and his colleagues laboured to show that this was a very good treaty in the interests of Canada and especially of the agricultural classes. Although I was not in the House when the treaty was first brought down two years ago, and had an open mind on the subject to some extent, I have failed to be convinced that there is strong reason for ratifying the treaty at the present time. I speak particularly from the point of view of one industry with which I have been connected for some time,

fruit-growing, and especially the culture of the grape. While, in British Columbia, we are not very heavily interested as yet in the production of grapes, in my old home district, the Niagara peninsula, this is a very important industry. There are at present about 18,000 acres in vineyards, the land used being expensive, with fairly expensive methods of cultivation involving some years before any results are obtained. I remember when, in 1883-86, the grape-growers, of whom I was one, were fortunate enough to get from eight cents to ten cents per pound for their crop. Naturally, this price decreased as the area of cultivation was extended, until, in 1890, the price obtainable was only about four cents gradually decreasing to less than a cent and a half. At these figures, it was problematical whether there would be any return to the grower. It was at this time that the wine-making industry was inaugurated, improving the market and affording relief to the growers. Another assistance to the growers was the establishment of the canning industry. The effect of these new industries was to steady the whole market for our fruits by relieving congestion and taking care of what would otherwise have been a surplus product. The result was better prices for the product and a stimulus to the industry generally. So far as the grape-growing industry in Ontario is concerned, the effect of this treaty must be to unsettle the minds of those embarked in this wine industry. In the fruit district in which I lived, one manufacturer was crushing from 400 to 600 tons of grapes every season. It can easily be understood what a relief it would be to the growers to have such a market for their product. As I understand the matter, these wine-producers apprehend that the lighter wines of France, those under twenty per cent proof spirit on which the duty is reduced, will have the effect of increasing the competition with not the most desirable class of French wines. Feeling that, as I believe they have ground to feel, they believe that the treaty is not a good one for this country as it affects the grape-growers. And the same may be said to some extent in regard to the canning industry especially as regards vegetables.

Now, I wish to refer to one or two things that were said in the debate yesterday. So far as I can find out, the attitude taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) may, to some extent, be the true one. That hon. member says that this treaty is neither good nor bad; it does not offer any great advantages nor does it involve any serious disadvantages. But I understand that it is to cost, indirectly, something like $200,000 a year—that is, in subsidy to a line of steamships. They also indulged in heavy expenditures for our plenipotentiaries when they went at great expense to this country to put that treaty through. I have been unable to see that the cost in connection with these two matters will not far more than outweigh any monetary benefit we will gain under the treaty. If we come to some of the remarks that were made by the Minister of Customs yesterday in pointing out some of the expected benefits, they were effectually dispelled, so far as cattle are concerned, by the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), who stated that Canada could not expect to get any benefit from trade with France in respect to our cattle. So out goes from the argument one of the chief benefits which we were told would come to us from this treaty. If there was one part of that treaty which seemed to promise us any benefit, it might be in fat cattle. But here again we find that little consideration has also been knocked out by the supplementary treaty. I think, however, that my hon. friends opposite have themselves been the prodigal sons and have sacrificed the fatted calf in this respect on behalf of the French government.

Now let me refer to another matter. I was much struck with the speech of my right hon. friend the first minister. He addressed himself to the argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who had said that in the main France was a self-supporting country, and being largely agricultural she would not therefore require many of our agricultural products. If I understand the right hon gentleman aright, he gave us to understand that France was the very reverse of such a country, and the fact that she imported such an enormous amount of agricultural products was a proof that she would become a most valuable market for our agriculturists. Now, if the right hon. gentleman will allow me to say it, I think his remarks were rather disingenuous, because while it is true that he was careful to speak of the imports of France—and I do not dispute his figures—he forgot to make any mention of her exports, which would put a different face on the whole situation. Let me take up one or two items. I will take an item which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs spread himself over, and that is butter. It is perfectly true, as he said, that large quantities of butter are imported into France. But far from that fact promising us a heavy market in France for our butter, I think the contrary will be the case. Now, I am not quoting from last year's imports into France, but I have before me the Statistical Abstract published by the British government, covering each year from 1896 to 1906. I find that while France, in 1906, imported actually 15,964,000 francs worth of butter, she exported in the same year 53,972,000 francs worth of butter.

Now I will take up the question of eggs. It is rather astonishing to me to infer from the First Minister's remarks that the

French hen was by no means equal to the occasion, that she was not laying enough eggs to supply the French people, and the Canadian hen, therefore, would find lots of room for her products in that market. I think the first minister stated that about 6,000,000 francs worth of eggs were imported into France. Well, in 1906 I find no entry of the import of eggs, but when I turn to her exports of eggs, I find that France in that same year exported 14,720,000 francs worth. I might go on and follow down this table and deal with eggs, fruit, vegetables and things of that kind, which would show similar results. When we come to the item of potatoes, I find that France although no figure is given here of imports, exported 28,000,000 francs worth in 1906. She also exported 12,000,000 francs worth of fruit and vegetables over and above the value of her imports in those lines. I think the House will at all events get some clear idea of the nature of the first minister's argument, and will agree that it was rather misleading. We might have assumed that France was importing much in excess of what she was exporting, and that therefore we would find a ready market for our agricultural products in her market, whereas the contrary is evidently the case. In the markets of Great Britain you will find that France is our most serious competitor in respect of many of those articles. No member of the government will attempt to argue that France offers us a better market for grain than the world's great market where we all have to meet each other on an equal footing. France does not give any inducement or any lower tariff to Canadian grain.

There was another thing which struck me as rather strange. The first minister took occasion to animadvert on the attitude of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he said that my hon friend had been doing a great deal of talking against the French treaty, and yet he was perfectly sure that he would vote for it. But surely the first minister is the last gentleman in the world who should find fault with people who talk a long time one way and then vote another way. When we look at the hon. gentleman's career, and remember that in 1896 he talked for two or three months steadily in one direction and then voted in exactly the opposite direction, and when we remember how often since 1896 up to 1909 he has voted and acted contrary to his previously expressed principles, we must admit that he is not in a position to criticise my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. It does seem strange to me that the Minister of Customs, who in stentorian tones—I think that is the proper word—previously to 1896 almost shouted himself hoarse in advocating free trade if possible, is now shouting himself hoarse in exactly the opposite direction.

It is an extraordinary thing, and I will be only too glad if, when they come to speak to the farmers in connection with this treaty, they will make some effort to show what they mean by free trade. In 1906, when they were talking about revising the tariff, a large meeting of farmers in Toronto expressed their views to the government on tariff matters. I find here a little article in the official organ of the Liberal party, the Toronto 'Globe':

> The memorial declares a genuine alarm at the aggressive campaign of the protected interests, cites the promise that protection was to be only a temporary aid to allow the manufacturers to secure a foothold, and points out in contrast the continuous demand of the full grown and even gigantic industries for greater favours. It is argued that the protection accorded by the tariff enables manufacturers of certain classes of agricultural implements to charge Canadian consumers 25 per cent more than the value of the articles, and permits an overcharge of from 30 per cent to nearly 50 per cent on the cheaper lines of farm carriages.

I must say that one of the most singular phenomena, I think, in the whole history of our trade matters and our fiscal matters in Canada is the fact that gentlemen like my hon. friend the Minister of Customs who, as I say, talks himself hoarse previous to 1896 saying that he was going to abolish all these things, now stands up in this House to speak on behalf of those who are protected at the rate of thirty and even thirty-five per cent. This is the position that I find in connection with this treaty, and I have to apologize for taking up so much of the time of the House. I do not believe the treaty will be any good when it goes into operation, but I do believe that in some degree it will do a certain amount of injury to the agricultural classes, and that is the explanation of my complaint against it.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The particular point with which my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) began his speech, that is the objection of the grape growing industry, was very fully considered when this treaty was before the House in its earlier stages. I remember that a deputation of gentlemen representing that very important industry came down to Ottawa and were heard at very great length. It was not unnatural that they should be somewhat anxious about that particular part of the treaty to which my hon. friend refers. I remember that when the treaty of 1893 was adopted by the House there was similar alarm on the part of the grape growers of the country; yet, I think that experience has shown that they probably did not suffer anything like the injury that they had anticipated. I will not undertake to speak for the grape growers, but I think I am justi-

fied in saying that the full discussion of the question that took place at that time tended to relieve their anxiety. They made at the same time one or two suggestions as to advantages which they thought might properly be conceded to them, to relieve them of what they thought might be an embarrassment and a disadvantage. Their suggestions in that direction were very carefully considered. Although the moment for action has not yet arrived I think I can safely say, as to one particular thing which they desired, that there is every disposition on the part of the government to meet them and that we anticipate that by the time this treaty is finally dealt with in such form as to make it effective such concessions will be granted to the grape growers or the wine makers—probably I should say the wine makers, although both interests are very closely identified—as will make them reasonably satisfied, and I anticipate that we shall not hear any serious complaints from them.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that experience had demonstrated that the treaty had not done them any harm. Have there been any importations of wine under the original treaty since we discussed the question two years ago?

Mr. FIELDING. The explanation is to be found in the fact that Canada is not a wine drinking country. The fear that large quantities of these French wines would come in was expressed when the treaty of 1893 was before the House, and yet I think statistics will show that the importation of these wines did not greatly increase. I have no doubt that we will have the same experience under this treaty. Our friends the French are producers of wines and naturally they will ask in making a treaty that regard shall be had to the things which are their particular specialties. Whilst they asked for some concession on wines we felt that we might give to them that, but at the same time we frankly told them that Canada is not a great wine growing country, nor a wine consuming country to any large degree.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that concession greater than they had under the treaty of 1893?

Mr. FIELDING. I presented the figures when the treaty was up for discussion and they will show as to that, but my recollection is that there was no very material increase in the consumption of the light French wines. Even though the treaty did give them some advantage our people are not a wine drinking people to any great extent. There may be some increase; if it were not so I suppose the French people would not have desired it. But, I do not think there is going to be any alarming increase in the drinking of wines because of this treaty. If our people want to drink they will drink other things which perhaps are not so good for them as these light wines would be.

But, the argument for this treaty may be put in a rather brief form. Suppose we begin by asking ourselves: Is it desirable that we should have a commercial treaty with France? I am sure there is hardly a member of the House who will say 'no' to that proposition. Almost every member who addressed the House, while taking exception to some particular part of the treaty, said: Surely, we want a treaty with France. Let us assume that that is unanimously agreed to or nearly so; are we satisfied that the present treaty is sufficient? Any hon. gentleman who will give the matter his careful consideration must reach the conclusion that the old treaty, which may have had some good qualities, which was a step in the right direction, was a very incomplete and unsatisfactory treaty and that if we desired to have a treaty with France it should be a broader one than the old treaty of 1893. The world has moved since that period. I am not attacking the treaty of 1893, I am not finding any fault with it, I am simply pointing out that whatever may have been its value since that time circumstances have changed and it fails to meet the conditions of the present day. If we want a new treaty we must learn to give and take. It is the easiest thing in the world to say: Why did you not do this, and why did you not get that? Anybody who has to do with bargaining in any way knows that it takes two to make a bargain, and I think that would be a reasonable view to take in reference to this question, and that we should ask ourselves if the Canadian government, by making every reasonable effort, have been able to secure such concessions as seem to promise now or in the future some advantage to Canadian trade. I might put it to a test in this way: Would any hon. gentleman stop and think and ask himself what article of Canadian output, in the way of agricultural produce, or the produce of our factories, or our mines, or the sea, would he desire to see sent to France which is not included in the treaty? Although hon. gentlemen may think there are things in the treaty which are not of great value, it will be difficult, I think, for any hon. gentleman, who will give the question careful attention, to name an article which Canada is now exporting that is not included in the treaty. If that be true then I think it is not unreasonable to believe——

Mr. BLAIN. What about fatted cattle?

Mr. FIELDING. I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) frankly that while we

thought it desirable that cattle should be included we were by no means sure that we were going to do a great trade in that, and when I found that a small concession upon that point would be the means of disarming hostility in the French Senate I had to ask the question: Is this privilege a valuable one? I made the most careful inquiry I could make, from my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike)—though I did not come into immediate touch with him—and I ascertained that that gentleman, from his own personal experience, was able to certify that the privilege of selling fatted cattle in France was not a valuable privilege, and was one, which, if given to us under the treaty, we were not likely to exercise. Therefore, we were making a concession which served a very excellent purpose from the point of view of our French friends, but which from the point of view of Canada was not of very great importance.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he could name a list of articles produced upon the Canadian farm in which the trade with France will increase because of this treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not going to boast of that. The worst that can be said of these things is that we get the privilege of the treaty for them. If we cannot do any business in that line nobody is hurt.

Now, hon. gentlemen call our attention to the fact, and dwell upon it, that we put grain in the treaty—that we have the benefit of the minimum tariff on grain. But they say there is no minimum tariff on grain in France and some ungenerous soul said that you are humbugging the people, you are conveying the impression that you are getting a concession on grain when you are getting none at all. That is a very short sighted view of the situation. Suppose we had not put grain on the list. France would have been free to enter into an arrangement with the United States and give them a concession on grain and would have been free to deny it to Canada. And so we stipulated that although we get no concession to-day grain should be put on the list in order that if at any time France should grant a concession on that article to any country in the wide world, she must also give it to Canada. Is that not something of value to us? Suppose we had proceeded differently. Suppose we had left grain out of the matter altogether, and suppose a year later our enterprising American brethren should make a new treaty—and they are trying to make a treaty now—in which they obtained a lower rate on their grain than we had on Canadian grain entering France, every hon. gentlemen opposite would have stood up and said: What were these men about, why had they not sense enough to foresee that condition and guard against it? We happily did see it and guarded against it. It gives us no concession for the moment, it does not give any advantage, the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Burrell) is quite right in saying that on grain we are not getting more than any other country is going to get. Sir, no nation, least of all a great nation like France, will give to any country a monoply of its trade. All that any country can expect to get is the agreement that at any time she shall not be placed at a disadvantage as compared with any other country. That guarantee we have secured as respects the articles mentioned in the treaty. But there is another consideration of great importance which has not been referred to in the recent discussion. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said it was very desirable that Canada should make many treaties of commerce with the nations of the world. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) specialized. He said: You ought not to mind this French treaty but ought to make a large, liberal treaty with Germany. I shall not stop to say whether he was right or wrong. The reasons why we dealt with France and did not for the moment deal with Germany are well understood. I hope we will yet be able, in due course, to deal with Germany. But I wish to point out the effect of the various criticisms that have been offered. Suppose we had taken the view of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) had agreed to make a treaty with Germany and granted certain concessions in our markets to Germany, I wonder if my hon. friend is aware that we would then have been obliged to give every concession thus granted to Germany to France without any return at all? There is in the old treaty of 1893 a provision—again I say I am not finding fault with it, at the time it may have been the best for the moment—which is the strongest justification of our making a new treaty. The old treaty of 1893 contains this clause:

> Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, shall be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria, and the French colonies.

Observe the wording, 'any commercial advantage.' That was not a reciprocal privilege. There is no clause in that treaty which says that any commercial advantage granted by France to any foreign country shall be granted to Canada. There is a condition in it that if any commercial advantage be granted by France as respects the small list—and it was a very small list—of articles mentioned, to any other country, then on the items in that small list, Canada should get an equal advantage. But for all the thousand and one things outside of that small list, France was left free to discriminate against Canada. But:

Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power especially in tariff matters shall be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria and the French colonies.

My hon. friends will see that while that clause remained in the treaty unrepealed, while that treaty remained outstanding—and it is outstanding and in operation to-day—if we had made a treaty with Germany as suggested by the hon. member for East Lambton, every concession that we granted to Germany in that treaty we would be obliged to give to France—and we would get nothing in return. The argument of my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was deeper and wider. He said it was desirable that we should make treaties with all the nations. Very well, the more treaties you make the stronger my argument becomes. If you had made a treaty with Germany, with Belgium, with Italy, with the United States, with any country in the world, then whatever advantage you gave to that country in the markets of Canada, for compensation which might have been adequate, you would be obliged to give to France without any compensation at all. That is the position to-day and is the strongest argument that this old treaty should be got rid of. We went to the French government and said: That is not a fair deal, that is not reciprocity; you give us favoured-nation treatment upon a few small items, and we, in return, have been obliged to give you favoured-nation treatment upon the whole range of your products; we think that is not fair, we do not think that you should ask us to do it any longer and we ask you to make it reciprocal. And now it is reciprocal. We have an agreement that upon the list of articles mentioned in that treaty, upon one side or the other, there shall be favoured nation treatment. That is to say, if France shall grant to any country any favour of a commercial character with respect to any one of the items named in that list of our Canadian products, she must also give that advantage to Canada; and, per contra, if we grant any favour to any country as respects the corresponding list on the other side of the treaty, we must also give that to France. That is reciprocity, that is fair. This is an aspect of the question that I would like my hon. friends opposite to understand. I am sure they will see the reasonableness of my argument. While the old treaty remains we are crippled, we cannot negotiate with any foreign country because any concession that we might grant to any foreign country we would be obliged to give to France for nothing. I think that argument is exceedingly strong; to my mind it is one of the strongest arguments in favour of getting rid of the old treaty and adopting the new one.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not have been perfectly possible for the minister to get rid of the old treaty without making a new one?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and if we got rid of the old treaty we would be in the position that at any time other countries could get an advantage in the markets of France that we could not get. We could have asked the British government to denounce the treaty, and I have no doubt they would have done so, although they would be reluctant to adopt such a course. They would have done so, I have no doubt, because it is their pride and our pride to recognize the fact that in all these matters affecting trade, the imperial government desires us to have and exercise the largest possible measure of independence. The freedom which Great Britain now gives us in the negotiation of these treaties is something for which we should all be grateful and proud, and I am sure if we had asked Great Britain to denounce that treaty she would have done so—but would have done so with great reluctance. As was pointed out by one hon. gentleman who spoke yesterday, after years of estrangement France and Great Britain had been brought together and there seemed to be a prospect that they would now work together for their mutual advantage and the promotion of the peace of the world. At such a time it would not have been wise for Canada to have asked for the denunciation of that treaty.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. Might I ask the minister if the wine growers in Canada are to have the same advantages as the wine growers in France in regard to the excise on the alcohol that is necessary for the fortification of the wine?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there has been a misunderstanding. The wine growers were of opinion and represented to us that in France those who produced wine were permitted to take alcohol in bond for the purpose of fortifying their wines, and the wine growers of Canada asked for a similar concession here. I investigated the matter and found that they were mistaken, that the wine growers of France did not enjoy any such advantage. On that point I think the wine growers are now satisfied that they were mistaken and they are not asking that concession. They are asking a concession of another character which I think is reasonable and which I hope may be granted to them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the nature of that concession?

Mr. FIELDING. It was in regard to the use of sugar. If we can make proper customs regulations to guard against abuse,

we are desirous of exempting from duty the sugar which they may use in the production of their wine.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings, Quebec—Quebec detention hospital in Savard Park—repairs, &c., $1,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works.) This amount is required for repairs, and also to build a proper fence around the lower portion of the yard. This is under the Immigration Department.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the building worth?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a two story brick building on a stone foundation, 115 feet in length by 100 feet in breadth. I do not know the cost of it.

Quebec immigration buildings—additions, renewals, repairs, &c., $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an appropriation for 1909 of $7,500, and there was expended up to the 31st of March, $2,180.95; so that there remains of that vote $5,319.05. It is proposed to spend $2,000 in building a covered way to the building, $595 on the old Marine hospital and $3,419.30 on the immigration buildings generally. This is asked for by the Department of Interior.

Quebec observatory—renewal of water supply pipe, &c., $1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked to make provision for the renewal of 1,200 feet of water-supply pipe which runs from the Grande Allée to the observatory.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of the pipe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three-inch cast-iron pipe. The cost of the pipe is $600 and the cost of the excavation $1 per running foot.

Mr. FOSTER. How deep do you go?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Below the frost line, I would suppose five or six feet.

Quebec post office—elevator, improvements, repairs and fittings, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked to make provision towards placing an additional story on the head post office building, also to provide an elevator to the ground floor, first and second floors and the attic, also rewiring the building for electric light, and repointing the exterior wall. The total expenditure up to the 31st of October, 1909, was $14,224.62. The estimated cost of rewiring the building is $1,800; raising one story of the extension at the rear, 66 feet by 35 feet, $12,000; providing for hot water, $1,000; repointing the exterior of the building, $5,000; steamfittings, $1,500; contingencies, $1,644. That makes the total cost of the proposed improvements $37,168.62. Then there is the expenditure from 1st April, 1908, to 31st October, 1908, $14,224.62; assumed expenditure to March 31, 1909, $1,794; revote, $7,000; new vote, $13,000. Total, $36,018.62, which still leaves an estimated amount of $1,150 to complete the improvements.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you get in the way of space?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We get an additional story on the extension in the rear of 66 feet by 35. This accommodation is very much required by both the Post Office Department and the Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you get any other extension besides that rear extension?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the only one. We are also putting an elevator into the building and making quite a number of improvements indicated in the details I have given.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the whole?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st March, $298,000. That of course runs over many years.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be in pretty bad state of repairs now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It requires considerable repairs.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is it used for a post office alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is used for post office and customs purposes.

Quebec custom house, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to enter upon the restoration of the customs house in the city of Quebec which was partially destroyed in the recent fire. At first it was thought we might repair the present building, and this amount was inserted in the estimates for this purpose, but we have had very strong representations on behalf of the Harbour Commissioners that we should acquire a site and erect a custom house in another portion of the city. It is urged that the present site would afford terminal railway facilities to the Transcontinental and it would be very much better for us to build a custom House in some other place. That matter is under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we enter upon the construction of a new customs house, that would cost in the vicinity of half a million dollars. If we repair the present customs

house, that will cost between $50,000 and $75,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very important that we should repair the old house unless we have money to burn. Here you have a customs house, which is pretty well situated, and, although injured by fire, may be repaired at a trifling cost. If the minister can do his work there fairly well, we should consider very carefully before going into an expenditure of half a million dollars because the Harbour Board wants us to do so. There does not seem to be any limit at all to the excursions which the Minister of Public Works is willing to take in the matter of public buildings.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I understood the minister to say that the customs work was done elsewhere and that this building was simply down at the shipping centre for the use of landing waiters. My opinion is that it has no business to be down there. There ought to be a building rented or some other provision made for having that building in another part of the city. I understand the customs house is in connection with the post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They use the customs house proper for offices.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for a warehouse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are customs officials who have offices in the building. The post office is used simply for the postal parcel business in connection with the customs.

Mr. FOSTER. What was this place used for which was damaged by fire?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I might be allowed to make a few remarks regarding the manner in which the question of removal has come up. Immediately after the fire, which destroyed a very considerable amount of other property, the question occurred to the Transcontinental Commissioners and the Harbour Board whether it would not be desirable to utilize the space burnt over in connection with railway terminal facilities for the Transcontinental. It has been represented to me that, in the opinion both of the Harbour Board and the Transcontinental Commissioners, there is no part of the city which could afford as good opportunities for providing these terminal facilities as this area which has been burnt over. If that part were selected for the terminal facilities, that would necessitate the removal of the customs house to another place. I do not wish to be understood as saying that this site will be given over to the Transcontinental or the Harbour Commission. If they take it, they will have to pay the Department of Public Works what the property is fairly worth. If it should form part of the Transcontinental railway terminal facilities, of course the Grand Trunk Pacific will pay a rental on the cost. It is a matter of very great importance. It has not yet been decided what we shall do, but it is certainly worthy of most careful consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Customs require a half million dollar building there?

Mr. PATERSON. That matter is with the Public Works Department. I do not know what the building may cost.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to say that he abdicates his position entirely with reference to the working of his department in this respect and leaves the matter to the Minister of Public Works? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) is responsible to the country for the expenditure of his department, and he must have an idea what facilities he requires. Does he want a half million dollar plant, or will a less expensive one do?

Mr. PATERSON. I am responsible for the expenditure of my department, but this does not pertain to the expenditure of my department. We have been burned out and must go somewhere. We are temporarily using the present premises, I fear at great inconvenience to the officers. We wished to rent a building there, but the commissioner thought—and his opinion was concurred in by the Public Works Department—that the rent was such that it was not advisable for us to pay it. What we want is to have a custom house in which the business can be properly transacted.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. minister think would be a proper provision to give him a place for his work? Does he think it would cost half a million dollars?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot express an opinion on that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, better let this item stand in the meantime until the Minister of Customs has made up his mind. For I am ready to fight this thing all winter, if necessary, unless we get the views of the Minister of Customs as to what he wants. This method under which the minister whose work is to be done has no wish, desire or plan as to the buildings to be erected for the work of his department, but leaves it entirely with another minister, is one which we have not recognized in this House. This building, if required at all, is required for the work of the Department of Customs. The Minister of Customs, as the head of that department, is the man who ought to requisition the Minister of Public Works for a sufficient building for the service.

Mr. PATERSON. That is what we have done.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, does the hon. minister agree that an expenditure of half a million will be required?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not seen either the estimates or the plans.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I think the estimates and the plans had better wait.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can satisfy the hon. member (Mr. Foster). When the estimates were made up and this item of $50,000 put in, the money was intended to repair the custom house building which had been injured by the fire. Since that time, we have had this urgent request to remove the custom house to another site. If we do that, it will necessitate the erection of a new building. In that case, of course, we would sell the present site and building for what they are worth to either the Harbour Commissioners or the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway. But, before I can properly ask this committee for a vote to erect a new building, I ought to be in a position to state definitely the character of that building and where it is to be erected. Therefore, I would say to the committee that unless we utilize this vote of $50,000 to repair the present custom house we will let the item lapse and come to the House and ask for another appropriation for the new building.

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly fair. Now, all we have to look at is the sum of $50,000. Is that sum required to repair the present building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the architect's estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the figures in detail?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the details of that estimate before me. But I may say that the attic and half the first floor were completely destroyed.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $400,000.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister will make it clear in the item that this is for repairs, that will make it all right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the committee will take my assurance upon that. I do not feel competent to alter the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. But——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says so, the alteration can be made.

Mr. FIELDING. So long as the amount is not changed, or the meaning destroyed, it can be done.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, there is no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item will read:

Quebec custom house—repairs, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest that we pass over the items for military buildings and go on with that relating to the Quebec East public building.

Quebec East—public building, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the completion of the public building now being erected on the corner of St. Joseph and Dorchester streets in Quebec East, frequently spoken of as St. Roch. The building is required for post office purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Post office purposes alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The building is to be 49 feet by 48 feet 3 inches; three stories and basement; wall of brick faced with cut stone on the street fronts and stone dressings on the remainder. The estimated cost is as follows: Site, $23,400; legal services, printing, advertising and architect's commission, $1,006.50; paid to the contractor on account of his contract to October 31 last, $18,680, making a total expenditure to that date of $43,086.50. The amount due on the contract is $29,031. We have been obliged to purchase additional land which cost us $3,770. The cost of heating and boilers will be $2,500; electric wiring and fixtures, $1,000; fittings, furniture and lock-boxes, $5,000; sidewalks and fences, $1,000; contingencies and superintendence, $8,319. This makes a total estimated cost, including site, of $9,762.50. The total expenditure to October 31, already given, is $43,086; estimated expenditure prior to March 31, 1910, $10,676, so that this vote of $40,000, of which $20,000 is a revote, will make up the entire expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $47,711.

Mr. FOSTER. How did the minister get the site, $27,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $23,400 was the first payment. The site was valued by arbitrators.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the reason for the additional $3,770?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We found, in locating the building, that the lot was not quite large enough, the site would be cramped, and we had to purchase additional land.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the dimensions of the first site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 66 feet frontage on the two streets, the lot is 66 feet square. Then it was decided to set the building back a little from the street, and we found there was not space enough in the rear, and we had to buy an addition of 10 feet, I think, in order to give the requisite light.

Mr. MAGRATH. Does the minister know the revenue of that postal division?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For 1908-9 it was $14,623,-60. Money orders issued, $70,692; money orders paid, $7,484. It is a very important division of the city of Quebec. As hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware, by reason of the configuration of the city, there are to all intents and purposes so far as post office requirements are concerned two cities, there is an upper city and a lower city. The erection of this building has been strongly urged by the Postmaster General, and he satisfied the department that it was absolutely essential for the accommodation of the public.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population to be served by that office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 40,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the $47,000 contract cover the heating and wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, just the building.

Mr. CROCKET. Were tenders called for heating, wiring and other matters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the minister think the language of this item is rather indefinite? It says: 'Quebec East, public building'. It does not say whether it is for a post office or not. Does he not think we should specify what the money is required for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is only one public building in Quebec East, that is the building under contract. Last session we put in a vote in exactly the same terms, so I do not think it would be desirable to make any change.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that you add the words 'post office' after the words 'public building'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no objection to adding those words.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the present cost of the service, and where is it being carried on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In St. Roch, the rent paid for the post office is $700 per annum, in St. Sauveur, $225. The total is $925. This one building will accommodate both divisions.

Mr. MAGRATH. The minister said the Postmaster General supported the construction of this building. Is it the custom of the Department of Public Works always to get the support of the Postmaster General before post offices are constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not always.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this building was planned, was there any communication between the Department of Public Works and the Postmaster General as to the nature and kind of building he wanted in which to carry on the post office work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there were a number of consultations, in which the Postmaster General informed us what was the accommodation required; and plans were submitted to the Post Office Department and approved.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the minister sees what he is doing. Whereas to-day you are paying less than $1,000 for accommodation, the yearly cost of this new building will be close on $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend estimates a 10 per cent basis, I think that is considerably too high.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so, from 30 years experience. It will come to that.

Mr. BLAIN. How are sites of buildings of this kind selected in the province of Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same as in all the the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. In the province of Quebec are sites furnished by municipalities free to the government, or does the government pay for them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not observed any difference in the custom in the province of Quebec from the custom in other provinces. Sometimes the sites are furnished. I can call to mind cases in which sites have been furnished by municipalities in Quebec as well as in other provinces.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the rule?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The rule is that the department purchases the sites in all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. In St. Catharines, two years ago, the government insisted on the city paying $6,500 for the land before they would erect a public building. That is in Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter of agreement. In Quebec there are large numbers of public buildings constructed on sites which are purchased by the Crown. I have now in mind Shawenegan Falls, in

the province of Quebec, where the county and the municipality furnished the site free. In Iberville I think the same way. I have never found that there is any difference between one province and another in that respect. Occasionally sites are furnished free, but in most cases we have to buy them.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand the minister to say that this price was fixed by arbitration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. How are the arbitrators appointed—one by the Department of Public Works and one by the owner of the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and these two generally chose a third.

Mr. CROCKET. The property not expropriated but submitted to arbitration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the price agreed upon.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the minister able to state that the price fixed by arbitration was greater or smaller than the price offered by the owner?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is that the owner did not make any offer as to the price he required because he was informed by the department that it would be necessary to fix the value by arbitration.

Mr. CROCKET. Who were the arbitrators? The minister having in mind the fact that they were very able men should remember the names.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I satisfied myself that the department was represented by a thoroughly competent and reliable man, but I cannot at present give my hon. friend the name because I have no memorandum of it. I would have no objection at all to submitting the name later on.

Mr. BLAIN. The reason I ask the minister if there is any difference in the selection of sites in the province of Quebec and other provinces is on account of an article that I have before me from the province of Ontario. It says:

Fergus post office—Liberals hold meeting to decide on the site.

Fergus, Dec. 1.—A public meeting of local Liberals was held to-night for the purpose of recommending to the government a site for the proposed post office. Four sites were voted upon, the final vote giving the Monroe property a majority of six over the Watt property.

It seems to be the policy at Fergus in Ontario, that when a site is to be selected the Liberals are called together, the different sites are submitted and voted upon, and I suppose that the policy will be that the majority shall rule. I want to know whether the same policy is applied in Quebec and other provinces or whether the minister is going to abolish this in favour of the new policy which he is introducing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no policy in Ontario, or any other province, by which we accept the recommendation of the Liberal committee or of anybody else in the locality as to the selection of a site. Of course, we cannot prevent people in a locality, no matter what political party they belong to, making a recommendation as to what, in their judgment, would be the best site for a public building. But we do in every case send one of our own officials to make an examination of the site, to compare the price at which one site can be obtained with that asked for other eligible sites and to make his report and recommendation as to which in his judgment is most desirable for the public building. In the case of Fergus we sent a very experienced representative of the department to that town and it was upon his examination and report that the purchase of the property was made.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend state to the committee which of these properties was selected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will come to that when we reach the Ontario items, and I would ask my hon. friend to wait.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite willing, only I want to give a note of warning to my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the information.

Mr. BLAIN. I hope my hon. friend will state whether it was the Munro site or the Watt site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will.

Mr. BLAIN. Then we are to understand that in no province of Canada are the local Liberals consulted with respect to the location of sites?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not say that. My hon. friend will see the reason. It might very well be that when our representative goes into a locality he naturally confers with the most intelligent, the most influential and the most disinterested people, and he would get their views.

Mr. BLAIN. If that is the policy of my hon. friend it would not take his officers long to consult the Liberals of Ontario now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That makes the work easier.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, it makes it easier and very much cheaper for my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. Did my hon. friend state what the dimensions of this lot were?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 66 feet square and then we made a subsequent purchase of 10 feet.

Mr. MONK. At what price per foot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The first purchase amounted to $23,400. That would be about $6 per square foot. The second purchase was made at $6.50 per square foot.

Mr. CROCKET. Was it a vacant lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may have been some cheap buildings upon it, but it was practically a vacant lot.

Mr. BLAIN. The member for the city (Mr. Turcotte) is suggesting what the site is. I think it would be only fair to the committee, he being a resident of the city, that he would explain it.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. It is a very simple thing to explain this matter. St. Roch, as hon. gentlemen know is represented by the right hon. the Prime Minister. It was proposed a long time ago to have a public building erected there. A new post office is necessary there because the main post office is now in the upper part of the city and this is a very important business centre. At present there are two post offices; one in St. Roch and one in St. Sauveur. As the result of an agreement these two services were combined and it was proposed to erect one new post office on the main street of St. Roch, St. Joseph street, in the centre of a locality where there are many important industrial establishments, a large population and extensive commerce. The price was not very high. It was fixed by arbitrators and I can assure the committee that it was agreed by all people in that locality that this action of the government was in the public interest. The building is not quite finished and all the commercial and industrial people in the locality are anxious to get the benefit of this new public building. Commerce in that locality is increasing rapidly and population is also increasing and so it is fair to say that the action of the government was a proper one.

Some resolutions reported.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 2, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—REPRESENTATION OF QUEBEC EAST AND OTTAWA.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) yesterday, (December 1), called my attention, as a matter of privilege, to the position of another hon. member of this House who had been returned for two constituencies and had not yet declared or elected for which of the two constituencies he would continue to retain his seat.

The contention was made that a certain sessional order of the House of Commons of Great Britain, requiring a member under such circumstances if within one week that it should be made to appear that there was no question as to his return, &c., was applicable to the case referred to inasmuch as such a case was not provided for by the rules and orders of this House. Rule No. 1 of this House is as follows:

> In all cases not provided for hereinafter or by sessional or other orders, the rules, usages and forms of proceeding of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the first day of July, 1867, shall be followed.

In the imperial parliament the matter under consideration is dealt with by sessional orders which are renewed by the House of Commons from session to session and which expire at prorogation.

The sessional order on the subject which was, presumably, passed by the imperial House in 1867 may or may not have been in force on the first day of July in that year depending on whether the House was then in session or had been prorogued before that date. Even if that sessional order was in force on the first day of July, 1867, the question as to whether that order in all its terms is applicable to the House of Commons of Canada is one of importance and not without difficulty. As far as I have been able to ascertain in the limited time allowed me since the question was raised, I have not been able to find that it has been observed in this country. In fact, from a somewhat hasty consideration of the precedents, I think I would be safe in saying that the practice of this House as to the time in which the member's choice shall be made, has been far from uniform and to the present time no formal ruling on the subject has been made in this House.

The question is, are such sessional orders as are annually passed by the British House of Commons at the beginning of each session included in the meaning of the words 'rules, usages and forms of proceeding' mentioned in rule 1 of this House. Those sessional orders are clearly neither rules nor forms of proceeding nor in the strict meaning of the term are they to be considered 'usages' and consequently are not applicable to this House in cases not specifically provided for. The practice of this House has so far not recognized them as binding.

In 1873, Hon. Mr. Blake having been elected for Durham and Bruce announced his choice of constituency fifteen days after

the beginning of the session, and in 1896 Mr. Dalton McCarthy elected which of the two seats (Brandon and Simcoe) he would sit for, on the seventh day after the opening of the session. The case of the honourable the present Postmaster General, returned for both Nicolet and Gaspé in 1904, is one of the latest in point. He only resigned for Nicolet on the third of December, 1906, and after some fifteen months had elapsed during which he might have exercised his privilege of choice. No doubt a search of the journals and records would show many similar cases.

A strict adherence to the British rule would therefore to a certain extent form an alteration in the customs and usages of this House in that regard.

My ruling is, therefore, that there is nothing in the rule of this House requiring a member who has been returned for more than one constituency to elect within any prescribed time for which of such constituencies he will sit. But, in my opinion, it is eminently desirable that some definite rule and practice on the subject should be established. The House has a Standing Committee for the purpose of considering such questions—the Committee on Privileges and Elections—and I would suggest that at an early date the matter should be considered by the House, or by the committee, with a view to the fixing of a definite period within which such election is to be made.

QUESTIONS.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES ON INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. PAQUET:

How many employees of all kinds were in the service of the Intercolonial Railway and its several branches in the course of the fiscal years 1907-8, 1908-9, and the 1st October, 1909?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM :

Average number of employees of all kinds on Intercolonial railway during fiscal year 1907-8, was 8,861; during 1908-9, 9,285; until 1st October, 1909, 8,610.

W. W. KRICK, INSPECTOR, PORT MAITLAND.

Mr. LALOR :

1. Was W. W. Krick, the government inspector of Port Maitland east pier?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and on what date did he commence his duties?
3. What was the date of his resignation?
4. What was his salary and the total amount of money paid to him?
5. Did he report to the government that he was not satisfied with the work being done and giving that as his reason for resigning?

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. GRAHAM :

1. W. W. Krick was the government inspector of Port Maitland west pier (not east pier).
2. He commenced his duties 26th May, 1909.
3. He resigned by letter to superintending engineer dated 2nd September, 1909, the resignation to take effect September 4, 1909.
4. Salary $3 per day, 26th May to 30th June, 1909.

Salary $3.50 per day July 1 to September 4, 1909.

Total amount paid him $292.50.

5. No, although it appears some correspondence took place between Mr. Krick and the superintending engineer.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—BOARD OF ARBITRATORS.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE :

1. Who composes the board of arbitrators to decide the question of over-classification in the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway?
2. Should the board of arbitration find that there has been over-classification, is it the intention of the government to compel the contractors to make good the loss or is the loss to fall upon the people of Canada?
3. If the government purpose fixing the loss, if any, for this alleged over-classification upon the contractors, has the government considered the advisability of having the contractors represented by a member on the board of arbitrators

Mr. GRAHAM :

1. Gordon Grant, chief engineer, of the the National Transcontinental railway, eastern division.

B. B. Kelliher, chief engineer, of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.

Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer to the government, for the western division of the National Transcontinental railway.

2. It is thought inadvisable in the public interest to reply to this question while the matters in dispute are still being arbitrated upon.

3. The composition of the board of arbitrators is fixed by statute.

EXPORTS OF PULP AND PULP WOOD FROM SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE:

I. What quantity of pulp and pulp wood, respectively, were exported from Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, during the years 1900 and 1909, inclusive?
2. What was the value of such exports, respectively?

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

The exports of pulp wood and wood pulp from the port of Sault Ste. Marie during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, have been as follows:

	Pulp Wood.		Wood Pulp.	
	Cords.	Value.	Cords.	Value.
1900..	.....	155,614	.....	362,243
1901..	.....	80.389	.....	71 750
1902..	.....	77,584	.....	230,389
1903..	.....	22,226	.....	436,948
1904..	10,680	39,080	.....	366,441
1905..	18,694	68,605	.....	420,810
1906..	20,183	75,960	.....	499,547
(9 months)—				
1907..	9,551	42,672	.....	558,929
1908..	35,151	120,164	1,061,884	758,463
1909..	35,016	175,779	1,044,371	876,055

NOTE.—The quantity of pulp wood was not recorded during the fiscal years 1900 to 1903, inclusive.

The quantity of wood pulp was not recorded during the fiscal years 1900 to 1907, inclusive.

ACCIDENT TO LOCKS AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What investigation, if any, was made by the government into the cause of the accident which occurred during the past summer at Sault Ste. Marie, by which the gates of the Canadian locks were broken and injuries were caused to shipping in the locks? If so, when and where was the investigation held, and by whom?

2. Has any report yet been made as a result of any such investigation? If so, when was it made and where is it filed?

3. What was the total cost entailed upon the government by the accident.

4. Have any steps been taken to recover this amount from those responsible for the accident? If not, is the department contemplating taking any such steps?

5. Has the department had any correspondence with reference to recovering compensation for the loss sustained? If so. with whom and with what result?

6. Who was employed to report upon and estimate the damage caused?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. An investigation was made by the superintending enginneer of the canal under the observation of the staff.

2. Yes; a report from the superintending engineer, dated June 18, 1909, which is now on file in the department.

3. Amount of expenditure on account of the damage to date is $67,229.67.

4. Yes; the matter is now in the hands of the Department of Justice, through whom all negotiations for settlement are being made.

5. Answered by No. 4. The claim is pending for settlement.

6. The superintending engineer of the canal.

ORDNANCE STORES BUILDINGS AT OTTAWA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What are the detailed instructions to the Dominion Police as to the patrolling of the Ordnance Stores buildings at Ottawa?

2. At what hours did such patrol visit the building between 6 o'clock a.m. of the 21st November, 1909, and 6 o'clock a.m. of the 22nd November, 1909?

3. Did the duties of the patrol include visits to the interior of the building in which a fire recently occurred? If not, why not?

4. Do military customs and regulations require that night guards shall be mounted wherever fires are maintained in store buildings? If so, what official is responsible for the absence of a night guard in the building in which fire recently caused damages and loss estimated at $170,000?

5. Who is the official responsible for the custody of the valuable accumulation of clothing and stores at the headquarters ordnance station, and has this official made any representations of the lack of sufficient men to carry on the ordinary duties of the service for which he is responsible?

6. Do the ordnance stores buildings at Ottawa accommodate all clothing and stores on ordnance charged at such station? If not, what nature and quantity of stores or clothing are otherwise provided for, where stored, rental, if any, paid for buildings or space, and what provision was made for night watch thereon?

7. Was any insurance carried on stores damaged by fire? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Answers to first three parts supplied by Minister of Justice:

1. A constable for the past five years has been detailed to visit the Ordnance Stores building three times nightly, going from the Militia Department, where he is regularly stationed. Time 11 to 11.25 p.m.; 1 to 1.25, and 3 to 3.25 a.m., to ascertain that all doors and windows were securely fastened and that no appearance of fire existed. In the event of anything unusual being observed to notify the sergeant on duty at police headquarters, East Block. In event of noticing fire, in addition to above, to turn in a fire alarm, a box for that purpose being installed close by.

2. As the building was burned on the morning of the 20th it is taken for granted that the question was intended to read from the 19th to the 20th. A constable was on duty at the main door of the Ordnance Stores building on the 19th from 8.30 a.m. till the building closed at about 4.30 p.m. The night visits were made as indicated in the foregoing answer, 11 to 11.25 p.m., 19th; 1 to 1.25 a.m., and 3 to 3.25 a.m., 20th.

3. Their duties did not require them to visit the interior of the building, the visits mentioned being deemed a sufficient precaution.

4. No, but the Regulations for Canadian Ordnance Services hold officers in charge of a store building responsible that all fires are made ' safe ' at night.

5. The Senior Ordnance Officer, Ottawa. No special application has been made, but all officers commanding Commands and In-

dependent Districts have recommended increases to the establishment of the Canadian Ordnance Corps, and these have been met as far as funds will permit.

6. No. The following are stored in a rented building on Sparks street, viz.:

Caps, forage, soft band	3,000
" " hard band	2,000
Trousers, infantry, serge	1,500
Pants, cloth	300
Tunics, Hussars	400
Frocks, blue, N. P	500
Trousers, khaki	800
Greatcoats, grey	6,844
Cloaks, grey	500
" khaki	1,760

The rent of the building is $960. The lessor paying the taxes.

This building is used simply as a warehouse. The building is not heated, and it is only opened when an officer of the corps inspects it, or when articles are required to be removed therefrom. Under these circumstances the appointment of a special night watchman is not considered necessary. The building is under the special protection of the city police.

7. No. The government does not insure.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MR. McINTOSH.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Is Mr. McIntosh, of whom Major Hodgins complained for alleged over classification and of whom Mr. Grant, now chief engineer, is said to have approved (see letter Major Hodgins to Mr. Lumsden, 14th Sept., 1907, Exhibit 6, before Special Committee), still in service of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission? If so, where, in what capacity, at what salary, and has his salary been increased since Sept., 1907? If so, from what amount to what amount?

2. If not in the service of the commission, when and why were his services dispensed with?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Transcontinental Railway Commission furnishes the following information:

1. Mr. McIntosh was promoted November 16, 1908, from division engineer, division No. 6, District 'F,' at salary of $200 per month, to position of assistant district engineer, District 'F,' at salary of $275 per month, being the salary attached to that position on reports of District Engineer Poulin and Chief Engineer Lumsden. He still occupies this position.

2. Answered by No. 1.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to a letter of Oct. 30, 1907, from Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway, in which he says among other things, 'I can only say that I do not concur with the interpretation placed on clauses 34, 35 and 36 of the general specifications by Mr. Doucet, or the engineers under him,' and after giving his own interpretation and stating the action to be taken, concludes: 'In any event, I ask that this correspondence be at once submitted to the government,' was the correspondence referred to submitted to the government? If so, when and how?

2. What action, if any, did the government take in reference to that matter, when was the conclusion arrived at, where is this recorded and was the result communicated to the engineer and the commissioners? If so, how and when?

3. Were the records, papers and documents in reference to this matter included in the return brought down on the 22nd of April, 1909, sessional paper No. 46F? If not, will the minister now lay them upon the table of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes; by letter of secretary, Transcontinental Railway Commission, dated Nov. 23, 1907, to the honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals.

2. The matter was referred back to the commissioners by the hon. the Minister of Railways, by letter, Dated December 5, 1907, for the reason that by the National Transcontinental Railway Act, full power is vested in the commissioners and the chief engineer to carry on the work, and under the form of contract and specifications approved by the government the duties of the chief engineer are fully set forth. The whole correspondence appears as exhibits in Hodgins' investigation. (See pages 65 and 66, Proceedings of Special Committee).

QUEBEC BRIDGE—TENDERS FOR NEW PIERS, &c.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government asked for tenders for the construction of the new piers for the Quebec bridge?

2. Are the existing piers in good condition? If not, what is the defect and how was it caused?

3. Are these piers to be utilized for the new bridge? If not, why not?

4. What did these piers cost, and are they to be demolished?

5. What is the estimated cost of the new piers?

6. What was to have been the weight of the steel to be used in the former structure, what kind of steel, what is the estimated weight of steel to be used in the new structure, and what kind of steel is provided for?

7. What is the estimated percentage of increased strength to be secured by the new plans as compared to the former plans?

8. What is the estimated cost of the new bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The existing piers have shown no defects whatever.

3. The south pier caisson will be fully used, and enlarged to carry the greater load that will be required for new superstructure. At the north pier; borings have demonstrated that the caisson can be founded on the rock and the span reduced from 1,800 to 1,758 feet, the existing north pier will then be demolished.

4. (a) The total cost of the old substructure, including anchor piers and abutments was $1,217,400.

(b) Answered by number three.

5. Tenders are now before the government, pending action no reply can be made.

6. The old bridge was estimated to weigh 35,000 tons and was to have been built of carbon steel. The new bridge will be built in part of carbon steel using nickel steel in the more important members—the weight cannot be given at present pending the receipt of tenders for the superstructure.

7. Impossible to answer. The new bridge will be strong enough to carry all the loads that may possibly be brought upon it.

8. It is not in the public interest to publish any information at this stage of the work.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. MONK:

1. What is the total amount expended to date for dredging and deepening the channel from Batiscan, P.Q., across to St. Pierre les Becquets?

2. Is the work in question terminated?

3. What depth has the said channel?

4. Are any steamers using the said channel to convey passengers or freight to St. Pierre les Becquets? If so, what steamers have used said channel during the past year?

Hon. W. PUGSLEY:

1. $27,775.95.

2. No.

3. Part of the channel has been dredged to a depth of 8 feet and part to 5 feet.

4. (a) Yes. (b) Two boats, one gasoline and one steam, have conveyed passengers and freight between Batiscan and St. Pierre les Becquets during the past summer.

DEEPENING OF ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What provision has been made as respects arms, clothing, ammunition, &c., to meet any possible sudden increase of the active militia from training to war establishment?

2. What provision has been made as to the mobilization stores of authorized establishments being available if required for active service?

3. Has provision been made for an adequate reserve of arms, clothing, ammunition, &c., being maintained between the Great Lakes and the Rocky mountains and between Calgary and the Pacific coast?

4. Is it the intention of the government to establish an arsenal west of Lake Superior?

5. Has any pattern of gun sleigh been yet approved for the use of the Canadian Horse and Field Artillery?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN: The kind of information asked for in questions 1, 2 and 3 has not very often been required and, in so far as I know, has never been given, as it is not considered in the public interest to do so. With my hon. friend's intimate knowledge of military customs I think he will agree with me that it is undesirable in this case that it should be given. As to question 4, the answer is: Not at present.

5. Yes, a pattern has been approved which will be further tested during the present winter.

IMPORTATION OF COAL.

Mr. G. V. WHITE:

What quantity of coal has been imported into the Dominion of Canada and the province of Ontario, respectively, from the United States, during each year from 1905 to 1909, inclusive?

Mr. PATERSON: The quantity of coal imported into Canada and the province of Ontario, from the United States, during the fiscal years 1905 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

	Dominion of Canada.			Province of Ontario.		
	Bituminous.	Slack.	Anthracite.	Bituminous.	Slack.	Anthracite.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1905	4,424,179	614,429	2,584,338	4,314,347	591,609	1,874,068
1906	4,742,485	750,489	2,152,616	4,657,254	730,623	1,473,753
1907 (9 mos.)	4,081,682	635,726	1,991,926	3,981,460	591,633	1,384,094
1908	7,220,672	1,236,503	3,056,600	6,652,624	1,107,756	2,151,077
1909	6,036,621	1,083,207	3,022,970	5,671,963	963,425	2,035,117

DEEPENING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. G. V. WHITE:

Has the government made an estimate of the cost of enlarging and deepening the St. Lawrence route from Port Colborne to Montreal? If so, what would be the cost of deepening said route to a minimum depth of 22 feet?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is it the intention of the government to increase the existing establishment of any of the permanent corps during the next financial year, or to raise any new permanent corps during that period?

2. If so, what are the details of proposed increases to existing corps and what station will be affected?

3. What new units are to be raised, of what strength, and where to be located?

Sir FREDERICK BORDON. The answer is : No.

BREEDING OF HORSES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

Has the government considered the advisability of starting a government farm or ranch for the breeding of horses suitable for military purposes, and thus providing against the reduction of the normal supply available to the rapidly increasing new settlers, beside ensuring a separate suitable supply for army and military purposes?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. The answer is: No.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And also for the Militia Department.

MOUNTED POLICE — ARRANGEMENT WITH SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

What arrangements exist between the federal government and the governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta as respects the employment of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the administration of law in those provinces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Each province, Alberta and Saskatchewan, pays $75,000 per annum to the Dominion for the services of the Mounted Police, also sixty cents per diem for the maintenance of prisoners or lunatics in police guard rooms, and the expenses of transportation from the guard rooms to the penitentiary or asylum. The existing arrangement is for five years and will terminate, if not renewed, on the 31st March, 1911.

SALE OF TIMBER ON WATHA INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Has any timber been sold by the Indian Department on the Watha Indian reserve, in the township of Gibson, district of Muskoka?

2. If so, how many acres have been sold, what was the price received, how many tenders were put in, and what was the amount of each tender?

3. Has there been any timber and bark seized by the Indian Department? If so, how many thousands of feet of logs and how many cords of bark, and has any of this been sold? If so, what was the price received for logs and bark, respectively?

4. Where sales have been made, who have been the purchasers?

Hon. F. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. No land has been sold. Tenders were asked for a number of hemlock trees slightly damaged by fire on the Watha reserve on the 15th of August, 1908, the estimated quantity being 150,000 feet, b.m. Two tenders were received, namely from Jas. Parke, 75 cents per M. feet, b.m., and from F. McGibbon & Sons, $1.75 per M. feet, b.m.

3. Yes. The exact quantity is unknown and cannot be ascertained until after measurements are made. The department is at present in correspondence with the Indian Superintendent on the subject. The timber seized was cut by Indians without authority. Some of it is green and some is standing and burned.

Tenders were asked for the burned standing hemlock on the 29th of October last, for an estimated quantity of 200,000 feet, b.m., and 75,000 feet, b.m., of green hemlock, also a quantity of hemlock bark. Only one tender was received, namely, from F. McGibbon & Sons, $3,26 per M. feet, b.m., for the burnt hemlock. No offer was made for the green, or hemlock bark.

4. Messrs. McGibbon & Sons tenders were accepted. No other sales were made.

SHIP-BUILDING YARDS ON INLAND LAKES.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE:

1. Will ship-building yards on the great inland lakes be asked to tender for the construction of some of the ships for the Canadian navy?

2. Can ships for the Canadian navy be built, armed and equipped in Canadian ship yards on the Great Lakes without interfering with the terms of the Rush-Bagot Convention of April 29, 1817, between Great Britain and the United States, or any other treaty or convention in force between these two countries?

3. Is it the intention of this government to ask Great Britain and the United States to abrogate the terms of the Rush-Bagot Convention or Treaty of 1817?

4. Could Canada give six months notice of the abrogation or annulling of the stipulation of this convention without the consent of Great Britain?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. This is a question which will be considered at the proper time.

2. This question will also be considered at the proper time.

3. It is not the intention of the government to take any steps with a view to the abrogation of the convention of 1870.

4. No.

SALARY OF OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Mr. RIVET:

1. Does the government intend to grant an increase of salary this year to the employees in the outside service?

2. If so, will a vote of credit for the purpose be soon submitted to the House?

Mr. FISHER. Not when it would involve any expenditure further than is provided in the estimates for the various outside services.

ORDNANCE STORES BUILDINGS AT OTTAWA.

Mr. SPROULE:

1. Was the $120,000 worth of militia clothing said to be destroyed in the recent fire which took place in the Ordnance building, a total loss? If not, what disposal was made of it, and how much of it can be made suitable for use by cleaning, pressing, &c.?

2. What was done with the $30,000 worth said to be damaged by smoke and water?

3. Has a contract or contracts been let to do the cleaning, pressing and repairing of it? If so, to whom and at what price or prices?

4. (a) Were tenders asked for to do the work by advertisement or otherwise; (b) if by advertisement in what papers did they appear; (c) if otherwise, in what way were tenders invited; (d) to whom were the invitations sent inviting tenders; (e) how many and from whom were tenders received for doing the work, what was the price of each tender; (f) and to whom was the contract or contracts awarded, and at what price?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes; $120,000 is the estimated cost of the total loss.

2. This stock is being dried and pressed, or cleaned, dried and pressed for further use.

3. Contracts have been made as follows:

(a) With the Good Shepherd Laundry for drying and pressing at the following prices:

	Cents.
Frocks, serge, scarlet, blue, green or khaki, each, at..	15
Tunics, cloth, scarlet, each, at.. ..	25
Tunics, cloth, blue or green, each, at	20
Trousers and pantaloons, cloth, blue, each, at..	10
Trousers and pantaloons, serge, blue or green, each, at..	10
Trousers and pantaloons, khaki, each, at..	10
Pantaloons, Bedford cord, each, at..	15
For drying only any of the above garments, each, at..	05

(b) With Parker's Dye Works, the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry and the Imperial Laundry Company, all of Ottawa, at the following prices, for drying, cleaning and pressing:

	Cents.
Frocks, serge, scarlet, each, at.. ..	75
Frocks, serge, blue or green, each, at	65
Frocks, serge, khaki, each, at.. ..	65
Tunics, cloth, scarlet, each, at.. ..	75
Tunics, cloth, blue or green, each, at	65
Trousers, serge, blue or green, each, at	50
Trousers, serge, khaki, each, at.. ..	50
Trousers, cloth, blue, each, at.. ..	50
Pantaloons, cloth, blue, each, at.. ..	60
Pantaloons, cloth, B. C., each at.. ..	60
Pantaloons, serge, blue, each, at.. ..	60

(c) With the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry Company, for washing, ironing, folding and parcelling white cap covers at $1 per 100.

4. (a) Tenders were obtained by telephone.

(b) Answered by (a).

(c) Answered by (a).

(d) Tenders were invited as follows:

For cleaning, drying and pressing.—From the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry, Imperial Laundry, Parker's Dye Works, W. H. Martin & Co. (My Valet), Home Laundry, Baker's Laundry.

For drying and pressing.—From the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry, Imperial Laundry, Parker's Dye Works, W. H. Martin & Co., Home Laundry, Baker's Laundry and Good Shepherd's Laundry.

For cleaning cap covers.—The Ottawa Sanitary Laundry, Imperial Laundry.

(e) Tenders were received for cleaning and pressing from the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry, Imperial Laundry, Parker's Dye Works. Tenders were received for drying and pressing from Good Shepherd's Laundry, W. H. Martin & Co., Imperial Laundry, Parker's Dye Works, Ottawa Sanitary Laundry.

Tenders were received for washing, &c., cap covers, from the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry and the Imperial Laundry.

The prices of each tender are given on the accompanying schedules. The tender of the Imperial Laundry for cleaning cap covers was received after the contract had been made with the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry. It was delivered by mistake at the Ordnance Stores instead of at the office of the Director of Contracts.

The tenders of the Imperial Laundry and Parker's Dye Works for cleaning and pressing were subsequently withdrawn because:

1. The work was divided among three firms; and their tenders were based on obtaining the whole of the work.

2. On further examination of the clothing, they discovered it to be in worse condition and therefore more expensive to clean than at first supposed.

3. The total quantity to be cleaned was much less then they had first estimated.

The work was therefore divided among these three firms at the price of the only

remaining tender, that of the Ottawa Sanitary Laundry.

(f) Answered by No. 3.

The condition of this clothing after the fire was such that only the greatest promptitude could save it from much greater damage. Much of it was thoroughly soaked with water and stained with smoke, tar, oil and dirt. It was impossible to dry it in the drill shed, the temporary place of storage, and every day's delay increased the chance of further loss by mildew or staining. This was understood not only by the officials of the department but was emphasized by all of the tenderers who examined the clothing.

The necessity for immediate action was therefore urgent. As soon as the clothing was sorted and piled, so as to ascertain the character of the work required, tenders were sought, as nearly as possible, from every laundry or cleaning establishment in the city. The newspapers were not used because it was believed that time would be saved by going direct to the tenderers by telephone; and the result appears to have justified that view.

TENDERS FOR CLEANING AND PRESSING.

Garments.	Imperial Laundry.	Ottawa Sanitary Laundry.	Parker.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Frocks, serge, scarlet	1 00	0 75	0 75
" " blue or green	0 50	0 65	0 65
" " khaki	0 50	0 65	0 75
Tunics, cloth, scarlet	1 00	0 75	0 80
" " blue or green	0 50	0 65	0 75
Trousers, serge, blue	0 35	0 50	0 40
" " khaki	0 35	0 50	0 45
" cloth, blue	0 35	0 50	0 40
Pantaloons, cloth, blue	0 35	0 60	0 40
" " B.C	0 35	0 60	0 45
" serge, blue	0 35	0 60	0 40
	5 60	6 75	6 20
Washing, ironing, folding and parcelling white cap covers	0 50	1 00 per 100.	

TENDERS FOR DRYING AND PRESSING.

Garments.	O. S. L.	Martin.	Good Shepherd.	Imperial Laundry.	Parker.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Frocks, serge, scarlet	0 35	0 25	0 15	0 25	0 25
" " blue or green	0 35	0 25	0 15	0 25	0 20
Tunics, cloth, scarlet	0 35	0 20	0 25	0 25	0 25
" " blue or green	0 35	0 20	0 20	0 25	0 20
Trousers and pantaloons, cloth, blue	0 20	0 10	0 10	0 15	0 15
" " serge, blue or green	0 20	0 10	0 10	0 15	0 15
" " khaki	0 20	0 10	0 10	0 15	0 20
Pantaloons, B.C	0 20	0 10	0 15	0 15	0 20
Garments not requiring pressing will be dried only	0 05	0 15-07	0 05	0 05	.....
	2 25	1 37-1 45	1 25	1 65	1 60

HOMESTEADS IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What has been the amount of money collected by the government from the 1st January, 1908, to date, respectively, in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, on account of homestead fees, pre-emption, and purchased homstead fees, other payments on account of lands, whether homesteads, pre-emptions purchased, homesteads or other lands?

2. What has been the total acreage of pre-emption and purchased homesteads sold in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, since the 1st January, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

To 31st October, 1909—Returns for November not complete.

1. Province of Alberta, $1,737,291.98.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Province of Saskatchewan, $1,081,519.57.
2. Province of Alberta, 1,504,960 acres.
Province of Saskatchewan, 2,625,440 acres.

DOMINION DREDGING COMPANY.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

What amounts have been paid by the government to the Dominion Dredging Company during the present fiscal year to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY: $77,755.52.

MARITIME DREDGING COMPANY.

Mr. GEO TAYLOR:

What amounts have been paid by the government to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company during the present fiscal year to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY: $195,016.24.

SECRETARY OF STATE DEPARTMENT—CHARTERS.

Mr. WALLACE:

1. In the judgment of the government, is the Secretary of State under obligation to issue a charter, with all its privileges, to any and every group of persons complying with the law who apply for it, no matter who they are or what their character or purpose may be?
2. Have any such applications ever been refused by this government?
3. Is the government aware that a charter granted to practically the same individual for the same purpose as that granted by this government to the Metropolitan Racing Association had been previously cancelled by the government of Ontario?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY:

1. In the judgment of the government, where, as in the case of the Secretary of State under the Companies Act, a power is deposited with a public officer for the purpose of being used for the benefit of persons, with regard to whom a definition is supplied by parliament of the conditions upon which they are entitled to call for its exercise, that power ought to be exercised and the courts will require it to be exercised.

In carrying out the provisions of the Companies Act the Secretary of State acts as an administrative, not as a judicial officer, not as an adviser of the Crown.

It would be an arbitrary and unwarranted exercise of power on the part of the Secretary of State to discriminate between persons who apply for charters in conformity with the provisions of the Companies Act.

It is the duty of the Secretary of State to scrutinize the objects enumerated in every application for incorporation and to ascertain whether they are within the provisions of the Companies Act. and are otherwise legal. In practice this is done with every application; and, by law, each company is limited in the scope of its operations to the objects set out in its charter.

2. It would entail an examination of over 3,300 files of the Department of the Secretary of State to ascertain how many applications have been refused and the reasons therefor. A partial search reveals that certain applications were refused because the objects sought were not within the purview of the Companies Act or were solely within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. If the hon. member desires detailed information it will be necessary to move for a return.

3. The applicants for incorporation of The Metropolitan Racing Association of Canada, Limited, were: William Alexander Cotton, manufacturer; Arthur Edwin Melhuish, veterinary surgeon; Alfred Jordan Rattray, architect; Arthur Clarkson, Hornby, accountant; and Peter Edward Callen, hotel manager; all of the city of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, and John McBean, merchant, of the town of Georgetown, in the said province of Ontario. The government is not aware that these persons or any of them were interested in any other racing association, nor that they or any of them held a charter that was cancelled by the Ontario government.

LAKE NIPISSING ROLLER DAMS.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. When were the roller dams at the outlet of Lake Nipissing built, and why?
2. What is the total cost of such dams?
3. Have these dams been removed? If so, why?
4. What amounts have been paid as damages for flooding, and what additional claims have been made for damages?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) In 1907 and 1908. (b) To raise the low water level of the lake, in the interests of navigation and lumber industry.
2. $18,778.91.
3. (a) Yes. (b) Owing to the extraordinary high water which prevailed for several weeks last spring throughout the entire Nipissing district, as well as throughout the Upper Ottawa river valley, upon representations made by the municipal council of the town of North Bay and other parties, the department deemed it in the public interest to remedy as much as possible this condition, by enlarging the lake outlets and mitigate possible damages to land owners.
4. (a) 17 claims have been adjusted and paid: total, $868. (b) 65 additional claims have been made, of which 53 have been adjusted.

PAYMENTS TO MR. T. C. NORRIS.

Mr. BRADBURY:

What amount of moneys has been paid by any or all departments of the government to

Mr. T. C. Norris, of Manitoba, since January, 1902, up to date?

Mr. OLIVER. As far as the Department of Interior is concerned, $9,096.84.

ALLEGED KIDNAPPING OF CANADIAN CITIZEN.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) to a matter of considerable importance to a portion of the constituency which I represent. It is stated that a man named William J. Kelly, living in Richmond, in the county of Carleton, N.B., has been kidnapped by United States officers and is now incarcerated in gaol in Portland, in the State of Maine. Of course, of this I have no proofs such as might be required in a court of law, but I have sufficient evidence in my hands to convince me that the man has been kidnapped. The circumstances of the case are as follows:

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is permitted at this stage to go beyond a question except with the indulgence of the House. Of course there will be a motion later on, at which time this subject may be brought up.

Mr. CARVELL. It is my intention only to ask a question. It seems that about seven years ago this man was one night teaming a load of produce into the United States and was confronted by a gentleman who turned out to be a United States officer.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a positive statement.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot make the matter plain to ask a question without laying some little foundation for it. The result was that the United States officer fired on this man Kelly twice, one bullet taking effect in his cheek and another striking a buckle on a belt which he wore. Kelly seized a stick and in the end the officer was laid out and Kelly returned to his own side of the line. That was seven years ago. About three weeks ago a gentleman came to Kelly's residence in Richmond and wanted to buy some produce from him. Kelly succeeded in selling him some produce at a good price. Then the man wanted him to haul it to the United States but Kelly refused to do so. However, after considerable dickering, he agreed to take it to the boundary line. They started in the evening and came to a place called Union Corners where for about a quarter of a mile the highway road is, for all practical purposes, the boundary line. They had proceeded along this line 30 or 40 rods when a number of men appeared on the scene and Kelly was arrested, gagged, and carried off into the United States. I am satisfied that the boundary line is at least 3 or 4 rods to the west of the point where Kelly was arrested. He is now incarcerated in gaol in Portland and I would like to know if the government have any information on the subject and if they have if they will give it to the House. Will they do whatever is possible in order to have this man set at liberty and to see that the rights of British subjects are not thus interfered with by American officers?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) has called attention is certainly one of very grave importance and one which will be, I have no doubt, on its being brought to the attention of the government of the United States, given the most careful consideration. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) that in a very general way the facts to which he has referred were a few days ago brought to my attention in the shape of a letter from a gentleman of the vicinity who stated in substance what my hon. friend has just stated to this House. I replied immediately, pointing out the necessity for the most careful accuracy in regard to the particulars of such an allegation, the importance of establishing, as definitely and certainly as evidence could establish such a fact, just where upon this highway, the actual arrest of Kelly took place and also, if it was possible to establish it, whether or not the men who arrested him and carried him into the United States were officers authorized by any competent authority of either the federal or state government. I have not yet received any answer to the request for this information and until it is supplied in definite form and supported by the ordinary verification of affidavit or statutory declaration, we should hardly be in a position to ask the government of the United States to investigate the matter. But as soon as we are placed in possession of the necessary evidence in that regard, I shall see that steps are taken to bring it to the attention of His Majesty's representative in Washington and through him to that of the United States government.

Such cases as this, I may say, do occasionally arise, possibly from the over-zeal of officers upon either side of the boundary. Occasionally a complaint is received that the sacred soil of the United States has been violated by some Canadian officer and similar cases, such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, sometimes have been shown to exist where some officer of the United States has undertaken to execute his warrant upon the soil of Canada, which I need not say is equally sacred and which I am sure the government of the United States desires to preserve as equally sacred with their own. There has never been any

difficulty put in the way of the most careful and thorough investigation of such charges when they are made, and if it can be established that in point of actual fact this man was deprived of his liberty while upon the soil of Canada, I think I can confidently assure my hon. friend that the fullest reparation will be made by the restoration of the man to Canadian soil.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not catch to whom the minister had applied for information with reference to this matter?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I applied to the gentleman whose letter I had received, a clergyman of the vicinity. I think his name was the Rev. Father Murphy, although I am not certain.

Mr. FOSTER. Not through any legal source?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not a lawyer, a clergyman.

OFFICIAL STATUS OF FOREIGN CONSULS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government a question with reference to the courtesy due or which should be due the representatives of foreign nations in Canada as a country making her own treaties. My question is founded on an article which I now have before me from the daily 'Free Press,' which reads:

All the Consuls stayed away from it—Drawing Room sees them not because of the ruling of Downing Street.

None of the foreign Consuls General resident in Ottawa attended the Governor General's 'Drawing Room' on Saturday night.

There is a reason and an interesting one.

Consuls General have no official status in Canada—they are not officially recognized.

When a new Consul General comes to Ottawa, no official calls are made upon him. He has to paddle around in his own canoe and trust to his own ingenuity in getting acquainted.

A Consul General is the highest official that any foreign country can send to Canada. If they could, some of them would doubtless send ambassadors.

The recent establishment of a Chinese consulate in Ottawa, with a gentleman of very high standing in his own country in charge, was regarded by Canadians as a pleasing development of our nationality. It was a recognition of Canada's growing importance.

It has been said that Germany and France are both desirous of establishing Consuls General in Ottawa. But in the case of each, there is reason to believe that the refusal to grant official status stands in the way.

Although the Consuls General at present resident in Ottawa refuse to discuss the matter, the 'Free Press' understands that it is for the same reason that none of them attend the Drawing Room.

They do not demand recognition; they do not even ask for it; but they do take the ground that they cannot permit their respective countries to be discriminated against in Canada's official functions. Consequently they absent themselves.

The official order of precedence at the Drawing Room, published in the newspapers, places the Consuls General at the very end of the list.

In refusing official recognition the Dominion is acting upon definite instructions received from Downing street.

But Canada's natural reply to this would be that England is able to show official courtesy to these foreign countries by recognizing their Ambassadors, whereas the foreign governments are not permitted to send Ambassadors to Canada.

No general instructions to colonial governors respecting the position and treatment of consuls appear to have been issued since a date nearly forty years ago, when it was intimated that if in any colony precedence was, as a matter of courtesy, already accorded to the foreign consular body, no alteration should be made, with the view of assimilating the practice to that in force in this country, without reference to the Secretary of State.

It was observed, however, that foreign consuls in England have no claim to precedency, and are treated like any other foreigners resident in England.

Toronto 'Daily Star,' Monday, Nov. 8, 1909.

'Ambassador from Germany'—New Consulate General at Ottawa to be a Big Thing.

(Canadian Associated Press.)

London, Eng., Nov. 10.—The Canadian Associated Press learns that the German government is considering the advisability of establishing a new Consulate General at Ottawa, which will be almost ambassadorial in its scope, character, and plans. Already plans have been suggested for the erection of a building.

The imperial army and navy recognize officially consuls in every foreign port. Why should not this be in our own country? I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman if any steps have been taken to remedy this state of affairs under a ruling which was made under different conditions. When we had not the power of making our own treaties; and if the government have not taken any steps, I should like to know whether they intend doing something. The consuls general are in Canada the highest representatives of foreign states, and while the matter of attending the drawing room may be, to a certain extent, a small one, still when we consider that the important question as to the size of a lady's foot occasioned a war which consumed millions of money and thousands of lives, this matter may not seem to be one which should be lightly treated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question which my hon. friend has brought to our attention is an important one, not perhaps so much on account of the drawing room as on account of the duties which consuls general now discharge in Canada. We have

no diplomatic service in Canada, and the consuls general are exercising by tolerance some, I shall not say diplomatic powers, but powers very often cognate to such. The question is one which should be settled, and the matter is now engaging the attention of the government.

THE NAVAL DEFENCE BILL.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the right hon. gentleman give any information as to when the Naval Bill will be introduced? I think there is an impression that we were to have a statement from my right hon. friend regarding that matter on some occasion previous even to the present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought that we would have been in a position to introduce the Bill 'ere this, but my hon. friend himself has called attention to certain correspondence which it will be desirable to have. We have not yet received that correspondence, and perhaps we would be better to wait until we receive it before bringing down the measure.

Mr. FOSTER. May we expect it next week?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say definitely, but have no intention to delay the Bill, and will bring it down as soon as we get the correspondence.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why should this correspondence interfere with bringing down the Bill? Two weeks ago the right hon. gentleman said the Bill would be introduced soon. He knows that it will have to be printed, which will take some days. Is that correspondence going to affect the Bill? If not, why not bring down the Bill and give hon. members a chance to study it before taking any action on it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked for some information, which I supposed would be valuable to the members of the opposition and also to the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why should that interfere with bringing down the Bill. I understood that the Bill was practically all ready some two weeks ago. If it is ready, the House is entitled to have the Bill immediately, and that need not interfere with the bringing down of the correspondence. The correspondence may be brought down afterwards and be made use of during the discussion. Does the right hon. gentleman refuse to introduce the Bill until we have the correspondence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the correspondence is to be unduly delayed, we shall not wait for it. I do not think it will affect my own judgment, but I see no harm in having the correspondence before we give our decision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK. Will the government not supplement the information contained in the blue-book recently brought down entituled ' The Imperial Conference ' by placing before the House, for the convenience of members, a conversion into Canadian currency of the statements of the cost of the scheme. At pages 27 and 28 of the blue-book and elsewhere, the cost is given in sterling. I would suggest that the government should have these statements completed by giving us the cost in Canadian currency, where it is possible, and approximately the cost in Canadian currency, instead of the cost at British rates, such as for the payment of men and wherever else it is possible to give the cost in Canadian currency. I have seen it stated that, speaking generally, the cost in England at £100 sterling would reach in Canada £170. It may not be possible always to give the figures exactly, but if the cost be given approximately that would be of great use to members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it would be possible to give additions to the blue-book, but no doubt my colleague, the Minister of Marine, when bringing in the measure, will give all the information asked for.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—RACE-TRACK GAMBLING.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: Mr. Speaker, before going into the discussion of this Bill, let me now, lest I forget it, give notice that, when the House is in committee on this Bill, I will move the following:

That the said Bill be amended by adding the following as paragraph (e) to section 230:—

Being the owner or other person in control of premises occupied or used as a disorderly house, knowingly allows any contrivance whatsoever upon the said premises for the purpose of preventing, obstructing or delaying the entry of any constable or officer authorized as aforesaid into any such disorderly house of any part thereof.

The reason for that amendment is that it is complained by constables and police officers that, in seeking to inspect or gain entry to Chinese gambling houses in many cases, they find that the occupants of the house have their inner rooms barricaded with very stout doors, thus preventing the police from gaining entry until the inmates have had an opportunity to escape.

In discussing the Bill itself, I wish first to state what is the object of the Bill. Its object is to utterly, entirely, completely suppress and prevent the business of betting, pool-making, book-making, the busi-

ness of betting or gambling in connection with or upon race tracks in any place in Canada. If the Bill should become law and fail of its object, it will be because the persons who have laboured to produce the Bill have not been able to find language that will accomplish the object they have in view. And I desire, at the beginning of my remarks, to say that I do not claim the credit, if credit be due to any person, for the framing of the Bill that is now before the House. The Bill that we are considering is based upon the work of three well known and able members of the legal profession. At least two of the three gentlemen upon whose very careful work the Bill is based have had peculiar experience and occupy positions that have made it possible for them with special ability to frame a law to meet the evils that we are endeavouring to combat. I have stated the object of the Bill; now let me state as frankly what the Bill does not endeavour to do. I want to impress the House with this, that the Bill does not endeavour to interfere in any way or to any extent with the racing of horses. Men will be just as free after this Bill becomes law to race horses or carry on a race meet as they are to-day or ever have been. Neither does this Bill seek to prevent betting upon horse races. If this Bill becomes law, two men will be just as free to make a bet upon which horse will win a race as they will to make a bet upon which of themselves can throw a stone the greater distance. The Bill does not, then, endeavour to affect horse-racing or to prevent betting between private individuals in connection with horse-racing, and I trust that every one who hears me will bear that in mind. Neither is it the endeavour by this legislation to correct any past bungling on the part of this parliament. I say that because many people have had the idea that the present state of the law, which appears to them absurd, is the result of error or lack of skill on the part of legislators of the past. One prominent Ontario newspaper, in a somewhat recent editorial, said:

> The Department of Justice has failed so far to frame a statute that will do what parliament manifestly intended should be done.

Very many people have had that opinion, but the opinion is an erroneous one. Parliament has never, up to this time, endeavoured to prohibit the business of betting or gambling upon race-tracks. Quite the contrary is the case, as I will endeavour to show. And I trust the House will pardon me if I take a little time—I shall not be long—to trace the history of the legislation that we have at present and that people have endeavoured to use to suppress race-track gambling.

Several years ago, men in Canada began to recognize the growing evil of race-track gambling, the business of race-track betting. This was not so much because public opinion has changed—partly, perhaps, for that reason and because, it may be, we demand to-day a somewhat higher standard than we did a few years ago—but more largely because circumstances in Canada have been changing. Race-track gambling is much more prevalent to-day than it was in Canada a few years ago. There are more race horses in the Dominion, race meets are held for a great deal longer time, and the book-maker is doing a work to-day that he did not attempt to do ten or fifteen years ago, that is, to anything like the same extent. I say that the people realized some years ago the grave evils attending race-track gambling. With that realization they turned to the statutes we had then and have now to see by what means they could suppress or prevent this gambling. They turned to the Criminal Code, section 235—which was section 204 of the Code as first passed in 1892. They found that to be the only section of the Code making reference to race-track gambling. That section, under paragraph (a) provides that every one is liable to the punishment inflicted by the section who uses or knowingly allows any part of any premises under his control to be used for the purpose of recording or registering any bet or wager, or selling any pool. Now that section might probably have been used with considerable effect to suppress race-track gambling had not it been that attached to the section as subsection 2 was the following:

> The provisions of this section shall not extend to any person by reason of his becoming the custodian or depository of any money, property, or valuable thing, to be paid as a prize to the winner of any lawful race, sport, game or exercise, or to be paid to the owner of any horse engaged in any lawful race, or to bets between individuals or made on the race course of any incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting.

Now, this language in section 235 does not appear to have been inserted in error. In order to show that it was deliberately placed there, let me refer to the remarks of Sir John Thompson and others which will be found in the 'Hansard' of 1892, page 2976. In 1892, as hon. members of the House are aware, the Criminal Code was first placed upon the statute-book. When the House was in committee considering this section 235, Sir John Thompson said:

> I suppose it is my duty to call the attention of the committee to the addition of subsection 2, which proposes a relaxation in regard to betting on the race course of an incorporated association while a race is going on.

So, Sir John Thompson frankly said that this was a relaxation of the law in connection with race-track betting. And Mr.—now Sir Louis Davies said:

It is just as well that the committee should understand that we are legalizing betting on a race course. I do not know that the committee is prepared to do that.

Then Mr. Curran said in reply:

The law has always allowed betting on horse races.

The matter was allowed to drop, and the section was passed, and included in the Code as we have it before us to-day. Then these people who, rightly or wrongly, were endeavouring some years ago to restrict race-track gambling, finding that section 235 was of no avail, turned to sections 225, 227 and 228 which, in the Criminal Code of 1892, are sections 196, 197 and 198. These sections were not supposed to relate to the restriction of race-track betting at all and an endeavour so to use them was only due to the absence of any legislation intended or enacted for such purpose. Section 235, to which I have already referred, had been in the criminal law of Canada for some years before 1892, but the addition exempting race-track gambling during the course of a meet on a race-track association, was inserted in 1892. But the sections 226, 227 and 228 had not been previously in our criminal law, they were adopted in 1892 from the English Betting Act. Without wearying the House by reading sections 226 and 227, I may say that section 226 defines a common gaming house, 227 defines a common betting house, and 228 imposes the penalty for persons who are guilty of a breach of 226 and 227. Sec-227 reads as follows:

A common betting house is a house, office, room or other place opened, kept or used for the purpose of betting between persons resorting thereto.

I will not read the remainder of the section, but that is the part of it that was relied upon to suppress race-track gambling, and it was the only section, together with the following one, imposing a penalty, that would be of any use, or could possibly be of any use, to bring about the object in view. Somewhere about 1906, I think it was, a man named Saunders, and some companions, were carrying on the business of book-makers during a meet of the Ontario Jockey Club in the city of Toronto. Complaint was laid against them for keeping a common betting house. They were convicted before the police magistrate of Toronto, and convicted under these sections, 226 and 227. They appealed from his decision, and at their request he stated a case, and it was taken to the Ontario Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal upheld the magistrate in his decision. Judges Garrow and Meredith, however, dissented, and were of the opinion that the conviction of the magistrate ought to be quashed. The solicitors acting for the defendants in that case, argued that Saunders and his companions, while they used a booth upon castors which moved from one part of the race-track to the other, could not be said to be using a house, room or other place as defined by the Act; and if it were held otherwise that they were using such house, room or other place, under section 235 they were exempt, because they did what they did on a race-track of a regularly incorporated racing association. The Court of Appeal, as I have already said, notwithstanding these arguments, upheld the magistrate in his decision. Judges Garrow and Meredith dissented from the other judges, and Judge Garrow said:

The proper construction in a word is in my opinion to hold that sections 197 and 198 (now sections 226 and 227) have no application to the case of betting carried on upon the race course of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting, whether or not such betting takes place within or without doors, or in any particular 'house, office, room or other place,' so long as it is within the boundaries of the race course and so long as the betting is confined to the races in progress upon that race course.

That was the view of Judge Garrow. But the Court of Appeal having sustained the magistrate in his decision, the case was carried to the Supreme Court. The judges of the Supreme Court confirmed the judgment of the Court of Appeal, and in upholding the magistrate here again two judges dissented from their brother judges and gave their opinion. Mr. Justice Davies and Mr. Justice Girouard differed from the other judges of the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, in delivering judgment, said:

I quite agree that the amendment of 1892 was intended to reserve the race courses of incorporated associations as places where bets might be recorded and registered, and any apparatus or structures used for more conveniently recording such bets or wagers, provided this was done during the actual progress of a race meeting, were exempted from the operation of that section.

But using a place for the purpose of recording or registering bets or wagers is something entirely different from using the place for the purpose of betting between persons resorting thereto and the owner or occupier thereof.

Chief Justice Fitzpatrick was drawing a nice distinction between the language of sections 227 and 235. Section 235 says that a penalty is imposed upon any person who uses or knowingly allows any part of any premises under his control to be used for the purpose, not of betting, but of recording or registering any bet or wager. Section 227, on the other hand, imposes a penalty on any person who has opened, kept or used a place for the purpose of betting between persons resorting thereto. The one relates

to betting, the other to recording and registering a bet. Drawing this distinction, Chief Justice Fitzpatrick said:

Bets between individuals or bets made on the race course of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting can be recorded in any place used for that purpose, but to keep a place, whether within or without the grounds of a racing association for the purpose of betting, whether during the progress of a race meeting or not, is an offence under section 197. In my opinion two distinct and separate statutory offences are created by sections 197 and 204, and that which may be invoked successfully as a defence in one case cannot avail in the other. To keep a place for making bets which may be recorded at that place or elsewhere and to keep a place for recording bets wherever made are distinct and separate acts, each of which has been made an offence and each of which is declared to subject the offenders to a different penalty. The exception created by subsection 2 of section 204 with respect to anything therein, does not apply to those places that are kept for the purpose of betting. I do not understand the rule of construction to be that all the sections of the Code dealing with nuisances are to be read together to see how they can be made to harmonize any more than the sections dealing with offences against the person or against property. Distinct and separate acts are by these sections declared to be common nuisances and the only question to be considered is: Do the facts proved in evidence support that charge as laid in each particular case? The appeal is dismissed with costs.

Mr. Justice Davies quoted the words of Judge Garrow as given in the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless the Court of Appeal decided to uphold the decision of the magistrate. The result of that decision in the Saunders case was this: That a man who used any structure, any house, office, room or other place, including a booth or other such thing which might be designated as a place was subject to the penalties imposed by that section 227. That, then, perhaps, for a time, checked the business of race-track gambling, but some time after that a man named Moylett, a book-maker, with his companions at the Woodbine track in Toronto, continued the very same business of race-track gambling which had been done by Saunders, only, in place of having a booth or tent that moved about, they simply stood on the ground within a limited area, walking from place to place and carrying on exactly the same kind of business. A complaint was made against them and the police magistrate, under the same section of the Code, convicted them of keeping a common betting place. Then Moylett appealed, as Saunders had done and the police magistrate as he had done in the other case, granted a stated case which was taken to the Court of Appeal. In this case the Court of Appeal quashed the conviction of the magistrate and Chief Justice Moss, in giving judgment, said:

The defendants and their assistants did not use any desk, stool, umbrella, tent or booth, or erection of any kind to mark any place where bets were made.

He continued:

Viewed apart from the authorities by which we are bound, the words themselves seem almost naturally to suggest a structure of some sort, and to import fixity or localization.

They also import rights peculiar to the persons designated as the owner, occupier or keeper, which rights are not shared by others. It is obvious that there must be not only a house, office, room or other place, but it must be one capable of being opened, kept or used for the purpose of betting. And there must also be some person who is entitled to exercise the right of opening, keeping or using to the exclusion of the exercise of a similar right by others except with his permission.

He said, in conclusion:

But, whatever doubts might possibly have existed before the decision of the House of Lords in the leading case of Powell vs. The Kempton Park Race Course Company (1899) must now be considered as set at rest by the result of that case.

The Kempton Park case, which ruled in this case, was under the English Betting Act where the language used was almost exactly the same as the language in sections 226 and 227 of our own Code and the judges held that the evidence of the facts in the one case corresponded almost exactly with the facts in the other case. In the Kempton Park case Judge Escher said:

It is not betting, whatever be its kind, which, independent of locality, is struck at; but it is the preventing of a locality for particular kinds of betting which is the mischief to be dealt with.

Again, Judge Halsbury said:

The legislature has not prohibited betting at all; but prohibited keeping a house for betting.

Chief Justice Moss, in giving judgment in the Moylett case, said:

If the user of any place where the better happens to stand, makes the place a common betting house, the words 'house, office or room' were unnecessary, and the words 'other places' therefore, necessarily take their colour and meaning from the words which precede them, and must be construed as meaning a place ejusdem generis, e. g. a booth, tent, etc., or otherwise equally clearly defined and capable of being used as the former.

The effect of this decision was that a man carrying on the business of race-track gambling would be practically exempt from the operation of the statute if he kept mov-

ing about, upon the ground and was not occupying any fixture such as a tent, booth or anything of that kind within which or upon which to carry on his business. I quote further words from the judgment of Chief Justice Moss. He summed the matter up in this way:

> Betting or the business of a book-maker, whether carried on upon a race course or elsewhere, is not prohibited by the Act. If the legislature intends to prohibit it, it is easy for it to say so. It is the opening, keeping or using a common betting house which is penalized.

Let me repeat his words. He said:

> If the legislature intends to prohibit it it is easy for it to say so.

The facts appear to have been as stated by Chief Justice Moss that this parliament never intended to prohibit race-track gambling, and if it be true that it is parliament's intention to prohibit race-track gambling it is easy for it to say so. If race-track gambling is an evil, if it is something that ought to be suppressed, it becomes the duty of this parliament to suppress it and the whole responsibility rests upon this parliament. What we seek to do by this Bill is to amend sections 226, 227, 228 and 235 of the Criminal Code which were never intended to suppress race-track gambling and to change them so as to make them effective, so that they will utterly and completely prevent and suppress the business of gambling upon or in connection with a race track. Now I will point out the changes that we seek to make in the Act as it is. Turning to section 226 of the Code which defines a 'common gaming house' we strike out the word 'house' and define not a 'common gaming house' but a 'common gaming place'. We strike out the words 'a house, room or' and leave simply the word 'place,' so that the section will read a 'place used by any person for gaming, betting' etc. Turning to Stroud's Judicial Dictionary, an English work, Stroud defines the word 'place' in this way:

> The word 'place' is generally found in conjunction with other words which give it a colour, and it is usually controlled by its context.

Referring to the words 'house, office, room or other place' in the English Betting Act he quotes Judge Channell in Brown vs. Patch as follows:

> The statute is directed against betting places, not against betting persons.

We are now endeavouring to make the statute apply to betting persons as well as to betting places. Wherever the words 'house, room or' appear in section 226 they are struck out and simply the word 'place' is left. I have no doubt that the person who drafted this section intended and endeavoured by the use of this collection of words to make the language more comprehensive, but what he really did was to make the language narrower in effect rather than broader, less comprehensive rather than more so. In section 227 we strike out the words 'house, room or' and leave the one word 'place' again, and in place of defining 'any betting house' we define 'any betting place'. There is another important change in section 227. We add as subsection 2 of this section a definition of the word 'place' wherever it occurs in the Act.

> The word 'place' as used in this section and in the preceding section, includes any place, whether inclosed or not, whether it is or is not a fixed place, and whether there is or is not an exclusive right of user.

This, then, will do away with the argument that a man standing on the ground is not occupying a place. Section 228, which imposes the penalty, has also the word 'house' struck out and the word 'place' substituted therefor. The words 'or other disorderly place' are inserted after the words 'disorderly house'. Section 232 is amended in the same way to make it consistent with the others. Turning to section 235—and perhaps this section is the most important of any—three important new paragraphs are added to this section the first paragraph of which section defines the penalty which is imposed, that is to say, that every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment and to a fine not exceeding $1,000. These new sections are as follows:

> (d) Engages in pool selling or book-making or in the business or occupation of betting or wagering or makes any agreement for the purchase or sale of betting or gaming privileges.
>
> (e) Advertises, publishes, exhibits, posts up, sells or supplies or offers to sell or supply any information relating to pool selling, book-making, betting, or wagering.
>
> (f) Aids or assists in any manner any of the said acts which are by this section forbidden.

Then, in the present Act that section 235 is amended by leaving out subsection 2, which contains a number of exemptions by which certain persons under certain circumstances are exempted from the penalties provided by the Act. These are the changes sought to be made.

Now, Sir, it may be asked why we seek to amend the law at all, or what necessity there is for the Bill I have introduced. Sir, I am willing to admit that one of the reasons why it has been thought proper to introduce this Bill is because it has been asked for by the Moral and Social Reform Council of Canada. And, whom does this association include? It represents the Church of England in Canada, the Presby-

terian Church, the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, the Congregational Church, the Salvation Army, the Canadian Purity Educational Association, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the Dominion Grange and Farmers' Association. I have heard it said that no layman has asked for this legislation, that it is a movement upon the part of the ministers, and that the ministers are not practical men and have no knowledge of the subject. But, Sir, let me say that at the various conferences, synods, presbyteries and meetings of the various churches in Canada resolutions have been unanimously passed urging this government to support just such a Bill as we have now before us, and a large number of the men attending these associations have been laymen, business men, men of the world, men having a knowledge of the subject they were considering and which they have asked this House to consider. But if it be contended that these people have been unduly influenced, it may be by the impractical clergy, let me say that legislation similar to that which I now propose has been passed by the following states: New Mexico, Missouri, Illinois, Washington, South Carolina, Colorado, Texas, New Jersey, Ohio, Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Massachusetts, West Virginia, Michigan, Louisiana, California and New York, and the last four of these states are among the greatest horse-breeding states in the American union. I take it that the very fact that this legislation has been passed by this large number of the states of the union is an evidence to us of the necessity of such legislation. I say that because these various states, perhaps without exception, have had a greater, wider, longer experience with race-track gambling than we have had in Canada. These states of the American union have not hitherto been supposed by the Canadian people to live up to any higher moral standard than we live up to. They are not supposed to aim at any higher moral plane than we should aspire to, but these states have practical business reasons for passing the legislation such as we have before us now. I not only ask the House to take this as evidence of the necessity for the legislation, but I ask hon. gentlemen to consider the effect upon Canada and the Canadian people of the passing of this prohibitory legislation by the various states. The effect has been to flood Canada with American book-makers. Prevented from carrying on their business in these several states they have come into our Dominion with the result that race-track gambling is much more prevalent in Canada now than it would have been had it not been for this prohibitory law on the other side of the line. Recently a grand jury assembled in Toronto declared that the province of Ontario had become a paradise for gambling. That was not the verdict of an assembly of clergymen, but the verdict of a grand jury. And, if the province of Ontario has become a paradise for gambling, it is not alone among the provinces; because the province of British Columbia is fast becoming cursed by race-track gambling, and if there be no change in the law, so soon as our prairie provinces have greater population and greater wealth they will be afflicted with the same curse. I have said that race-track gambling is becoming a nuisance in the province of British Columbia. I was speaking a few days ago with a very prominent citizen of Victoria, British Columbia, and he told me that race-track gambling had become alarmingly prevalent in that city, and a great evil. An editorial in a Victoria daily newspaper, shortly after the holding of a recent race meet in that city, said that the racing was not true horse-racing, but racing of horses as an excuse for gambling. The board of trade of the city of Vancouver, after the holding of a recent race meet in that city, adopted a resolution urging this government to pass such legislation as I am now asking the House to pass. Not only that, but Japan has legislated against race-track gambling. We cannot say that the population of Japan are a goody-goody people, but we can say that perhaps more than any other nation in the world to-day, Japan realizes that the strength of a nation depends upon the strength of the individual citizens, and if Japan has passed legislation to do away with race-track gambling, it is because Japan wants to have virtuous citizens and to build up a strong people. I have received a letter from Chief Inspector Archibald, of the Toronto police force, and he manifests a great deal of interest in the legislation which is now before the House. In this letter, dated the 16th of last month, he says:

> I would respectfully call your attention to subsection 2 of section 235 of the Criminal Code which you will observe has given colour of right and is in the main responsible for the present undesirable conditions; hence the necessity to expunge this subsection from the statute absolutely.

That is what we are endeavouring to do. Now, Sir, for economic reasons, from the point of view of dollars and cents, it behooves us to pass this legislation. The Toronto 'Telegram' of the fifth of June last describes what took place during the race meeting which was held in the city of Toronto shortly before that date. The Toronto 'Telegram' said that at the Woodbine the race meeting had lasted last spring for thirteen days, that on the first day there were 72 book-makers on the track and that for the remaining 12 days of the meet there were from 50 to 80 book-makers present each

day. It said that not more than eight or ten of them were from the city of Toronto, the rest being from outside. And the 'Telegram' went on to say that, as I have before stated, the legislation recently enacted in all these states of the American Union had very much increased race-track gambling within this Dominion. Coming to the matter of dollars and cents, The 'Telegram' said, not as its opinion, not as an estimate but as a fact, that during that 13 days of the race meeting on the Woodbine our people had placed in the hands of book-makers $2,600,000 or $200,000 a day for 13 consecutive days.

An hon. MEMBER. The growing time.

Mr. MILLER. It is indeed the growing time, but the growth is the wrong way. The Toronto 'Telegram' further says it cost these book-makers to be on the ground $115,000. I ask whether it is a desirable state of things that anything should induce or be permitted to induce people, most of whom cannot afford it, to place $2,600,000 in 13 days in the custody of American book-makers.

There are many people who appear to fear that if this Bill becomes law it will interfere in some way with Canadian horses. Sir, there is no man in Canada, who loves a good horse, a beautiful horse, much more than I do. I would say of the man who does not love a horse what Shakespeare said of the man who hath not music in his soul. But there is nothing in connection with this Bill that will in any way affect injuriously horses or the lovers of good horses. Men like clean sport, but they do like the sport to be clean; otherwise it is not sport. I claim that race-track gambling does much to deteriorate sport and does nothing to elevate it and that we can have much cleaner and better sport without the gambling. It has been said that we must have men to ride horses, that it is men who are accustomed to riding upon horseback who will be of use to us in time of war and that for the purposes of our militia, for military reasons, it is a good thing to encourage riding. There is nothing in this Bill in any way to discourage riding. A man is permitted to ride, to ride any kind of horse or to hold any kind of race meeting as surely and as freely under this Act as he could do if there was no such Act. But I want to say more, that while horse-racing, and especially race-track gambling, has been rapidly increasing in Canada, horse-back riding has been growing less and less common, and that there are in Canada to-day fewer people who ride horseback than there were 50 years ago. As to the manner in which it may affect the breed of horses, I wish to say that we have in Canada the draught horse which is not affected in any way by any action that may be taken as regards the thoroughbred. We have the hackney, and the trotting horse and the various breeds of coach horses which are not affected even by horse-racing et alone this Bill, and for the breeding of which thorough-bred or running horses are not used. There are many counties in this Dominion and in every province in Canada where no thoroughbred horses have been used for breeding purposes, not so many are used, I think, as there ought to be. I go further and say that whether for the improvement of trotting, or saddle or riding or any other breed of horses, the thoroughbred used is not the stamp of thoroughbred that is found upon the race-track.

I was talking a few days ago to a member of this House who loves horses, as many of us do, and who is fond of seeing a good horse-race. Once in a while he adds to the zest of the sport and the relish of the race by putting up a small bet. He is a man of good judgment—by that I do not mean that he always bets on the winning horse, but that he is a man of sufficient self-control not to wager more than he can afford to lose and he may have bet many times without being injured in the slightest degree. He told me that a short time ago, coming up from the Woodbine on the street car, he saw a little boy probably twelve years old, certainly not more than fourteen, who was exultantly exclaiming to every one in the car that he had won $2 on a horse-race. This member said to me that he thought: Is there not, after all, an element of evil in this whole thing and may not the winning of that $2 injure and probably spoil that boy's whole life? I was talking to a prominent Canadian manufacturer who informed me that he had in his office a young man who had held a position of trust in some financial institution. The young man got to playing the races, and lost a considerable amount. At first he took a small sum of his employer's money and losing it took out another sum to make another bet, hoping to make good his losses, but with the usual result, the book-maker had the best of the contest. The young man's losses and embezzlements increased until he lost his situation. His father had to make good the money he had lost, the young man was to that extent disgraced and his father, an estimable man, came to my friend, and asked him whether he would not, for kindness sake, take the young man into his office and endeavour to make something of him. He did so. The young man was an estimable fellow, every one liked him, but every fall or spring, when the time of the races at the Woodbine comes around, he becomes uneasy and makes some excuse or other to get off to the Woodbine. This manufacturer stated that last year he secured $50 from one member of the firm, $50 from another person

and $50 from some one else. He went to the races with the usual result, he lost his money. He said that the young man, not only lost money he could not afford to lose. but he unfitted himself for business and, so reduced his value as an employee that his employer would have dismissed him were it not for the sake of his father.

Personally I represent a rural constituency within which no horse-racing takes place. I have not the opportunity, whether I would embrace it or not, of watching horse-races or seeing personally much of race-track gambling. But a sad instance came close within my own view. A young man of my own town, more than ordinarily clever, was given a place of considerable trust in Toronto where he handled a good deal of money. He began to play the races, and embezzled the funds of his employer in order that he might bet on the Toronto race track. He was detected and sent to prison for two years. His young wife, a very estimable woman, whom I knew very well, appealed to me to endeavour, if possible, to have her husband liberated because as he had been the bread winner his family were suffering in consequence of his imprisonment. She had two little children to support whom, she laboured with her needle. I appealed to the Minister of Justice, first having said to the young wife that it would be no use to make an appeal until after one half the time had expired. After that time I appealed to the Minister of Justice who said to me: Much as I would like to meet your wishes, I cannot do so; I do not think it would be in the public interest or in the interest of this young man that he should be set at liberty until he had served the greater part of his two years. His wife told me very pathetically of the endeavours she constantly made to hide from her little children the fact that their father was behind prison bars. You may judge whether it would be possible to hide that fact from her children. Sir, there are other wives, there are other fathers and mothers, there are other children, who are being cursed by the results of race-track gambling. I ask you, because of the evils resulting to Canada as a nation and the people of Canada economically, morally and every other way, to support the Bill, and I trust it may become law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question? Did I understand him correctly to say that the object of the Bill is not to suppress betting, but only some forms of race-track gambling?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad that question has been asked. It does endeavour to suppress entirely the business of race-track gambling, but we have carefully avoided any attempt to suppress the making of private bets between private individuals.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does my hon. friend think it perfectly right for him to make a bet on a horse-race with any one he choses but illegal to make the same bet with the book-maker?

Mr. MILLER. We have not endeavoured to suppress the making of private bets between private individuals for two reasons. First because, whatever my own private opinion may be, there are many persons who would not support a Bill to prevent the making of private bets, and I doubt whether public opinion would endorse such a Bill. There are many who desire to do away with race-track gambling but who would not desire to do away with private betting; and if we should enact legislation to prevent the making of private bets, it would be impossible to enforce it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are many of us who do not understand the methods adopted by book-makers and pool sellers and perhaps the hon. gentleman would explain what are these methods, and what are the objectionable features in book-making and pool selling so that we would be in a better position to exercise our judgment in this matter.

Mr. MILLER. I think my hon. friend has an experience in these matters which will enable him to give me pointers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is not an answer to my question. It is purely a matter of opinion and conjecture on the part of the hon. gentleman as to whether I have had personal experience or not. I have asked the question for the benefit of members who do not understand book-making and pool selling.

Mr. MONK. Before the question is put, I should like to offer a few observations. I may say that I did not anticipate that my hon. friend would discuss this measure at this afternoon's session, and consequently am not prepared to go as fully into it as I think it would be my duty to do if I had had sufficient time for preparation. But I would point out that we have in the vicinity of Montreal a very important association connected with racing, and I feel it my duty to offer the House some observations on this measure. There is a point in the remarks of my hon. friend which I think one cannot emphasize too much because the general impression created throughout the country—and it is one which I shared myself to a certain extent—is that those who are pressing this measure are absolutely opposed to betting in any form. My hon. friend, however, has said that there is nothing immoral or wrong in two men on a race-course engaging in any betting operations provided they do not make it a business. I understand from him that a man can go on a race-course and make

bets with another without doing anything wrong and that there is no intention of legislating against any such transaction, but that the evil is done the moment he makes a bet with a book-maker. If I am wrong, I would like my hon. friend to correct me. The occasion for this Bill has been stated by my hon. friend. It is the invasion into the province of Ontario of American book-makers.

Mr. MILLER. Not alone the province of Ontario.

Mr. MONK. Well, all of the western provinces. The fact that book-makers have come from certain states of the Union where book-making has been prohibited, is the occasion of this measure, and that the prohibition of book-making, in the state of New York more particularly, has caused that invasion and that some abuses have resulted. I would like to say, with regard to the province of Quebec and more particularly the race-course I have in view in the immediate vicinity of Montreal, that, so far as I have been able to observe, this invasion has not yet reached us to any appreciable degree. The race-meetings I have attended there and the observations I have made myself and those made by others do not bear out the statement that the book-makers from the United States have invaded that race-course to such an extent that great abuses have resulted. That is one point I desire to make more particularly as regards the province of Quebec, because my observations do not extend outside of that province. I take it as an admitted fact that the racing of horses has the effect of greatly improving the breed of horses. You cannot improve the breed of horses unless you have trials or tests of speed and endurance, and you cannot have these trials and tests successfully unless you have prizes and betting, and I will even go the length of saying book-making at any rate has been the result of experience. My hon. friend says that there is nothing in his Bill to prevent these trials and tests. That is true, but on the other hand you cannot have these tests which result in the improvement of horse breeding, without the accompanying prizes, the bets and even upon the race-course the book-maker, in order that that betting may be conducted in such a way as to make the race meeting a success.

I would not like to be understood as approving of abuses, nor as denying that abuses do exist sometimes—even often; nor would I say anything derogatory of the bodies and individuals whom my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) has quoted here as having encouraged the movement intended to bring about this legislation—nothing of that sort by any means. But I say that, in my opinion, we can take it for granted that successful race-meetings cannot possibly be held if betting be prohibited, or even book-making; and that without race-meetings conducted as they are in England and as we have conducted them hitherto in this country, you cannot have that encouragement of horse breeding that is absolutely essential not only in my province but throughout the whole country. In the province of Quebec—I wish now to become a little more specific—a number of gentlemen of means and immensely interested in the encouragement of horse-breeding and to whom we in that province are greatly indebted for what they have done in that regard, have at very great expense, organized a race-meeting association. And the kind of encouragement that they have given to horse-breeding, even in the short time for which the association has existed, has produced very good results indeed. Of course, in an association of that kind where a large expenditure is made, they must take means to obtain some return. Hitherto, their returns have been very small indeed; I doubt very much, though I am not authorized or qualified to speak for them, that they have realized any dividend whatever. Their object was the encouragement of horse-breeding and not at all the encouragement of abuses in the way of betting or book-making. They have succeeded in improving the breeding of horses in our province, as can be testified to, I am sure, by our agricultural societies and others who are interested in the promotion of that very important national industry. The government of the province of Quebec have realized this also, and have encouraged that association by giving it a grant. I do not know exactly what the amount of that grant is, but I know that the government have testified publicly to the usefulness of the association by making such a grant. But what is more important—and I call the attention of the government and of my hon. friends who belong to the legal profession particularly to this point—the association is working under a charter granted by the provincial authorities of the province of Quebec. That charter, if I am not mistaken, authorizes fully all the operations of whatever nature which that association is carrying on on the Blue Bonnets race-course in Montreal. The reason I point this out to the government, and to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) particularly, is that it seems to me questionable whether we can, by such legislation as this, interfere with the operations of that association, by declaring criminal operations which they are carrying on under a provincial charter—operations, I would furthermore particularly emphasize, which, if this Bill carries, will have to be interrupted, for I start with the principle that it is impossible successfully to carry on a racing association without allowing

not only betting, which my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) states he does not intend to discountenance, but also that particular form of betting which is carried on by book-makers.

The question presented to my mind is, can we legislate that association out of existence?—for that would be the practical result, as I believe, of such a law as is here proposed. I question very much if there does not appear to be there a very serious conflict of jurisdiction between our own power and the power of the legislature. I am not prepared to discuss that at length. But I remember that the question was raised before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Lamb versus the Bank of Toronto. Lamb was a collector of the provincial revenues, and he was endeavouring to collect a tax imposed upon the banks by the province. The decision which condemned the bank was carried to the Privy Council. I have not the report of the case here, but my recollection is that the members of the Judicial Committee stated that if the legislation of the province imposing the tax upon the bank was of such a nature as to strike at the existence of the bank itself the Privy Council would be prepared to pronounce that legislation ultra vires, but they went on to express the opinion that the province had not intended, nor was it the result of its legislation, to deprive the banks of existence or of the power of carrying on their operations, but merely to impose what appeared upon the surface to be a legitimate tax. In this instance—if I am right in stating that to suppress the book-makers would be to render the holding of race-meetings impossible—you could apply the observation made by the Privy Council that it would be a case of legislating out of existence a body created by the province acting within its jurisdiction, by declaring criminal, an operation which, of course, becomes criminal by its abuse but is not criminal if carried on under proper supervision and in such a way as to prevent abuse. I mention this point, because, so far as I have been able to observe, the abuses which exist in the United States, and which since the prohibition there have resulted in the inundation of the province of Ontario and other provinces by the parties guilty of these abuses, have not become evident in the race-courses in the province of Quebec, at any rate in the race-course in the vicinity of the city of Montreal. In this case, as was recognized, I believe, in the case of the Sunday Observance Act, the duty of enforcing the criminal law, the administration of criminal justice, is, under our constitution, left to the provinces; and it seems to me right that the application of this proposed Bill, should it become law, should be left in the hands of the Attorney General of each province. Thus, the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, should the abuse of race-track betting spread to that province and be brought to the notice of the government charged particularly with the administration of the criminal law, could, by proclamation, bring this law into operation in our own province. It seems to me that would be just and fair; because the movement to bring about this legislation has resulted, as my hon. friend has stated, from the chasing out of the United States, or of certain states, the men who created those abuses, or carried on operations in an abusive manner. Their presence, I think, has not yet been felt in our own province, at any rate, on the race courses in question. Why should the men who originated this association, the men interested in horse-breeding, horsemen of high repute—why should these men, having started that association and gone to considerable expense to establish it in an important centre of our province, where their operations are doing good to agriculture, are improving the breed of horses—

Mr. MILLER. Would my hon. friend allow me a question? Has the association in Quebec a charter to carry on race-track gambling, and if not, how will this Bill interfere with that association, or with its work?

Mr. MONK. I have not the charter of that association. But I said a moment ago, so far as I know they are empowered under their charter to carry on betting on their race-track in any form.

Mr. MILLER. If the hon. gentleman is not certain of that, I think he is mistaken. The charter means that they may carry on racing but not betting.

Mr. MONK. I have great difficulty in finding out what my hon. friend means by race-track gambling. I think he said that it was far from his intention to prevent race-track gambling, my hon. friend began with that observation. What he wishes to repress is the abuse by men who make a business of it, the book-makers. But race-track gambling in the sense in which my hon. friend understands it, is, I think, authorized by, or at any rate can be implied from, the powers granted by this charter in Quebec. I have no doubt that if this law passes, a conflict will arise as to whether the association in question, chartered by the province, cannot independently of that law carry on its operations. What objection, might I ask my hon. friend, has he to the insertion of a clause in this Bill that the Attorneys General of the provinces themselves should have the power of bringing the law into operation in our province, where the abuses he has pointed out have not, so far as I am aware, yet manifested themselves? Why should we

suffer because the province of my hon. friend is at the present moment suffering from those abuses? Why should our legitimate operations be interfered with?

Mr. MILLER. If my hon. friend asks me a question I will answer it. If there are in his province no offenders, the law will not apply; but if in his province there are offenders, then the insertion of anything such as he requests in the Act will make it difficult to enforce the Act.

Mr. MONK. Of course, in a large city like Montreal, I have seen a great many results of speculation, results that, among young men, are indeed melancholy. But as far as I am personally concerned, I have not seen a young man in Montreal yet, or in the vicinity, who has come to grief in the way my hon. friend explained a moment ago, through betting on race-tracks. I have not yet seen any such case, though I have seen a great many cases of young men falling and being sent to the penitentiary through speculation, gambling of different kinds. But of gambling on race-tracks, I have not seen yet any cases. Of course there are abuses in Montreal, as everywhere else. I have seen abuses in bazaars, in kermesses, in election competitions, carried on even for the erection of churches and other laudable objects. But I have not yet seen on race-courses the abuses to which my hon. friend has referred. They have in France a system of betting in which one is not exposed to make great losses or great gains. I would not like the House to think I am a betting man, because I am not, nor am I familiar with that particular kind of betting which is called Pari-Mutuel. But I know it has been countenanced in France, for the reason, I suppose, that the system is carried on under the control of the state, and as it is a source of gain, the state has distributed such gain for agricultural purposes throughout France. The gains resulting from this Pari-Mutuel amounts to millions of francs every year, and this sum the government distributes for public purposes. I do not know whether it would be possible to introduce that system here which exists in different countries of Europe. But it has that advantage that you cannot lose a great deal nor gain a great deal, according to the principle that you cannot have a proper risk without betting. It might be a good idea for the government to allow the system of Pari-Mutuel to be carried on by the racing authorities under proper supervision.

Mr. J. B. McCOLL (West Northumberland). I am of opinion that this Bill should pass its second reading without prolonged discussion, and should then be referred to a select committee of this House to investigate the whole matter and report.. My hon. friend who introduced the Bill (Mr. Miller) has given an involved legal argument, and I do not think that many members of this House can, by a discussion of these clauses in committee, get at all the abuses that my hon. friend is attempting to suppress by this Bill. Now, my hon. friend has used the expression, 'Playing the races,' As I understand it, betting upon horse-races takes place every day in the year, and in other places than on the race-tracks at actual meetings. But I am of the opinion, although I would not like to be positive, that the greatest abuses in connection with race-track gambling take place in the pool-rooms, or among what are called hand-book operators, betters of that kind. Last night, in taking up the Toronto 'World,' I found on one page nine different advertisements, one of which I will read, as it will give an idea of all the others.

C. R. James & Co.,
Room 4, 21 Leader Lane.

Monday I gave out, Patsy 8 to 1, won. Yesterday I gave out, Woolstone, 3 to 1, won.

Follow me at Jacksonville, boys, and you'll get the money.

To-day—8 to 1—to-day.

This is a sure winner and one that you can go as far as you like on. I have the word to-day that there is no chance to go wrong. Don't miss this one, boys.

That is the purport of nine different advertisements that appear in this paper, and all in the city of Toronto. In the first place, I point out that it mentions Jacksonville. There is a race-meeting going on in Jacksonville at the present time, and that would imply that there are eight or nine concerns, in the city of Toronto, doing business and recording bets, or that there was some sort of betting carried on in connection with the races at Jacksonville. If that be true, that is something that should be prohibited. I am not sure whether my hon. friend's Bill covers cases of that kind or not, but I fully believe that the great abuses that exist in what is called playing the races arise from outside betting, that is the betting that goes on from day to day and year to year, and not the betting that goes on at a properly regulated race-course. I heard an expression about pool-rooms, hand-book operators and that sort of thing. I never was in a pool-room, and I do not know how they are operated or carried on. I have never seen a hand-book operator to my knowledge. I do not know exactly how he carries on his business, but I have been at one race-track in Canada on several occasions, that is the Woodbine at Toronto, and I must say that if no greater abuses exist on the other race-tracks in Canada than what I have been able to see at the Woodbine, I do not see very much cause for this legislation. As I say, I have not very much information on this subject, my

information may be erroneous and that is why I would like to see it go to a special committee of the House in order that we might find out all about the subject and be able to legislate intelligently. Betting with the book-maker on the race-track is a different proposition from betting with a book-maker in a pool-room or on the street outside of the race-track. If I am correctly informed, when you go into a pool-room the book-maker who conducts the business, or the hand-book maker, fixes the odds and you are betting upon his judgment entirely and upon such information as he is able to get, but when you go to the race-track and bet against that book-maker the book-maker does not make the odds; it is the public that make the odds. Everything is done in the open and above board. It is true that the book-maker produces his slate and suggests the odds, but the public actually make the odds. The book-maker may open the betting on a certain horse at ten to one, but the price is brought down to five to one, or perhaps even money. Why? Because the public take up the proposition and force the price down. So, I say that on the race-track the public make the odds and not the book-maker. If the racing association properly regulates its business, and the association is properly regulated, I do not see any very great harm in betting on the race-track. I am informed, however, that there are many race-tracks in Canada that do not carry on their business in the same manner as it is carried on at the Woodbine. As to that, I do not know. That is one thing I would like to have investigated by a select committee of the House. I am informed that there are race-tracks that are really owned, controlled and operated by professional gamblers or book-makers. They advertise a race-meeting and carry it on for three or four weeks, or thirty or sixty days, so that they are carrying on at the race-track a similar business to that which they carry on in the pool-rooms. If that be true certainly that class of race-tracks should be regulated. That class of betting on race-tracks should be, in my opinion, entirely prohibited. How can that be done? Supposing that some Act were passed to restrict the length of these meetings to a week or ten days and to limit the number of meetings in a year, or something of that sort it would have the effect probably of putting that class of race-tracks out of operation. As far as race-track gambling is concerned the foundation of the thing is the regulation of the race-track associations instead of resorting to the Criminal Code. However, as I say, I am not absolutely certain upon this. I would like to see the question referred to a select committee, so that we could get exact, full and complete information regarding it. If what I have suggested is true I fear that my hon. friend's Bill will not regulate many abuses, that, I am informed, do exist in certain parts of the country.

Mr. MILLER. Would the hon. gentleman tell me to what particular point he refers now?

Mr. McCOLL. Regulating the length of the meetings. I do not see anything in the Bill that at all regulates racing associations. I think that it is the racing associations, the jockey clubs that carry on race meetings and permit gambling upon their premises that should be dealt with first. I do not think the Bill touches that feature of the case at all and I think that is the first thing that should be dealt with. My hon. friend stated, and it appears in the numerous petitions that have been presented to parliament day after day for the last week, that race-track gambling had been prohibited in Japan and in several of the states of the American Union. They do not say that it has been prohibited in Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, Italy Australia, New Zealand or in any of those countries in which horse-racing and race-track betting were in existence long before they were known in the United States. From that I think I have the right to assume that when, in these countries that I have just mentioned, racing associations are in existence and where betting takes place on the race-tracks, they must have some way of regulating them because the evils do not exist that appear to exist in some of the states and on some of the race-tracks in Canada. It may be that in those particular states that have been referred to by my hon. friend the race-tracks are controlled by the book-makers or professional gamblers and not by men who are in the business for the sport that is in it. I would judge that from reading this advertisement which I have just now given to the House, because these men pretend to get, and perhaps do get, information from Jacksonville as to what horse is going to win on a certain day.

That would lead me to believe that the track at Jacksonville is operated and manipulated by men who are in the gambling business and not actually in the racing business, and probably such was the reason for prohibiting betting in these various states. I believe there are very many strong reasons why this matter should be referred to a special committee of the House. Horse-racing has been called the sport of kings and I suppose there is no country in the world to which that description more aptly applies than our own, so that, if the absolute prohibition of betting would ruin this kingly sport as is alleged it may be well for us to inquire in the matter. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that I cannot see very much

difference—I can see no difference in principle—between private persons betting with one another at a race-track and betting with a book-maker. That is particularly so when you have an even chance with the book-maker. And I maintain that as betting is carried on at the Woodbine you have that even chance. Probably that chance may be modified by the fact that the book-maker has an advantage in that he visits all the races in the country and may be a better judge of the form of the different horses, but at all events he proposes the odds and the people who bet take their chance, and if these race-tracks are properly conducted the public have an equal chance with the book-maker. However, I may be all wrong as to that and so I would like a special committee of the House to consider the matter so that we may know what the conditions are and legislate accordingly. If this Bill should pass its second reading, as I think it ought, I shall move that it be referred to a special committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) that a special committee should be appointed to inquire into the question of race-track gambling, and particularly so as the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill was unable to explain to us what the abuses were that he asked us to legislate against. When the Bill gets its second reading I shall have much pleasure in seconding the motion that it be referred to a special committee.

Mr. GEORGE H. COWAN (Vancouver). In so far as this amendment is intended to remove the inconsistencies in section 227 of the Criminal Code I am in favour of it. Section 227 defines a common betting house as 'a house, place, room, or other place', and the courts in interpreting that section have held that a book-maker in a booth or stall or in a hand wagon run about the inclosure commits an offence under the Criminal Code, but that if he walks about even though he has placards all over him declaring himself to be a book-maker, and even though he uses all the arts of a book-maker, he is not within this section. The courts have gone further and have held that if the book-maker is standing on a chair he is liable to a penalty, but that if he gets down from that chair and walks about he is not committing an offence. It seems to me that the provisions of the Criminal Code should square with our moral sense, and our moral sense teaches us that in the one case the crime is as great as in the other. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he says that book-making is a necessary concomitant of races. I believe that the lover of horses needs no such incitement to induce him to take part in clean races, conducted in a clean way, and I believe that when this parliament passed section 227 and gave the definition it did, it really meant to put an end to book-making whether a man stands on a chair, sits in a booth or stall, goes about in a hand wagon, or walks about covered with placards proclaiming himself to be a book-maker. The amendment offered by my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) seems well calculated to remove the anomaly I have referred to and for that reason I shall support it.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to say a few words in favour of the motion of the hon. member from West Northumberland (Mr. McColl), that this Bill be referred to a special committee.

Without entering upon the merits of this question, and, consequently, without saying what stand I might take should the Bill come back before us, I shall state that the chief motive which urges me in voting for the motion to refer is that, apart from the race track at Blue-Bonnets to which the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has alluded, there is also the 'Montreal Driving Club' at De Lorimier Park. I do not know what goes on in Toronto, on the Woodbine race track, but I am aware of what happens at Blue-Bonnets and at De Lorimier's Park, and I can corroborate what the hon. member from Jacques Cartier has said on this subject.

I am in favour of referring this Bill to a special committee because both the associations I have just mentioned claim that they have provincial charters, and, consequently, that they are entitled to engage in betting transactions. I know that during last summer war was waged against the 'Montreal Driving Club;' one newspaper has even deemed proper to enter upon a crusade against the association. I am not aware that the association has been blamed or has been warned by any magistrate, but I know that the proprietors of the 'Montreal Driving Club' claim and assert publicly, as they did at that time, in all the Montreal newspapers, that they had the right to act as they did and that matters were left in abevance.

We are not here to find out new crimes, especially when they relate to actions that the legislatures permit. Thus, in the province of Quebec, the civil code authorizes betting when it tends to the improvement of the breed of horses.

I shall not dilate longer on the subject and, and as already stated, I shall vote for the motion introduced by the hon. member from Northumberland asking that this Bill be referred back to a special committee for consideration and report.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). Mr. Speaker, this is a question that does not properly belong to this House. The ad-

dress of my hon. friend is an attack upon the province of Ontario within the jurisdiction of whose legislature this matter properly falls. The province of Ontario is one of the best provinces in this Dominion. Such a charge as has been made against race-track-gambling by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) should not be laid in this House. It is a question with which the local legislature of Ontario alone ought to deal. I must say that I have been on the race-track in Toronto once or twice, but I saw nothing at all like what the hon. member describes. He told a most pathetic story about a small boy going home with $2 in his pocket. I saw a boy going home with a dollar in his pocket and I asked him how he got it. He said that ten little newsboys each put a ticket in a hat and had each put in ten cents and he happened to draw the lucky ticket. The hon. member calls that gambling. There is no gambling about it at all. I know of no race-track in this country that amounts to much except the Woodbine in Toronto and it is a credit to Canada. We did have a batch of Americans who came over to Fort Erie and set up a race-track and another similar institution was established at Windsor. These men should have been put out of the country. They were not Canadians and their race-tracks were not desirable, but they should have been dealt with by the government of the province of Ontario, not by this government. If the effect of this Bill would be to do away with gambling in this country I would be glad to support it, but there is other gambling in Canada far worse than race-track gambling which is not affected by this proposed legislation. This Bill, in fact, only touches the fringe of the gambling in Canada. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) very wisely keeps clear of that. Thousands of petitions have been presented to this House upon this subject and I have examined many of them. Sir, many of these petitions are signed by young girls who know nothing about the subject and who have never been on a race-track. I am proud to say that I am perhaps the only member of this House who lives in a thoroughly respectable, non-gambling community—I have not received one petition from the city of London on this subject.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. member resent having been so neglected by the young ladies of his riding?

Mr. BEATTIE. No, I am pleased to know that our young ladies do not know anything about the gambling evil to which the hon. member has referred this afternoon. I protest against the hon. member's description of a state of things that I hope does not exist in this country; if it does exist it is the legislature of the province of Ontario who are responsible for this alleged evil, they should right it and not the Dominion of Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at six o'clock, I referred to a small boy having won one dollar by ten of them putting up ten cents each and drawing tickets from a hat. I wish to state that did not take place at the Woodbine track, because the Woodbine course is so well conducted that no small boys such as the member for South Grey referred to are allowed within the grounds. I understand this Bill is likely to go before a special committee, and I do not know that I shall make further remarks but wait the report of that committee, and if that committee can show me that the statements of the hon. member for South Grey are founded on fact, I shall only be too pleased to vote for this Bill.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). I have much pleasure in endorsing this amendment to the Criminal Code introduced by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). The view appears to be entertained by a number of hon. gentlemen that horse-racing improves the stock of the country, and that for this reason we should allow horse-racing to be indulged in, because if repressed we would thereby be preventing the improvement of the breed of horses. I do not know how that may be in other provinces, but in the province of Nova Scotia, the horses that usually get away with the money in contested events are brought either directly from the United States to take part in those events or are horses that have been imported from the United States, and very few of the prize-winners are bred in the province. Furthermore, the horses which participate in track events, whether running, trotting or pacing are not such as the people of the country are most deeply interested in. But while supporting this legislation, I would venture with some apprehension, to offer a suggestion to my hon. friend from South Grey, and that is to remedy what I consider an irregularity in the Bill itself. He has told us that the Bill was drafted by three well known legal gentlemen at the instance of the Reform Association in Canada. Well, if I may be permitted to refer to the law as it originally stood, I would mention that under the common law, in the old country, the business of gambling was prohibited, and in the imperial draft code, when the common law was modified, that prohibition was embodied in certain sections from which the general sections in our Code of

1896 were drafted. Sections 226 and 227 of our Code of 1906 follow verbatim the sections 197 and 198 of the Criminal Code of 1892. Section 226, for instance, defines a common gaming house as a house erected or place kept by any person for gaming. Under the amendment now before the House, the word 'space' is substituted for house, and a common gaming place is a place used by any one—the words 'house, room or' being struck out and the word 'kept,' which is significant, is changed to 'used.' The same is true with regard to 227. Now the punitive or penal section 228 in the amendment goes on to say:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who keeps any disorderly house or other disorderly place, that is to say, any common bawdy house, common gaming place, common betting place or common opium joint as hereinbefore defined.

It must be quite apparent that the user of the place is not punished under the penal section of this amendment, and as the law stood under the old sections 226 and 227, as was pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side before dinner recess, if a person making and registering bets, commonly called a book-maker, carries on his nefarious business within a building, room or generally in some fixed place, then the old sections, as they stood, would reach and punish him, but under the decisions of our court, as pointed out by my hon. friend from South Grey, it was found that a book-maker who moved around on the grounds and in front of the grand stand amongst the crowd and who moved on, when requested by the police, was not such a one as is contemplated by the Code and could not be punished as keeping a gaming place. This amendment then is to reach book-makers moving about the race-track ground, and whilst the defining sections 226 and 227 would reach him well enough, the punitive does not. Subsection 2 of section 228 says:

> Any one who appears, acts or behaves as master or mistress, or as a person having the care, government or management of any disorderly house, or other disorderly place, shall be termed to be the keeper thereof and shall be liable to be prosecuted and punished as such, although in fact he or she is not the owner or the keeper thereof.

Well, if any one who appears to be the keeper of such a place is the one who is to be punished, it must be quite apparent that a book-maker moving to and fro in front of the grand stand and meeting shows very little appearance of being the keeper, and is in fact not the keeper, and so this Bill would not reach him. I venture the suggestion to my hon. friend from South Grey that he would consider the advisability of inserting after the first word 'keeps' in the thirty-first line of page 2 the words 'or uses' so that the section will then read:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who keeps or uses any disorderly house or other disorderly place, that is to say, any common bawdy house, common gaming place, common betting place or common opium joint as hereinbefore defined.

If the words 'or uses' were introduced after the word 'keeps,' that would reach a book-maker on the race-track. Then again it would punish unduly the frequenter of a house of ill-fame, which is not contemplated by this Bill. I would, therefore, recommend that irregularity to the hon. member for South Grey in order that he may prepare an amendment at the third reading of that Bill, or in order that it be submitted to the committee should the Bill go before a committee. So much with regard to the Bill itself.

I submit that the benefits to be derived from horse-racing are not commensurate with the evil consequences which flow from gambling on race-tracks. This Bill is intended to punish book-makers, that is, people who make a business of gambling, whilst it does not pretend to punish a person for gambling itself. The real evil flowing from the book-makers' business is that tricksters and people who pretend to give pointers to those who follow the turf, and also to many who know little or nothing about the turf, publish their pointers and tips and circulate their agents on the race-tracks and sell these tips at so much per day with a view to leading the unsophisticated and credulous to believe that they can make money by betting to win without any chance against them. The man who deals in pointers, the tipster, is one of the evils incident to the work of the book-maker. I submit, further, that the business of the book-maker has the effect of cultivating in the young people of our country the habit of gambling and destroys the true sporting spirit of the rising generation, blunting their sense of sporting morality and fair-play.

Now, I have only to say, in conclusion, that I commend the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) for the manner in which he presented this Bill to the House. Though he is a layman, I think it is safe to say that no member of the bar on either side of the House could have presented the case with greater ability than did the hon. gentleman. He handled the legal aspect of the subject with all the skill of a trained student of Blackstone, and the moral aspect almost as well as a Spurgeon or a Moody. I am not sure that the isolated instances of moral degeneration and social dislocation which the hon. member has pictured could fairly be called the outcome of race-track

gambling only. Still, I submit that the evils flowing from the traffic of book-making on the race-tracks of this country are such as to warrant this House in passing this legislation. As pointed out this evening, this legislation is not new. The very acts which will make a person guilty under this amendment would always have made a person guilty under the law as it stood if they had been carried out in any fixed place, under cover, in some room, in one spot. It has now become necessary to enlarge the operation of the criminal law in order to catch the book-maker who has been shrewd enough to discover that by keeping on the move, by abandoning any place of abode or fixed point of operation, he can evade the consequences of his conduct. It is in order to bring home to him the consequences of his crime that this legislation is sought. I support the measure because I believe it in the best interest of the country and because I believe it is right.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). I have listened with great interest to this discussion, and I cannot let the opportunity go by without putting myself on record as absolutely in favour of the amendment of the Criminal Code here proposed. In fact, I know of no question that touches a greater mass of the people than the question of race-track gambling. I think the House cannot pass a better measure during the present session than this, and I hope it will be passed unanimously. I must congratulate the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) on the exceedingly clear way in which he placed the question before the House. Personally, I would support this measure if for nothing else than because it properly defines the word 'place' under the criminal law. It seems a most peculiar anomaly of the criminal law that a man can act as book-maker wandering around from place to place and be held quite innocent under the law, but the moment he becomes stationary he is liable to punishment. The question at issue, I think, was well put in the judgment of Chief Justice Moss in the Moylett case. Let me read a word from that decision: In speaking of the so called 'place' in question in this case, he said: There was an absence of 'that measure of localization and fixity and exclusive right of user which is necessary to constitute a place.'

It is to meet this difficulty, as I understand it, that this measure has been brought before the House. I believe that by passing this Bill and thus defining the word 'place' we would go far to overcome the difficulty which stands in the way of putting a stop to illegitimate race-track gambling in Canada. I do not know the conditions in Quebec or the maritime provinces, but I do know the conditions in the prairie provinces. Outside of Winnipeg, the race-meets are small, but at every meet there are a number of people who make it their business to follow the race-track—do nothing else. If a man got a fair deal in dealing with book-makers, possibly it would not be of so much importance to pass legislation. But every body knows that the dice are loaded against the person dealing with the book-maker. So far as the portion of the west in which I reside is concerned, every one will be in favour of this amendment. No better legislation could be passed by this House.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.). I have but a few words to say on this Bill. I wish to go on record as being heartily in support of the measure. I also wish to take exception to a statement of the hon. member (Mr. Miller) who introduced the Bill wherein he represented that there was an extended race-meet in the city of Victoria during the past summer. I call attention to the fact that the meeting was not in my constituency, but in that of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). At the same time, I am prepared to admit that some gentlemen who reside in my constituency extended a moderate support to that race-meet. But we have had in that constituency an experience of what this business means when carried to the extent to which the people who support it are prepared to carry it. The state of California prohibited betting on race-tracks with the result that we had all the thugs and undesirable characters of the Pacific coast landed on the constituency which I represent for a period of sixty days last summer, and the experience of that town, both commercially and morally was the reverse of satisfactory. I am in hearty support of this measure and will do everything I can to see it carried through.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely rise to express my sympathy with the measure which is before us, and ask that it be taken into consideration, and that an amendment be introduced to meet a case to which I am going to call attention. I notice in yesterdays issue of the Toronto 'World' 10 advertisements similar to the one which I will read:

DO YOU PLAY THE RACES AT JACKSONVILLE?

IF SO

I AM ON THE SPOT.

I own a stable of horses and am in the know when many a good thing will be cut loose here this winter. I want to put you next when I have them on tap. I don't want any money in advance, merely the winnings of a two-dollar commission on each horse I send you, and they may be one, or two, or even three, a week.

Can I put you on my list?

I will make some money for you.

Send me $2 (two) American money, as a guarantee that you will accept my wires, and we can do business.

GEORGE J. HEWSON
326 West Ashley Street, Jacksonville, Florida.

I will not make any further remarks on this question, as it has been already so fully discussed. But I would like to see an amendment introduced to this effect:

That all advertisements soliciting patronage for betting on race-tracks shall be prohibited.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I do not wish this Bill to go through without voicing my sentiments in its favour. So far as this Bill is concerned, or any other Bill calculated to effect moral reform, I am willing to support it. What I object to is that the hon. member who introduced this Bill is willing to allow gambling on one side to be carried on, while on the other he wishes people to be prosecuted. I would like to see a Bill carried that would make all kinds of gambling illegal, and render every person engaging in gambling liable to prosecution. Now this matter of gambling restrictions was brought to the attention of the government some time ago, and the Secretary of State, instead of taking it into his consideration and trying to carry out the wishes of the people, was willing to legalize it and give the applicants a Bill that made it legal to do gambling throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MURPHY. May I interrupt my hon. friend? The Secretary of State never did anything of the kind, nor was he asked to do anything of the kind.

Mr. J. D. REID. I may say that an application was made to the Secretary of State to grant a charter that would legalize gambling in the city of Toronto, and the Secretary of State gave a charter which legalizes gambling in the city of Toronto to-day.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate my denial that the Secretary of State was asked to issue any charter legalizing gambling, and to assert that he did not do so.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the Secretary of State issued a charter that, perhaps, does not mention gambling, but it is part of the law to-day that they can carry on bookmaking under the charter that was issued by the Secretary of State, and which legalizes gambling. But I do not find so much fault with the Secretary of State, because he was a young member of the cabinet; but he took good care to go to the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, who was responsible for the whole matter, and the Prime Minister authorized him to issue that charter to make it legal to carry on gambling in the city of Toronto. That charter is in existence to-day, and it is a part of the laws of this country that in the city of Toronto they can carry on gambling under a charter issued by the Dominion government, through order of the Prime Minister of Canada. Now, as I say, I would like to see this government pass a law prohibiting gambling of every kind. When the matter came up before the Prime Minister and his government why didn't he suppress that charter? We know that petitions have been pouring in here every day by the hundreds, asking this government to suppress gambling. What did they do in this case? Instead of going to the Minister of Justice and asking him to present a Bill to amend the Criminal Code, the right hon. gentleman hands the matter over to a backbencher and gets him to present the Bill in order to ascertain the feelings of the House before the government acts. Why, Sir, this is one of the most important matters that ever came before this House to improve the morals of this country, and yet the government have not courage to bring in a Bill themselves. Even if they do bring in a Bill, they have to ask one of the backbenchers to present it. So far as I am concerned, so long as this Bill is in the interest of moral reform I am willing to support it.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I dare say it would be better for me if I held my tongue on this occasion. I am vice-president of that terribly and horribly wicked concern, the Ontario Jockey Club, and I am not ashamed of it. Now I am a man with a large family, and have seen much of young men. I have always had a belief, and it grows stronger as I grow older, that you may restrict but you cannot suppress vice. Nobody who has attended the Woodbine races but can bear testimony to the strong ground the management of that concern takes in trying to make sport clean and decent. The hon. member who introduced this Bill, if I heard him aright, gave as a very melancholy instance a young man who had been contaminated by winning $2 at a race, and I think he gave his age at twelve years. Now, Sir, one of the strongest rules and regulations of the Woodbine is that no boy or girl under eighteen years of age is allowed on the track. That rule has been carried out in the strictest possible manner. I do not believe that anybody who has been at the Woodbine races for years past has ever seen a boy—of course a boy of sixteen may say he is eighteen—but you absolutely see no children there.

Mr. BLACK. Let me ask the hon. member a question. What is the motive of regulating the age in the case of the Woodbine? Why not permit boys under eighteen under sixteen, down to twelve, even little

children, and girls under sixteen—why prohibit them attending the Woodbine?

Mr. OSLER. Let me ask the hon. member, why do we impose any restrictions at all in a family on young children? Why not permit them to do just as they like? Why exercise any control over a family? Why do a father and mother control their children until they arrive at years of discretion?

Mr. BLACK. May I ask another question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Only with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. OSLER. I have no objection.

Mr. BLACK. I have no desire to interrupt the hon. gentleman, I simply want to ask a question for information. In restricting the age of persons going to the race track, is there not an acknowledgment that there is a moral wrong somewhere in the sport?

Mr. OSLER. I do not think it necessary to answer such a question, if he does not see the difference himself. I cannot explain it to the hon. gentleman if he does not know the difference between ten years old and twenty years old. If I could, by my vote and influence, prevent all gambling I would do it very soon, but my experience is that you cannot prevent by Act of parliament many of the evils incident to human nature. The difficulty that is before the people of Canada to-day, in my mind, is, to a very great extent, that those who are looking after the morals of the country are trying to put those morals on the lines which they think is right by Act of parliament and not by home and church influences. The Woodbine race track has the approval of all men who are more or less familiar with racing and betting, and I think the testimony of all these men will be that it is possibly the best conducted race track in the world—except none. Yet, with all that, if it were possible by Act of parliament, to stop betting I would give my vote and influence to do it to-day and for all time. I have been in very active business for more than forty years. I have come in contact with hundreds and thousands of young men in banks and offices. My experience may be quite exceptional but I make this statement now that I have never known in, all my experience, of the case of one young man who has gone wrong from betting on the races.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh,.

Mr. OSLER. I make that statement. It may not be the experience of others. I also make the statement that there is hardly a day in the week in which I do not come across cruel, hard cases, not only of boys and of young men but of women who have entangled themselves, lost money and brought themselves and their friends into terrible conditions through gambling in stocks. To-day, all over Canada, there is wild gambling in mining stocks. Flotations are put up at one dollar a share and inducements are held out through every advertising medium in this country to buy these stocks and make a great amount of money. Perhaps it is not necessary to say it, perhaps it is a hard thing to say, and perhaps it may be a thing for which one should not take credit, but for many years no women speculator has been allowed to do business in my office. I have seen the evil of it and I think that the women are the ones in this country who are to be protected infinitely more than the men and the boys who are referred to more particularly in connection with this Bill. Bank clerks, and clerks in offices buy 10, 20, 30, or 40 shares of mining stock. They go into debt for it and the gambling in that particular class of stocks just now is causing infinite trouble and ruin to hundreds of thousands of people in Canada. Servant girls are brought within the range of this kind of stock transaction. If any one going through the city of Toronto will go to any of the evening newspaper offices during a baseball game or a football match he will see thousands—I am not exaggerating—of young men, mechanics and boys, eagerly awaiting the result. I will venture to say that in connection with the football match played between 'Varsity and the Ottawa Rough Riders in Toronto last Saturday, a match played as cleanly and as finely as any match could be played, more money was won and lost, not only in Toronto alone but all over Canada, than there was lost or won during any week of the Woodbine races. I say that because I saw in my own office, from friends of the clerks, telegrams from many outside points asking them to put up $10, to put up $50, or to put up some other amount of money—not in a business way—but on one side or the other of that football match. In the ordinary everyday life throughout Ontario there is more money won or lost by women and men at games of bridge every day than is won or lost at the Woodbine in a week.

Mr. FOSTER. Not excluding Sundays.

Mr. OSLER. Not excluding Sundays. I felt moved to say a few words in connection with this proposed Bill, and I say now that if that Bill could effect the purpose which is aimed at and could suppress gambling, I would vote and work for it heart and soul. But, I do not believe that it will have any good effect. The Woodbine races have become a social affair in Canada, they naturally attract a good deal of attention, and it

is a very easy and pleasant matter for the reformers to train their guns on that one particular event and make very strong and serious statements in connection with it. I know I shall probably be misunderstood very seriously among my constituents and among many of my friends, but I have here a letter from the clerk of the Presbytery of Toronto in which he writes to me inclosing many petitions signed in connection with this gambling Bill and also one or two petitions signed in connection with immorality and vice. I know a little bit about the reason for the gambling evil, but I must say that when I read the resolution of the Presbytery about immorality and vice I thought I knew a little of the bad that was going on in Canada and that I was fairly in touch with those who do know it because I do not always attend to business and I take a very serious and keen interest in many things that are not business. Than the Presbytery of Toronto, there is no more able, no more sincere, no more honourable body of men. They are men who want to do their very best for Canada and in the interest of morality, but, I read in this resolution passed for the Presbytery of Toronto:

> Whereas habitual, open and notorious adultery, and habitual, open and notorious lewd cohabitation are not unlawful in the present state of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Now, the statement is made by that body:

> Whereas many of them living in this disgraceful state, having been driven from the American frontier states, are making their homes on Canadian soil.

That assumes that many of the people of Canada are living in that criminal and disgraceful state and that that class is being added to largely by men and women who are being driven from the American border states to live in Canada because the laws of Canada are more lax and open than the laws of the American states bordering on the Dominion. This resolution goes on:

> Whereas our Dominion is in grave peril because of this evil, owing to the inflowing tide of foreign immigration, thus threatening the sanctity of marriage and destroying the home;
>
> Therefore this Presbytery would urge the Dominion parliament to enact such legislation as will protect Canadian society and morals against this great evil.

I, for one, as a Canadian, born here, living here all my life, seeing, I think, the ins and the outs and the good and the bad of a great city—and not only of a great city, but of most of the outlying districts of Canada—I repudiate absolutely that statement. I do not believe that such a state of things exists. I have written to the reverend gentleman who sends me this letter, saying that I, with many members who have received that circular, are astonished and pained at it, and that we believe it is a slur upon the morals and the character of the men and women of Canada. Now, the meeting which passed that resolution, also passed that terrible indictment against race-track gambling, and if the meeting had only the same information as to race-track gambling that they had with regard to immorality and the social evil, I say they are making much of little and that they are trying to have suppressed by Act of parliament that which can only be suppressed by the moral teaching of the ministers of this country and the mothers and the fathers of the children.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). I did not intend to say one word on this subject. I was here to listen, and to listen carefully, to everything that was said against racing in Canada, and I was particularly anxious about the matter, because for a good many years I have been connected with the Hamilton Jockey Club, of which for some years, I was president. I gave careful personal attention to everything connected with that club from top to bottom, and therefore I honestly think I know perhaps more about it than the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) who probably has never been at a race meeting in his life.

Mr. HUGHES. He goes to camp meetings.

Mr. BARKER. I do not care where he goes, but I do think it would have been wiser for those who wish some reform in this connection, to have placed the Bill in the charge of a gentleman who can speak of his own knowledge of that which he discusses. I have a great respect for the hon. member (Mr. Miller) as an industrious and indefatigable man in anything which he undertakes, but I always like to hear him when he is talking of something he knows a little about. The hon. gentleman may know something about morals in the abstract, but he is as ignorant as the babe unborn about morals as applied to racing and race-horses. I am sure he will not take any offence when I say so; he will no doubt consider it a compliment. Sir, I have been a member of a jockey club and I am not ashamed to say it. I have watched every act and proceeding of that club, from those of the directors down to those of the men who have conducted what is called 'professional betting' on the race-course. I may say that it has been the object of every member of the board of that club, to which I have the honour to belong, to see that everything connected with the Hamilton Jockey Club is conducted in a gentlemanly and honourable manner which would bring the blush of shame to no man's cheek. I am

happy to say here to-night, that I have heard highly respectable men from the United States and from England, express the opinion that there could be no more honourable methods than those adopted by that club, and that everything they did was very very remote, indeed, from the rascality that has been imputed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller). It has been our effort from first to last to stamp out every-evil thing that the hon. member (Mr. Miller) has imputed such a club and to those connected with it. From the day I entered that club, I acted with a view to seeing that nothing was done that could not be published to the world, and that nothing should occur which would cast a shadow of a suspicion on our characters as gentlemen. One broad idea that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) has brought forward here is, that betting is an evil, but he starts out by saying that he does not object to all betting. Betting in the abstract is no sin according to the hon. gentleman, but betting in a particular way is wrong, and I would like to know how much that gentleman knows about the particular sort of betting he objects to. I venture to say he has not the remotest idea about it, and yet he appears here in the parliament of Canada to lecture the people of Canada on their immorality as regards a thing which he knows as much about as he does about the precise question as to whether Dr. Cook or the other gentleman discovered the north pole.

I have been a member of a jockey club for some years, and although a fairly busy man I have given time and attention, without any personal monetary interest, to the supervision of every detail of the Hamilton Jockey Club while I was its president, and I deny what he has charged. That club and every member of it has done everything that could be done by them to put down what is really the mischief, an evil which the hon. gentleman and those whom he represents could have abolished, had they given their attention to it. We have felt that the whole odium of the betting evil is due to a matter with which he does not attempt to deal, that is the maintenance in small shops, barber shops and other small places, of betting places where small wage-earners can wager small sums upon horse-racing, football or any other sport. That evil was known to exist as far back as the passing of Sir John Thompson's Criminal Procedure Act. That, Sir, is the great mischief to-day and it is an evil which is known to every one who chooses to study the subject. The small wage-earner frequents these places, tempted by advertisements such as that read by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl). In these places betting goes on from New Years Day to the 31st of December. That is the curse of the business, and if the hon. gentleman has thought of the subject he knows it. These people induce clerks and small wage-earners to speculate for a few cents or a few dollars on races that are taking place at San Francisco, New Orleans or New York, betting on the advertisements they read in the newspapers. You never see one of these small bettors at a race meeting such as that of the Woodbine or the Hamilton Jockey Club. To enter the Hamilton Jockey Club would cost them more than they are willing to venture on their bets. Those who attend these race meets are not the class of people touched by this evil. The injury is done to the unfortunate man who is addicted to betting, as a man may be to drinking or smoking or any other habit. Such a man loses his money in thus betting, because the other fellows live upon his bets. These are the cases you will see in the newspaper reports of the police courts of Hamilton, Montreal, or any other city. At any of the great race meets the people you see around you are not of the class for whom the hon. gentleman is appealing. He tells a pitiful cock-and-bull story about a boy twelve years of age who was boasting to some gentlemen in Toronto of what he had won at the Woodbine. Does the hon. gentleman himself believe that story? I do not. I know that the whole effort of the Hamilton club is to keep such boys out, and even a member of the club, I myself, if I wanted to bring a son of mine or a daughter of mine under sixteen years of age into that race meeting, could not do it. Yet the hon. gentleman tells a story about a boy of twelve years of age who had been betting and making money. If the hon. gentleman had been in the habit of attending these meetings, he would not have told such a story. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has properly said that these things are guarded against by the clubs. I have no doubt that the Montreal, Toronto and Hamilton clubs are as anxious to protect the youth of this country against danger of that sort as is the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). Does he arrogate to himself a greater anxiety for the morality of the youth of Canada than I have, or than the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has? Does he suppose that because I happen to be a member of a jockey club, I am less anxious than he to guard our youth? The only privilege I enjoy as a member is that I have paid out some money to establish the club. I have never received one cent in dividends or in any form from it and I pay the same as any one else to enter the club grounds. I have given labour to protecting and advancing the respectability of the club, to keeping it as something worthy of and not a disgrace to

this country. I have given time and labour and paid out my money, and all the reward I have ever received has been to hear a little abuse occasionally from gentlemen who do not know what they are talking about. Sir, we see the King of England, the ruler of this British empire, honoured and respected by every man and woman in the land, running horses at the races in England. What a rascal he must be! Probably he would even offer or take a bet with a friend. I do not know whether he gets near enough to bet with any one else, but if he did, I think no man would be afraid of the temptation into which he was running, or fear that he was leading boys of twelve to ruin. The trouble they have in England is that there are a lot of touts who use the love that the British man has for a good horse and for the best horse of the day, to draw a shilling or two out of some poor devil who cannot afford to lose it, and the laws there are framed to stamp out that sort of thing. It has been a slow process, but they are always advancing. But here you do not find the gentlemen who are so anxious for reform trying to abolish the real evils or make them impossible. I heard what the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. McColl) said as to a certain class of advertisements. There is much more in it than appears on the surface. Few men here can appreciate the amount of money that has been expended by gentlemen whose hearts are in the improvement of the horses of this country. There is a general impression that these men make fortunes out of this thing. Why, the men that spend the most make the least. There are men who have devoted their whole lives to the improvement of horses and who have never made one dollar. The desire for gain is not what moves them. It is the love of the thing they go in for, just as in the case of a great many people who go into trotting racing for the pleasure of seeing tests of speed between good horses. I do not object in the least to what the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) has proposed. I should be very sorry to object to any full inquiry into a subject of this kind affecting the moral welfare of the country. I would like nothing better, so far as I am concerned, than to submit every dollar that is invested in the club to which I belong to the impartial investigation of a committee of this House which would honestly decide whether, taking it all in all, there is not good done by horse-racing. I do not want to further occupy the time of the House. I did not intend to say one word, but I speak honestly what is in my own mind from what I know, and I can honestly say this, that if I had to go back upon the last ten years in which I have been connected with a jockey club, and go through them again with the proper sense of what is due the people of this country and the upholding of its morality, I would not hesitate to follow the same course, so far as my connection with the Hamilton Jockey Club is concerned.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). I have listened with much interest to the very exhaustive after dinner speech we have just heard from my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He seems to think that somebody has evil designs on the Hamilton Jockey Club. At least that is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from his remarks. Well, he entirely misconstrues the purpose of the Bill. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) appears to have a similar impression regarding the Woodbine Club. Let me say that the hon. member for Hamilton is hardly justified in the severe castigation he has given my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller). Any one who has listened to the very exhaustive argument made by him cannot fail to come to the conclusion that while that hon. gentleman may be a layman, he has given more care and study to the legal side of the case than many legal gentlemen in this House, and presented it in a more masterly manner than many of these legal gentlemen could have done. The hon. members for Hamilton and Toronto take the ground that this Bill is aimed at the respective jockey clubs to which they happen to belong. That is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from their speeches. They practically admit that these jockey clubs would not exist, if these betting arrangements were not allowed. But that is the very thing we find fault with. This Bill does not say anything about jockey clubs and does not want to put down either the Woodbine or the Hamilton Jockey Clubs. There is nothing in it to prevent these clubs having racing meets unless they are willing to admit that such meets cannot be a success if gambling be not allowed to go on at them. Well, I think that other hon. gentlemen in this House have just as good a right to their views as the hon. members for West Toronto and Hamilton. Like the hon. member for East Grey I have never lost a dollar in betting on a race-horse, but I think we both know what is going on perhaps as well as the hon. member for Hamilton. He took good care not to make any reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Cowan) who spoke of the influx at those race-meets of American horses and jockeys from California, and what he said can be argued of every race-meet in eastern Canada during the last ten years. At such meets the entries are practically monopolized by American horses and jockeys, and in the great majority of instances there is an arrangement between the jockeys and

book-makers and every race is sold out before it is trotted. Consequently no man is safe who goes there and risks his money.

An hon. MEMBER. You need not buy if you do not want to.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend says you need not buy unless you chose to, but I ask the best thinking people is it proper that we should allow such institutions in this country, and allow those connected with them to hold out this bait to the people, especially to the younger men? When I say that such a course is not proper, I believe I am voicing the sentiment of the best people in this country. If you take the flood of petitions we have had during the past three or four weeks, you must admit that they mean something. You may say that these petitions are signed by innocent parties who know nothing about race-meets, but I have only to reply that if these institutions were the splendid ones my hon. friend from Hamilton has pictured them to be, it would not be necessary to make any argument against the gambling connected with them. There has been a proposition made this afternoon to refer this Bill to a special committee. That is something with which I have very little to do. My own opinion however, is that if we refer it to a special committee, that will give the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) a chance to bring down the officers of these jockey clubs, and of course they will say there is nothing wrong with these clubs. I do not think that the members of the Canadian House of Commons need the evidence of these gentlemen to inform them whether there is gambling going on at these race-meets or not. Every one here to-night knows that gambling transactions are there taking place. We have as much information on that point to-night as if we were to investigate the matter during months, and I see no reason why we should refer this Bill to a special committee or follow any other course than the one usually pursued. Therefore, I shall vote that this Bill be taken up in the ordinary course and I hope it will pass and become law.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). It was not my intention to offer any remarks on this matter; but, as an old sport, I thought that probably—seeing this appears to be a time for a confession of faith on the part of the members of the House—a little of my own experience might do no harm. From my early boyhood, I have been engaged in athletic sports of every description. And I never, directly or indirectly, wagered a farthing on any game in my life. I am not claiming any special virtue for that. All I say is that I was not prevented from doing it by any Act of parliament. Fortunately, I had the training in my home and in my school life that taught me that it was not very creditable for a fellow to try to get something for nothing. The virtuous outburst over race-track gambling that we have heard to-night reminds me of two instances in the history of this country. One was the Sunday Observance law—as great a fake as ever was placed on the statute-book of any land. The gentleman who led in putting that enactment through refused point-blank to make duck-hunting on the Sabbath illegal, but they provided that if a young fellow hired a rig to go and see his best girl he was guilty of a crime. The other incident took place a few years ago in Toronto. The exhibition people there, with the desire of affording those who were inclined to be pleased with the classic in sculpture, organized what they termed 'living pictures'. They picked up a lot of old girls from all over the United States, decked them out in tights and showed them as 'living pictures' at the exhibition. There was a great outcry and the ministerial association of Toronto took the matter up. And, in order to decide whether this thing was moral or immoral, those who were appointed as a committee went out there day after day. Finally, on the last day of the fair, they reported—well, I really forget how the report ran, but at all events they had enjoyed the exhibition immensely. I do not believe in gambling, but I have read this Bill from start to finish and I do not see that gambling is even attempted to be suppressed by the measure. Book-making is condemned, but gambling is not condemned, and gambling after all is the evil. You start a person gambling for matches in one of these pious games of bridge that are played in home parlours or in church parlours, and it is just as seductive to the youth of our country as to allow a boy to go on the race-track and bet his money on the horses. Now, what is all this agitation for? Why, it is just to let my genial fellow countryman, the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) out of a nice little hole into which he plumped himself during the past year. There was a little Liberal ring in the city of Toronto, engineered by a very able man connected with some race-track institution in the suburbs. That race-track, owing to offences against decency carried on there, was suppressed by the provincial authorities—and, I believe, very properly suppressed. But these gentlemen said: We will teach this Tory outfit that we have pals at Ottawa. So they came down here, and—I suppose, under the law; I am not questioning the procedure—a charter was granted to this company. Forthwith, there was indignation, and that eminent authority on Christianity, the Toronto 'Globe' came out and demanded—in a moment of weakness—that this charter be cancelled. My Irish friend, the Secretary of State, not only stood his ground but went to Toronto to talk it out with them. And it was

delightful to see how the poor old Globe crawled—got under the lid and stayed there for some days until the Secretary of State came back to Ottawa. The next step was to attempt to suppress betting on race-tracks all over the country—if gambling on race-tracks in Toronto was to be suppressed, it must be suppressed on race-tracks every where. And the pious clergymen—good fellows as a rule; I am not saying a word against them—took up the agitation. But let me say here that if the clergy, instead of trying to govern the people by repression, would follow the lines of education, of building up the individual, there would be less necessity for this race-track gambling legislation. Well, the 'Globe' got back in this way, and petitions were hawked about the country for signature. And I asked several splendid fellows in my own county, 'Do you know what all this means?' Not a man of them could tell me the first thing about it. Thousands of names have been signed to these petitions, but I venture to say that not one out of five hundred of the signers knows the first thing of the history of what he was signing. I want gambling suppressed, whether on the race-track or any where else. At the same time, here in my place in the House I want to place myself on record as believing that this system of governing people by repression is not what has given the nineteenth century the place in history it occupies or that will make the twentieth century what we hope it will be. We must build up the manhood of the nation, and that repression cannot do. Point, if you can, to any period in history where repression has built up manhood. It cannot be done. It is educational, it is kindly teaching the mother with the child, the father taking his boy by the hand. I have a son—I do not want to bring in my own case but I want to show that I am not afraid to practice what I preach—and I am proud of that boy. He is able to hold his own in any place in which he goes in life. And that boy never was repressed, directly or indirectly, either by his father or by his mother. I resent the effort of any man, in politics or out of politics, to repress me, and I have never sought to repress any man; I have never found it necessary. To my mind, this Bill should be relegated to a committee, in order that we may know what there is in this race-track gambling that should be repressed. I have been at the Woodbine a couple of times, and I have seen young fellows bet their fifty cents or whatever it may be on a horse, sometimes winning, sometimes losing. Whether there was any thing wrong with that I do not say. Let us have the committee suggested by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) that we may consider what we shall do, not only with race-track gambling but with gambling in connection with games of all kinds. Why not consider the gambling in connection with bridge-playing? Why, Sir, in this very city of Ottawa homes have been wrecked by bridge-playing; whole properties have changed hands and people have been led to ruin through gambling at bridge.

Gambling in bridge is to my mind even more criminal than gambling on a race-track, because the latter is something for the moment, while the other becomes a craze and is carried to an extreme extent. Let me point out another thing. There was a football match in Toronto last Saturday, and thousands and thousands of young fellows in this city and other parts of the country put up their all on that match and lost. Why is it wrong to bet on a horse-race and right to bet on football? There is another point that I think our hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) might well include in this Bill of his. We frequently find another species of gambling indulged in when a public lecture is advertised, or a football match is advertised, and the admission is placed at a certain figure. The tickets are all corralled up, and when a person wishing to obtain admission and is ready to pay the advertised price, calls for his ticket, he is told: Hand out $4 or $5 or you cannot go through. Possibly a thing like that would come under the law regulating combines in restraint of trade, or against increasing the price of commodities. At all events, it is a species of gambling, and to my mind it is more contemptible than gambling on a horse race. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I am not a horse-race gambler; I claim no credit for it, because I never had any inclination for it. I was trained in my infancy by a good mother to believe that there was nothing honourable in it, but that on the contrary it was disgraceful to be connected with a horse race. I would therefore make a suggestion to those gentlemen throughout this country, the clergymen, and they are a lot of fine fellows, a great many of them, a splendid lot, but they are a little too prone, as I have told them on more than one occasion, to take a crack at the politicians. Now politicians are no better than they should be, but I will say this, that I think the politicians of the parliament of Canada, take both sides—I will include the other side too, although it will bring down the scale a little—I say the politicians in this House will compare favourably with any other class, even the clerical class, in the Dominion of Canada to-day. But I wish here, from my place in the House of Commons, to give a word of suggestion to the clergymen, that splendid lot of fellows in this country, and that is that they should direct their zeal along other lines than the present line. It is so convenient to press

and to grind people down, to crush somebody, and I would suggest that another plan be taken, that they try to reach these people who are going wrong, to extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and show them a better way of earning money than to indulge in gambling, in the effort to get something for nothing. Let the clergymen develop that feeling in the individual, and in their congregations, and throughout the nation, and there will be no longer any need of laws against race-track gambling or any other laws of that nature. But I would say, and I want this to go on record, that I am opposed to gambling; and if my hon. friend from South Grey will make his Bill cover gambling of all classes, betting in every shape, I will support it heartily. To that end I would be pleased to see it referred to a committee, as suggested by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl), in order that all the facts in connection with the matter may be ascertained.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The subject under discussion is a troublesome one to legislate upon, for the reason, I suppose, that in essence the thing struck at by the Bill under consideration is the making or taking part in a bet. Now the trouble is that the making of a bet is not considered by a large portion of the people of this country to be in itself a crime, and that by this legislation which is now proposed, as by legislation already on our statute-book, you are making by statute that thing a criminal offence which, in the eyes of the average citizen, is not an evil thing. It seems to me an innate propensity of the Anglo-Saxon human being to make a bet, to calculate chances, to take those chances, and to stake his property upon his judgment or his skill. The small boy that plays on the sidewalk in the springtime, stakes his marble against that of his playmate upon his ability to make a shot, and if he misses his shot he loses his property, while if he wins, he pockets the marble of his adversary. When that small boy gets a little older, and is able to make or to borrow money enough to waste, he probably ventures into a larger form of gambling, he probably indulges in the purchase of many thousands of bushels of wheat, or many thousands of pounds of bacon or of pork, which the seller never owned and which the purchaser never meant to buy. He simply makes his bet upon his faith that the price of the commodity he purports to buy will rise in the market. Or perhaps he indulges in some other form of stock gambling. Perhaps he goes to the more legitimate broker and engages in speculation by making what is in all substance a merely theoretical purchase of stock in some well known public company. It may be a company whose stock, if he bought a hundred shares, would cost him more money than he might ever hope to possess. He lodges with his broker a percentage, he takes his chance upon the price going up or going down. He never sees any certificate for the stock he has bought, in all human probability no such certificate is ever issued by the company the shares of which he purports to be dealing in. If the price goes up he sells, he wins the bet, and his broker pays him the difference. If on the other hand it goes down, he probably loses his deposit. Well, everybody I suppose calls transactions of that kind gambling, and it is merely gratifying the innate propensity of mankind, or of English mankind at any rate, to make a bet.

But these very gentlemen who have been referred to in the course of the discussion to-day as advocating this measure are, I venture to think, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, engaging in substantially the same sort of business transaction, and considering it an eminently laudable thing for them to do. Suppose I go to a life insurance company and want to obtain a policy of insurance upon my life. What else does the company do but avail itself of its knowledge, by experience or by the experience of others, as to the chances that I will die within a year, and make its bet that I will not so die. They calculate the odds, they know what those odds, in the ordinary experience of mankind, amount to, and they tell me, if you pay us so much money, then, if you die within the twelve months, we will pay many times a larger amount. If I die I win my bet; if I live the year out I lose and the company pockets my money—undertaking on their part that if I live they will renew the bet upon the same terms for the succeeding year, and so it goes through a man's life. Such a contract is in its essence a contract of wagering, a contract of betting in which each party pits his knowledge, or want of knowledge, upon the chance whether or not that particular man will live for a certain prescribed period. Nobody thinks it is wrong, everybody thinks it is right and laudable and this legislation has the defect, that I think every one must appreciate in it that in substance and essence it is running counter to that all but universal propensity—I think I may very properly call it—on the part of the average man to back his judgment or skill by his money.

Now, the practical question here is, I think, whether indulging to excess in this propensity is a thing to be prohibited, or an evil by reason of which you should seek to prohibit absolutely the whole thing, or is a reason why you should seek to regulate it and to prevent, if you can, the excess. Betting upon a horse-race, or upon any

trial of skill, has been the subject of legislation in the old country for centuries at least. As long ago as the days of the Stuart kings statutes were passed in the United Kingdom upon this subject. Very probably before that time it was a matter of legislation and some forms of betting upon trials or contests of skill, or speed, or strength, were considered at all times by the parliament of Great Britain as perfectly legitimate. When we came in Canada to frame our Criminal Code, which contains the present law on this subject, that condition of the antecedent English criminal law was perfectly understood by the men of that day and perfectly recognized in the legislation which is now in question. A great deal of ridicule has been poured upon this legislation, or upon the interpretation of it which has been made by the courts, on the part of newspapers and public speakers who have advocated some change in the law —ridicule, which, I think, is entirely unfair and unjust. I have been brought up to believe, and I do believe, that law is the perfection of human reason and I think that our law upon this subject, as it has been interpreted and declared by our judges, is not any legitimate subject to ridicule, but that the judges have correctly interpreted that which the legislature, whether wisely or unwisely, some seventeen years ago deliberately enacted in this House. They wanted to prevent the keeping of common gaming houses; they were not striking at the individual bet, at one man meeting his neighbour, betting with him upon anything he pleased and depositing the money in the hands of a third person as stake-holder. They were not striking at the comparatively harmless bet of a pair of gloves with a lady, or a pound of candy, or some other trifle of that character, but they were striking at the wholesale, promiscuous betting engaged in in public gaming or betting-houses. They accordingly prohibited, under heavy penalties, the keeping of a public gaming-house or place. In section 235 of the Criminal Code they addressed themselves to the wholesale betting, if I may so describe betting by means of pool selling at race-tracks, or upon contests of that character where the parties to the wagering contract do not individually come at all into contact with each other, but where the bet is arranged through intermediaries on either side, and with the aid, perhaps, of the telegraph wires or other apparatus. Accordingly, they declared by section 235 that every one was guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to one years' imprisonment and to a fine not exceeding a thousand dollars, who did one or the other of several different things—used or allowed any part of his premises to be used for the purpose of registering bets or wagers or selling pools; or kept or used in his premises any device or apparatus for the purpose of recording bets or selling pools; or became the stake-holder or recorded or registered any bet or wager upon, among other things, the result of any race. In passing that enactment the legislatures of that day saw, as any one must, on considering it, that it would render the stake-holder in not only the ordinary innocent bet between two men, but also the stake-holder in the case of a contest for a prize, liable to the penalty of the Act. At every agricultural fair in the province of Ontario each fall I suppose one of the most attractive features is the speeding of horses in the ring for a prize given to the fastest trotting animal, or given for other contests of speed between horses. The owners compete and it was never intended by this legislation to make the treasurer of the association, who held the prize money, a criminal liable to be sent to jail for his conduct. Accordingly they provided by a subsection that:

> The provisions of this section of the Act shall not extend to any person who has become the custodian of any money, property or valuable thing staked to be paid to the winner of any lawful race.

That was the first exception. That exception is swept away by the legislation of my hon. friend. He proposes to re-enact the clause as it stands already on the statute-book, to make it criminal to be in the position of assisting at anything in the nature of a bet upon the result of a race or contest of skill or endurance of man or beast, but does not include the three exceptions which were deliberately put into the Act when it was passed as part of the Criminal Code in 1892. The second exception which was made and which, at the same time, recognized, what I may speak of almost as a standing principle of English law, so great is its age, was that the provisions of this section were not to apply to the owner of any horse engaged in a lawful race. Legislation against betting upon horse races is as old as the Stuarts. In the days of Charles II, in the days of Queen Anne, during the reign of George I and George II, repeated statutes were passed on the subject in England; introduced into Ontario when the law of England as it stood at the date of the meeting of the First Parliament of Upper Canada was adopted as the basis of the law of that province. Under those statutes of Charles II, of Anne and of George II, while there was illegality declared in the making of bets on certain kinds of races and under certain circumstances, the owner of the animal was not penalized if he bet upon his own horse in a lawful race. It was as if he were contesting for a money prize, for plate, or for any prize that was offered to the speediest animal. And so our parliament in 1892, recognizing that condition of the English law which had then obtained for

one hundred and fifty or two hundred years, made that second exception, that nothing in this enactment was to apply to the owner of any horse engaged in any lawful race. Then came the third exception, as to bets between individuals; and finally the exceptional specially made and deliberately enacted by the parliament of Canada in 1892 in order to protect racing upon the race-tracks of an incorporated association.

'Nor to any bets made on the race course of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting'.

The parliament of that day adopted that final exception with its eyes wide open. Sir John Thompson in introducing the Bill, called attention to the effect of the legislation. Mr. Davies—now Sir Louis Davies of the Supreme Court—pointedly called attention to it by saying: 'It is just as well the committee should understand that we are legalizing betting on a race-course' The Solicitor General of the day took part in the discussion pointing out that the law had always allowed betting on horse-races, and so, with fullest knowledge in 1892, a law was enacted which permitted betting between individuals, or on the race-course of an incorporated association, during the actual progress of a race-meeting. And just here let me pause to say that it was with some astonishment—unless my infirm ears much deceive me—that I heard a few minutes ago my hon. friend from Grenville charging against the Secretary of State that by some administrative act of his, within the last few months he had legalized betting upon race-tracks in Toronto. Why, the Secretary of State had no need to do anything to legalize betting. My hon. friend's honoured chieftain, Sir John Thompson had done that in this country years ago. If there is anything improper in betting upon the race-track of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race-meeting, you must strike at it as my hon. friend from South Grey proposes to strike at it, meeting it squarely by repealing the exception which seventeen years ago was put upon the statute-book.

Now, the question, I take it, for consideration to-night by this House is, whether or no that should be done. It is simply a question of policy. Those who support the institution of the race-track in its legitimate form say, either impliedly or in so many words, that if you prevent betting upon the race-track, if you destroy the revenue to the association which they derive directly from the sale of book-making privileges, and if you also deprive that association of the revenue which indirectly they make out of the circumstance that betting is permitted upon the race-track and out of the attraction which that circumstance affords to many of those who otherwise would not attend, you are going to destroy legitimate racing altogether. Now, I do not know for myself, whether that is so or not. Several members of this House during the day, seem to have made more or less confession, and perhaps I may do so too. I had lived in Toronto before I came down to Ottawa four years ago, I had lived in Toronto within a mile or so of the Woodbine race-track for thirty-five years or more, I once went with a friend to see what it was like, I did not stay more than an hour because it did not interest me at any rate, and I never was at the Woodbine under any other circumstance. I never won or lost one cent upon a horse-race—I prefer to take my form of gambling with my broker. In these circumstances, I think I am in the position of the ordinary member of this House, of being able to pass impartially upon this question. Certainly I do not claim to be and do not consider I am in any way a champion or an advocate of the race-track or of race-track associations. But I find this state of things: We have had day after day during the few days this House has been in session, hundreds upon hundreds of petitions upon this subject. Every one knows who has had any practical experience, how readily people sign petitions and very possibly too much credence and weight can be given to petitions. But I cannot think that all those petitions are meaningless. I have had the honour of presenting a considerable number signed by men from my own county whom I know personally; petitions signed without any regard to the political feeling of the men who sign, but petitions which I see signed by substantial men of the constituency and not, at all events, altogether signed by women and children, even if women and children are to be ignored. These petitions were signed by the sober, serious minded back bone of this country. I do not think that we can afford to disregard petitions of that sort. I do not think we can close our eyes to the fact that whether or no it is manufactured, or whether or no it is spontaneous, there has grown up and there does exist in this country at the present time, a strong body of public sentiment upon this question. But, while that is to my mind well established, I think it is equally the fact that public sentiment upon the subject is by no means unanimous.

The debate in this House to-day has demonstrated that and we cannot close our eyes to the fact that if this legislation of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) would have, in fact, the effect of shutting up such race meetings as those of the Woodbine in Toronto or of the equally beneficial meetings held at Montreal or at Winnipeg or at Hamilton, we should be legislating counter to the sentiments and the views of a great many people who can with all propriety be spoken of as, socially and in every other respect,

among the best people in the community. If we think of the class of people who attend our races, we see among them the highest in the land, and when we know that these race meetings are patronized by people of the best standing, people of repute, people who have the best interests of the country at heart and who would never dream of breaking the law or of doing anything which they thought would work any injury to their fellow man, I think it is a subject upon which we certainly ought not to act without the advantage of all the light we can obtain. For that reason, and just because it would be important to know what the effect of withdrawing the revenue from betting privileges would be upon the race-track meetings of legitimate, incorporated associations, I certainly should favour the course which has been proposed by my hon. friend from West Northumberland (Mr. McColl). It cannot do any harm, the session is young yet, there is ample time and after the special committee has heard both sides of this question, has heard whatever evidence may be offered before it by those who are interested in racing and who want to keep up the breed and the excellence of our horses as well as by those who think that the evils which necessarily attend a race-track meeting are so great that the whole thing ought to be suppressed, we shall be in a much better position to deal with this legislation than we could possibly be at present.

I alluded a little while ago to the ridicule which had been in some quarters poured upon the law and the interpretation of it with regard to the question of its being against the law, an illegal thing, for a man to take a bet in the way of book-making at a race-track if he stood still and not at all illegal if he moved about. Many of the petitions which have been presented to the House have referred to that circumstance as an absurd position of things and they put the fault of it upon the judges and of their work in interpreting this legislation. That, I say is a very unfair thing, unfair to the law and unfair to the judges, and it only needs to be understood to be appreciated. When this legislation was passed in 1892, with the deliberate exception permitting bets made on a race-course of an incorporated association during the actual course of a race meeting, it did not meet the approval of those of our citizens who on principle were opposed to all betting, and it was not long before what was considered a test case was made by prosecuting some one under this provision of the law. It was found impossible to secure a conviction, the case was within the exception. Then the ingenuity of lawyers engaged by those who wanted to stop the betting at race-tracks was brought into play and some one conceived the idea of prosecuting the book-maker who occupied perhaps an upturned soap box or stood under an umbrella on the race-track, as the keeper of a common gambling house under the other sections of the Act. That was devised on the part of the godly people. That was an effort on their part to circumvent the legislature and it succeeded to this extent. The court said it does not need four walls or a roof to make a place. The statute prevents any one keeping a common, open gambling house or place, and if he occupies any fixed place, in or on a box, or under a stationary umbrella, any definite fixed location, he may be held to be keeping a common betting place if he holds himself open to the public as a man willing to accept bets from all-comers. Accordingly the law was tortured, if the law ever can be tortured, the law was distorted from the intention of the lawmakers at the instance and upon the argument of those who wanted to repress betting on race-tracks, although it had been deliberately permitted by the legislature seventeen years ago. The next step, of course, on their part, was to attack the man who kept moving about, but the courts said that was going a little too far and they could not say that a man who walked up and down, who was continually on the move, was keeping a common betting house or place even although he was taking bets from every one who would walk along with him. I think then if one remembers how this question has arisen he will acquit our learned judges, who have honestly sought to interpret the law as it was set down for them, from any decision which deserves the ridicule that has been lavished upon it.

I observe in the legislation under discussion that my hon. friend has proposed to get over this last difficulty and, if legislation can do it, to make the man who perambulates about but never stands still for a moment, the keeper of a common betting house, because he takes bets from those who speak with him, and makes bets as he so moves around. The legislation in question proposes, in the second subsection of the second section to define the word 'place' and it says that the word 'place' means something that is not a place.

> The word 'place,' as used in this section and in the preceding section includes any place, whether inclosed or not and whether it is or is not a fixed place, and whether there is or is not exclusive right of user.

We have all heard the ancient conundrum, 'when is a dog's tail not a dog's tail,' with the answer, 'when it is a-waggin'. It seems to me that this is something of the same sort, when is a place not a place? The definition is that the word 'place' is to include any place, whether it is or is not a fixed place. Now to my mind, the word 'place' necessarily implies and carries with it the idea of

localization and of definite fixity. I cannot understand a place that is not a fixed place, and I cannot therefore think that the object which the framers of this Bill had in view in endeavouring to get over the decision of the courts I have described, can be accomplished by any juggling with words or verbal trickery such as, it seems to me, with all respect to the draftsman of this Bill, the definition I have referred to, literally amounts to.

Just one word more because of a misunderstanding which possibly exists on the part of my hon. friend who introduced this Bill. I understood him to express the opinion, in answer to the observations of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that this Bill would not prohibit or affect individual bets between man and man. To my mind that is far from clear. The new section, which is submitted for section 235, in distinct terms, makes it a criminal offence for any man to record a bet, so that if any gentleman, who has made more bets than he can keep in his memory, ventures to take out his pocket diary and make the merest jotting, he would, under the proposed legislation, undoubtedly render himself liable to one year's imprisonment and possibly a fine in addition not exceeding a thousand dollars. If the House means to enact such a law, well and good, but it should be pointed out that the whole effect of the proposed legislation is to sweep away the exceptions which were deliberately inserted into our present legislation, when the Code was enacted in 1892.

I sympathize to the fullest extent with the efforts of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) and those who think with him, to lessen or put an end to the evils of gambling. But if their efforts will necessarily and inevitably carry with them the destruction of property, which is already represented by many hundreds of thousands of dollars in investments of our race track associations if those efforts will necessarily involve the suppression of our race-track meetings and the encouragement which they give to the improvement of the breed of our horses I should hesitate before supporting any change in the present law; and just because I want information on that head and because it seems to me that information can best be obtained by a reference to a special committee, such as has been suggested, I propose to vote for the second reading of this Bill and then to support the amendment or motion which the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) says he intends proposing, to refer the Bill to a special committee of this House.

Mr. STEWART. Representing, as I do, a constituency which has a race course, I do not think I would be doing my duty to that constituency were I not to say where I stand on this question. I am in favour of the principle of the Bill but not in favour of the Bill, as submitted to the House, and I think that the proper course would be to give it a second reading and then send it to a special committee, and in that way obtain information on the subject and hear the different views held regarding it better than we can by following the usual course. It is only fair that those who hold different views should have a chance to come here and give expression to their views. We cannot get too much information on the subject before passing a measure which may have such an important effect on this country, and if the Bill were sent to a special committee and there properly threshed out, we could then vote more intelligently than we can at present.

Hon. C. MURPHY (Secretary of State). At this late hour I do not intend to delay the House for more than a few minutes. At the outset let me associate myself with the gentlemen in and out of this House who do not believe that you can legislate morality into the people of this or any other country. At the same time I desire to associate myself also with the members of this House who earnestly and honestly desire to correct or remove what they believe to be a very serious evil. For that reason I am in sympathy with the objects of the Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend from South Grey. It is my intention to vote for its second reading; and if the hon. member for South Grey approves of its going to a special committee, I shall support a motion to that effect. Permit me to say, Sir, that, in common with other gentlemen in this House, who have been sent here to represent public opinion, I resent the attitude of people who are not members of this House and who declare that this parliament must pass this or that measure of legislation. The members of the House of Commons are the mirror of the public opinion of this country, and I submit that it is not competent for any man or set of men to tell us what legislation we must pass and what we must not. Speaking for myself, I am not affected by any views of that kind either in connection with this or any other measure that may come before this or any other parliament.

Let me refer very briefly to one or two observations that have fallen from hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House. I regret that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) is not here, as I would like to return him good for evil. My hon. colleague the Minister of Justice has made it unnecessary for me to point out to that hon. gentleman that it was not a charter issued by the Department of the Secretary of State which legalized gambling, as he asserted, in the city of Toronto, but it was

the Criminal Code introduced by the late Sir John Thompson. But the hon. gentleman objected to this Bill for the reason that it is proposed to remove the opportunity to bet or gamble at race-tracks. Therefore, it is a fair deduction that he favours betting and gambling at these race meets. Yet in the very same breath, he condemns the Secretary of State for having issued a charter which, he claims, legalized that very thing. I commend his consistency to the very serious consideration of his mother's son. Then the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), for whose opinion I have the very greatest respect, drew attention to the fact that the race-meetings at the Woodbine track are conducted in a manner which is entirely proper and regarding which he asserted no criticism could fairly be indulged in. He illustrated what he says took place in connection with other branches of sport in this country by drawing attention to the crowds that assemble to hear the results of football matches and baseball games and ventured the assertion that more money was wagered and lost on a certain game of football in Toronto last week than is wagered and lost in any one week on the Woodbine track. As to that, I shall not venture an opinion, but let me draw the attention of the hon. gentleman and of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to the fact that the attendance at these football games, unlike the attendance at the race-track meets, which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier affirms could not be successfully conducted unless betting were permitted, is not marked by the presence of bookmakers or by the practice of betting, and the same can be said of hockey matches. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that at these matches the average attendance is much greater, I venture to say, than the attendance at race meets. What does that prove? It proves that two of our most popular sports are not dependent upon betting for their existence. I submit that the whole case against the Bill of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) was given away, to use a colloquial phrase, by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he stated that, in his opinion, horse-racing could not be successfully conducted without gambling. Now, my hon. and gallant friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), whom I am sorry not to see in his seat—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY—whom I am pleased now to see on his way to his seat—referred to a family discussion which took place a few months ago in which the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) figured, and with regard to which it is not necessary for me to give the House any particulars beyond those given by my hon. and gallant friend. But let me point out to my hon. friend that the charter of the association in Toronto which he was under the impression had been cancelled by the provincial government because of some improper practices on the track of that association, was not cancelled for any such reason. That charter was cancelled because of non-user—because it had not been used at a time prior to its coming into the hands of the gentlemen who were operating under the charter at the time it was cancelled. And, in this connection, it may be well to point out that the cancellation of that charter illustrates a very important, a vital, difference, between the Provincial Companies' Act and the Dominion Companies' Act. Whereas under the Provincial Companies' Act there is provision for cancelling a charter, there is no such provision under the Dominion Companies' Act. So that the strength of lung and quantity of ink expended in demanding of the Secretary of State the cancellation of the charter that he issued was very uselessly spent. All that might have been saved if the gentlemen who were making the demand had only taken the trouble to look up the law or consult the nearest solicitor.

Now, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has pointed out certain features of the Bill which render doubtful the effect it may have in actual practice. These are matters, which, I presume, can all be considered in committee. My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Maddin) has drawn attention to what may turn out to be a very necessary amendment in subsection 1 of section 228. That also may be considered in committee. I desire to draw the attention of the House to one or two other amendments that may be made in the direction of broadening this Bill and making it extend to a class of the population who have been very vociferous in demanding this legislation. In my estimation, section 235 as amended by my hon. friend does not go quite far enough. This section provides that every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment and a fine not exceeding $1,000, who —according to subsection (e) as here proposed:

Advertises, publishes, exhibits, posts up, sells or supplies, or offers to sell or supply, any information relating to pool-selling, bookmaking, betting or wagering.

If it is a crime on the part of the men who do this, I want this section 235, so far as I am concerned, extended to the newspapers that assist in disseminating this information. I am going to propose in committee that after the word 'any' in the twenty-fifth line, the words 'news or' be inserted. That line will then read 'news or information.' And I will further propose

in committee that after the word 'wagering' in the twenty-sixth line, these words be inserted:

Upon any horse-race or other race, fight, game or sport, whether at the time of advertising, publishing, exhibiting, posting up, selling or supplying such news or information such horse-race or other race, fight, game or sport, has or has not taken place.

I submit that the necessity for this amendment must have been impressed upon every hon. member of this House when listening this afternoon to the extracts read by one of the hon. members on this side and by an hon. member on the other side of the House. I do not intend to offer any further observations at this moment, but when this Bill reaches committee, I shall ask the indulgence of the committee to allow me to have something further to say.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Murphy) whether he intends to suppress all news relating to the event, or simply betting news?

Mr. MURPHY. The news relating to the events specified in my proposed amendment.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In the case of railway Bills proposed by private members of the House, I have invariably taken the position that where they affect large vested interests, and where there is difference of opinion it is the duty of the House to afford opportunity for those interests to be heard. I think that is only fair. We are here to legislate not alone for the people whose opinions we endorse, but for all the people. If we were sent to legislate only for those who think as we do, we should have only one kind of legislation—and if hon. members opposite were in power, I fear it might be bad legislation. But I have taken the position in railway Bills—fairly, I think—and I intend to take it hereafter, that these Bills should be referred to a committee, not in an unfriendly but in a friendly way, so that the people who are opposed to them can have an opportunity to present their views and so that the members of the House themselves can thus be placed in a better position to judge. I am in sympathy with the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) and intend now to vote for the second reading to advance it a step and to get it where we can, perhaps, hew it into better shape. But I am strongly of opinion that, in fairness to all classes, and in line with the view I have held on other Bills introduced by private members where interests are affected, we ought to give those concerned a chance to be heard, and consequently will support the motion to refer it to a committee.

So far as betting itself is concerned, I believe that the insanity which pervades a portion of the people of Canada on the question of bridge-whist is training people up to be racing touts and book-makers throughout this and other countries, and that the foundation of much of the trouble we shall have from betting in years to come is being laid in the homes of this Dominion in playing bridge-whist and other games for money. So far as the sport of horse-racing itself is concerned, I am guilty of liking it. I would rather own a string of fast horses than be the ruler of any of the smaller countries of the world at least. I see nothing wrong in it, I see every thing good in it. The lover of animals is generally a man of broad mind, and a lover of humanity also. I am fond of good horses, and I pretend to know something about good horses, and when I am in the vicinity where men are trying to see which horse will go the fastest, call it a horse-race, or a trial of speed, or what you like, I am there to enjoy it. Nevertheless I am opposed to some of the evils that go with it, gambling to excess, men betting their last cent on these races, and I am in sympathy with the Bill of my hon. friend. But in fairness to all classes I take the position I do on other public Bills, and say that all parties ought to be heard.

Mr. MILLER. I have to thank, in the first place, some members of the House on both sides who said some kindly things of me, much more kindly than I deserve, in connection with my address in favour of this Bill. At this hour of the night I will not keep the House many moments for fear I would lose their good opinion, which I desire to retain for at least 24 hours. I do feel, however, some responsibility in taking charge of a Bill of so great interest to the people of this Dominion. I would like to refer briefly to some remarks made by hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the Bill. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was the first one to speak. He said that the evil we are endeavouring to combat has not yet reached the province of Quebec. He is fortunate, and the people of Quebec are fortunate that it has not. But I wish to say that when it does reach Quebec, as it will, the machinery of this Bill, if we pass it, will be all ready at hand. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that though they had successful race-meets in the province of Quebec, they are not troubled with the evil of book-making, thus proving by good evidence that racing is possible without book-making. I think the hon. gentleman was scarcely fair to his own province, which he would have us believe to be very tolerant with and generous to professional gamblers. I think that his words will create a misapprehension that would not be

complimentary to his own province. He said that a certain racing association within his own riding, I think he referred to the Blue Bonnet race-course, had some privilege in its charter that permitted gambling or betting. Now, Sir, I have looked at the Quebec statutes incorporating the old Belair Jockey Club, which was at one time one of the first jockey clubs of the province of Quebec, and find that it gives no permission to its members to gamble or to bet, but it does, on the other hand, give them permission to suppress betting and gambling.

Mr. MONK. The charter of the present association is much more recent than that by letters patent.

Mr. MILLER. I have turned, not to the charter, but to the Act of incorporation of the more recently incorporated company, that is the Montreal Jockey Club, and the statute, in defining the rights of the jockey club, says:

> The club shall not permit any form of gambling to be carried on upon its premises; but this shall not affect wagers upon exercises for promoting skill in the use of arms or upon horse or foot races or other lawful games requiring bodily activity or address within the meaning of the Civil Code.

Mr. MONK. What is the date of that?

Mr. MILLER. 1909. Now the Civil Code of Quebec, speaking of betting says:

> There is no right of action for the recovery of any money or anything claimed under a gaming contract or a bet. But if the money or thing have been paid by the losing party he cannot recover it back unless fraud be proved.

The next section says:

> Denial of the right of action declared in the preceding article is subject to exception in favour of exercises for promoting skill in the use of arms and of horse and foot races, and other lawful games which require bodily activity or address.
>
> Nevertheless the court may in its discretion reject the action when the sum demanded appears to be excessive.

Now there is no greater right given in the act of incorporating that society, that jockey club, than is given by the Code, and the Code gives no right for professional gambling, or book-making, or anything of the kind, but simply says that there may be betting, and the Bill that is before the House does not in any way seek to prevent betting, as I have repeatedly stated.

Mr. MONK. The Code does not prevent betting.

Mr. MILLER. Neither does it permit it. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and others coming after him have spoken of lacrosse and football, and they say that the Bill I have introduced does not say anything either about lacrosse or football. It does not particularly. The Bill I have introduced does not, unless it does what I do not mean it to do, prevent betting upon a horse-race; neither does it prevent private betting in connection with a football or a lacrosse match, but it does prevent the business of gambling and book-making, either upon a lacrosse game, a football game or a horse-race. It has been well pointed out by the Secretary of State that football associations and lacrosse associations forbid book-making or anything of the kind upon their grounds, and they have large crowds to witness their games, they get large gate receipts, and they can continue lacrosse and football without selling or permitting to any body the privilege of book-making. If they can do that, I would like to know why the same thing cannot be done with horse-racing. My hon. friend has said, and others have followed him in the same line, that we must have horse-racing in order to improve the breed of horses. I have spoken of that before, and I will not now speak of it at any length save to say this, that the 'Farmers' Advocate,' the leading agricultural paper published in the province of Ontario, and as good an agricultural paper as there is in the Dominion of Canada, wholly devoted to agriculture and stock-breeding, has been loudly clamouring for the passing of just such a Bill as this, and those gentlemen are at least as solicitous to encourage the breeding of good horses as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. McColl) has said that the great evil is the outside betting. Now, I think he will agree with me that the Bill is a good one in so far as that it prevents outside betting. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), the vice-president of the Woodbine association, did not endeavour in any way to deny or lessen the strength of my statement taken from the Toronto 'Telegram' that $2,600,000 was placed in the hands of book-makers in the last meet of thirteen days on the Woodbine track. This was not on outside tracks, and was not the outside betting referred to by the member for Northumberland. The hon. member for Northumberland has said that while they have done away with book-making in several states of the union—a majority, I believe, of the states of the union—they have not in Britain, or in Austria, and in some other places. If the abolition of book-making, of professional race-track gambling, is a good thing, must we as Canadians, be the last people in the world to enact such legislation? Must we wait till every other country in the world has so legislated? Sir, I am a Briton, I believe a true Briton, but there are many things in Canada that I believe are superior to similar things in

Britain. I believe our temperance legislation in Canada and control of the liquor traffic is vastly ahead of such legislation in Britain, and we have better results on every hand throughout the Dominion. My hon. friend from Northumberland suggested short meets, and in this he has been followed by others. Now, I am not seeking to attack horse-racing. I am a lover of horses, and the member for Norhumberland says horse-racing is necessary in order to encourage the breeding of good horses. If horse-racing is necessary to develop a good breed of horses, then surely the more horse-racing we have the better, and it is better that the meet should continue, and that instead of being limited to six days, it should last for ninety days. If horse-racing is going to encourage the breeding of good horses, then the more horse-racing the better. I am not seeking to lessen horse-racing, I am seeking to lessen gambling and gambling has nothing to do with the breeding of horses.

One thing I had thought in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Northumberland; I had thought that he was somewhat conversant with the ways of the race-track until about the last statement that he made. Then he said that the Woodbine is run in such a way that the public have an even chance with the bookmaker. Then I thought that my hon. friend was not so well informed as I had thought he was. Would the American book-makers come every year to the city of Toronto and pay large sums for the privilege of making books on the race course if they meant to give the innocent public an even chance with themselves? The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has said that this is an Ontario matter and that it ought to be left to Ontario to deal with. Contrast that with the statement of his friend and my friend, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) as to the extent of the evil in British Columbia and in his own city of Victoria. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) is not in his seat. I was going to say to him that he very much hurt my feelings and pierced my very thin skin when he spoke of me as a back bencher because I sit one seat farther back than he does. But, Sir, it is not for that that I make reference to him. He said, as other members have said to-night, that I did not oppose gambling in the Bill and that I said I had no objection to gambling. I said nothing of the kind. I said nothing to indicate that that was my attitude. I do not practise gambling for two reasons; in the first place, I do not believe in it, and, in the second place, I would be afraid that I would bet on the losing horse. I have given my reasons why I have not attempted to penalize the man who engages in a private bet. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), a gentleman whom we all respect, has rather ridiculed the statement that I made as to the boy of twelve or fourteen years of age returning from the Woodbine where he had won his $2. That story was not one which had come to my own notice, but the story was told to me by a member of this House who was on the spot, who saw the occurrence, who would sympathize with horse-racing and the race-track and who will, I believe, vote against this Bill. I do not know whether that bet was made on the race-track or whether it was made with the bookmaker off the race-track, but I have no doubt that it was made. The hon. member for West Toronto told us that he is vice-president of the Woodbine Association. I fancy the member said this for fear that if he did not make the statement it would be on the tongue or in the mind of somebody else, but I am sure that those who know the hon. gentleman would not impute any action that he might take or any word that he might utter to any wrong or unworthy motive. I would not think for a moment, nor would any member of this House, that the hon. gentleman would be influenced in his action or in his words because of any connection that he might have with the Woodbine. I do not think for one single moment that the hon. gentleman ever invested a dollar in the Woodbine for the sake of making money out of it. If he did go into it as a money-making investment and if he lost the whole cost of the Woodbine it would not make any particular difference to a man of his wealth. But, I do say this that a man who is vice-president of the Woodbine Association naturally perforce, unconsciously, it may be, sees the whole matter from a rather different view point that many other people will. A man having the wealth of the hon. member for West Toronto moves in a circle and upon a plane where he naturally does not come in contact, as other people with less means and different associations do, with the evil results of race track gambling. The hon. gentleman is not any better qualified to judge of the evils of race-track gambling than I am simply because he is vice-president of that association. He has said that this Bill does not provide a penalty to deal with mining stocks and that it does not deal with the playing of bridge. If the hon. gentleman thought that I was going to concoct some sort of a patent medicine for the remedy of every evil man can think of and if I have not endeavoured to prevent the evil of bridge or gambling in stocks it is no reason why the hon. gentleman should oppose this Bill before the House. It may be his duty to introduce a Bill preventing the playing of bridge and preventing stock gambling and if he does I will be glad, for one, to give his Bill my very careful and honest consideration.

The hon. gentleman has said that many women gamble in stocks, and that women

ought to be protected rather than the men whom we are seeking to protect by the Bill before the House. He spoke of the housemaids who invest their money in mining stocks. I want to know which woman is in greater need of protection—the housemaid who earns her $10, or $12, or $15 a month and then invests some of it unwisely in mining stocks, with no family to support and no children dependent upon her, or the wife of the wage earner who invests his wages at the race-track and, losing them, reduces his wife to want and his children to disgrace. The hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker), president of the Hamilton Jockey Club, thinks his knowledge of race-track gambling superior to my own. I admit his superior knowledge. I did not take any offence at anything he said respecting myself. I admire the hon. gentleman so much that nothing he would say, I think, could offend me. But, I say to him as I say to the hon. member for West Toronto that while these gentlemen, connected with racing-tracks and associations as they are, no doubt have honestly endeavoured to engage in the sport as gentlemen should do, and while they may not be responsible in other respects for the evils that attend race-track gambling, they and other men who have an official connection with a racing association have this responsibility that they sell and sell for gain and sell as a means of maintaining their race-tracks the privilege to men to make books. For this we will at any rate hold them responsible. The hon. member for East Hamilton has told us of their efforts to keep the race-track clean, but he has not given us any evidence at all of the success of those efforts. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) speaks of the petitions that have come before this House, that I thought, was well replied to by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I had thought that we ought to pay a great deal of attention to these petitions, and that for the most part the people who had signed them knew what they were doing, but I have often thought that the voters in Victoria and Halburton must be a peculiar people. The hon. gentleman says that hundreds of people in his riding had signed these petitions without understanding what they had signed. I think they must have been in the same mood and had the same dazed understanding election after election when they marked their ballots for the hon. gentleman. The Minister of Justice has said that there is, in many transactions, the element of gambling. He said that when a man insures his life or property with an insurance company or association it is a gamble. Sir, there is absolutely no parallel between the man who insures his life or his property and the man who bets upon the race-track. The man who insures his life gets his policy of life insurance, the man who insures his barn, or his stock of merchandise, gets his policy and the moment he gets his policy he gets some value for the money he has invested. He gets protection the very moment he pays his money and makes his contract. What protection, what thing of value does a man get who invests his money with a book-maker on the race-track? I say again there is no parallel at all between the two cases. The Minister of Justice rather conveyed the idea that this Act would penalize the treasurer of any society, for instance an agricultural society who would pay a prize to the owner of a horse. I do not so understand the Act, but I bow to the superior wisdom and great legal learning of the Minister of Justice which we all admire and in which we all have a great deal of confidence. I do not think the Act penalizes the owner of a horse who bets on his own horse. The Act does not mention the owner of a horse, the owner of a horse is at liberty to bet on his own horse or on any other man's horse, but he is not permitted, whether he be the owner of a horse or not, to engage in the business of book-making or in the business of gambling.

The Minister of Justice has said that if this Bill would cause the loss of many thousands of dollars that are invested in race-tracks and in racing associations, it would be a matter that would deserve our very serious consideration. Sir, I do not consider, and I do not think this House ought to consider this matter for one single moment; I do not think it has anything to do with the matter before us. If these gentlemen have invested their thousands of dollars for the purpose of perpetuating horse-racing, then I say I have no quarrel with them and I do not endeavour to interfere with their horse-racing—they can carry it on every day in the week except on Sunday, which is forbidden. But, if they have invested their money to carry on a system of gambling then I do not care how much money they have invested it ought not to be perpetuated. Some one has very tersely said that this whole matter is a question of the horse-race versus the human race and if that be so, I, Sir, will endeavour to be the humble champion of the human race. It has been suggested that this Bill be sent to a select committee, and to this I have no objection. I believe I have a very excellent case, I believe that those who with me support the Bill have an excellent case; I am not afraid of all the inquiry that can be made, I am not afraid of all the evidence that may be produced, and I am willing that it should be referred to a special committee. But I do ask that that shall not be the means of shelving the Bill, I do ask that if it is referred to a select committee, that the committee will act with reasonable promptness so that they may report to the

House in time to have this Bill become law in such shape as it will be agreed upon.

Motion (Mr. Miller) agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

Mr. McCOLL. As I intimated, I shall now move that this Bill be referred to a special committee of the House. In selecting that committee I have thought that every portion of the country shall be represented. I have in no sense considered it a party question and have consequently selected an equal number of members from each political party. Then, as there are legal questions involved, I have selected a number of legal gentlemen and I have thought further that members composing that committee should be selected from those particular localities in which they have jockey clubs and racing associations as these gentlemen would be more likely to know the conditions actually existing. As, for instance, one of the British Columbia members spoke of the position of affairs in his part of the country and I have consequently named him on the committee. I therefore move, seconded by Dr. Black:

That Bill (No. 6) to amend the Criminal Code be referred to a select committee of this House composed as follows:—Messrs. Miller, Bristol, Macdonell, Monk, Gervais, Barker, German, Lalor, Harris, Clarke (Essex), Haggart (Winnipeg), Campbell, Neely, Barnard, Macdonald and the mover.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say to my hon. friend, (Mr. McColl) that I cannot agree to the composition of his committee. The committee proposed by him is too large. It ought to be composed of not more than seven members so that it may be a business committee to work a prompt solution of the problem which is referred to it. If we had such a large committee as that I am afraid that the anticipation of my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) might not be realized and that the Bill might not receive proper treatment. I therefore beg to move as an amendment:

That the committee be composed of seven members, namely: Messrs. Miller, McColl (Northumberland), Monk, Blain, Sinclair Stratton and Martin (Regina).

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The Public Works estimates will be taken up again.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose they will take the whole day.

Mr. FIELDING Unless they can be got through more rapidly than usual.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.00 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 3, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to communicate the following letter to the House:

Ottawa, Dec. 3, 1909.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that Chief Justice, the Right Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, acting as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 3.15 for the purpose of assenting to a certain Bill which has passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. J. JONES,
Assistant Governor General's Secretary.

To the Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Captain J. Ernest Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal assent to the following Bill:

An Act respecting a certain supplementary convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

BANK ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. J. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) —(Translation)—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) to amend the Bank Act. He said: These amendments are made primo, in order that banking operations may be more known to the shareholders when advances to a considerable amount are made to the bank's customers; second, to make the special general meeting of the shareholders more easy by allowing fifteen amongst them, in possession of one-twentieth of a bank share, to ask for the convocation of such meeting, instead of twenty-five shareholders in possession of one-tenth of these shares, such as prescribed by law; certio, this Bill is designed to get rid of those dishonest or undesirable shareholders; last, the object of the fourth amendment is to establish a system of banks' inspection through the Department of Finance of Canada.

Bill read first time.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) to amend the Bank Act. He said: This is the same Bill as that which I introduced in the early part of the session with the exception of the clause with regard to the payment of interest. It was suggested to me, that, owing to that clause, if the Bill became law, it might involve a charge upon the consolidated revenue of the country and in consequence would be irregular. It was suggested that I should secure the discharge of the order and reintroduce the Bill with the omission of that clause. The object of the Bill, as I explained on a former occasion, is to provide that the unclaimed balances at the banks should be transferred to the government who shall become the custodians and trustees thereof.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday the 7th inst. it stands adjourned until Thursday the 9th.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the trouble with Wednesday?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Wednesday is a legal holiday by statute—the feast of the Immaculate Conception.

INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if there is any correspondence in existence between himself and the two ministers who went over to the conference this summer, or with any member of the British government, concerning the negotiations, business and attitude to be taken by the representatives of Canada, or any letters of instruction or anything of the kind? I had a motion prepared to ask for all the papers and correspondence. I did not push it because these papers that we have came down but they do not include anything except that it took place over there. If there is any correspondence, in the nature of instructions, letters or otherwise I think we ought to have that before the discussion on the second reading of the Bill comes on. I am not sure whether there is any or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All the correspondence upon this subject has been brought down. If there had been any correspondence of a confidential nature, of course, it would not have been proper for me to have brought it down, but I can tell my hon. friend that there is not even correspondence of a confidential nature. Everything is before the House.

Mr. DEMERS.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the government when those papers ordered on the 22nd November will be brought down. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place. Perhaps the Prime Minister will call his attention to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take a note of it.

IMPRISONMENT OF MRS. ROBINSON

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr Aylesworth) whether he has under consideration a recommendation of further executive clemency in the case of Mrs. Robinson, recently found guilty of murder at the Sudbury assizes and whose sentence was subsequently, upon the petition of upwards of 100,000 Canadian citizens, commuted by His Excellency in Council to imprisonment in the penitentiary of Kingston for ten years. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice or the government to release Mrs. Robinson on parole or otherwise, or in any other way to effect any further mitigation of the very severe punishment which she is suffering, which will result in her release at any early day?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The case referred to was the subject of very anxious and careful consideration before the date fixed for the execution of the capital sentence with the result that His Excellency was advised to commute the capital sentence into a sentence of imprisonment in the penitentiary for a period of ten years. Since the announcement of the decision on the part of His Excellency, I have received a few letters from different individuals who were interested in the case, some of them in the nature of expressing their appreciation and gratitude as to the course which was taken in the matter, one or two expressing the hope that at some future time it might be possible to extend a further measure of clemency in the case of this particular prisoner. No formal application and no suggestion of further clemency, except of the nature I have described, have been made and the matter is not therefore at the present time under consideration.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. I would like to elicit the sympathy of the Prime Minister, of the Minister of Justice, and of the whole cabinet on behalf of Mrs. Robinson, who is imprisoned for a crime which she was forced to commit. There is no doubt that this poor woman had to face a position which no other woman was confronted with since the time of Eve. I am sure that if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice should consider this matter care-

fully they will come to the conclusion that each hour and each minute this poor woman remains in prison is a blot on the justice of this country. I shall not go into the details of this horrible crime, and when I call it a horrible crime I do not refer to what this unfortunate woman did, but to what she was forced into by her monstrosity of a husband. I hope the Minister of Justice, and the Prime Minister particularly who we all know has a sympathetic heart will have mercy on this unfortunate woman.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENTS.

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

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is carried I would like to draw the attention of the government to matters of legislation that, I think, should be attended to. Over a week ago this House dealt with two measures to amend the Railway Act, and saw fit at the instance of the government, to send these measures to the Railway Committee for consideration. These Bills passed their second reading in this House, and then at the instance of the government they were sent to the Railway Committee. That is over a week ago and the Railway Committee has not yet met to consider these Bills. When it does meet it will be so congested with Private Bills that these public measures which provide a remedy for evils which the people of Canada are suffering under will be relegated to the background. The government is responsible for sending these Bills to the Railway Committee, and the government should see that they are dealt with there. I, with other members of the House, am opposed to sending these Public Bills to committees appointed to deal with private legislation, but as the government has taken the responsibility of that course they should see that no delay occurs. We all know that these Bills are necessary legislation in the interest of the country, and that if they are not dealt with early in the session and reported to the House, the government will later on have taken all the sittings for government business, and even though the committee should report in favour of them, if they are presented to the House at that stage they would only be so much waste paper. I appeal to the Prime Minister to see that these Bills are dealt with by the Railway Committee immediately.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committees of the House are under the control of the House itself and not under the control of the government. I believe that had the attention of the chairman of the Railway Committee been directed to this matter he would have promptly called the committee together. I shall deem it my duty to call his attention to it at once.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the Minister of Finance intend to introduce the Banking Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. Not for some little time. There are one or two measures before the House which in due course will, I hope, be referred to committee, and if so I shall ask them to be detained in the committee until other legislation is brought forward. The matter has engaged our attention, but I fear I will not be able to promise the Bill before the Christmas recess. In the meantime there are other matters concerning my department which will engage our attention.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any probability that the budget speech will be delivered before Christmas?

Mr. FIELDING. I would like if possible that it should be, but I will make an announcement with reference to it next week.

Mr. FOSTER. There is so much delay in bringing down the Naval Bill that we might take some of the legislation of the Finance Department if it were ready.

Mr. FIELDING. There are a large number of measures to be dealt with.

Mr. LENNOX. Mountains of them.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Quebec Province Immigrant buildings generally, $5,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works.) This is to make provision for repairs to various immigration buildings. $5,000 was voted last year and $975 expended.

Mr. FOSTER. How many immigrant buildings are there in Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one at Montreal, one at Nominingue, one at Peribonka, one at Roberval and one at Quebec, also others. Each year it has been customary to take a vote for making repairs to the immigrant buildings and to cover what is not otherwise provided for.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we shall have to have some further information on this vote. The difficulty about discussing these matters arises from the fact that the minister who is concerned in the public works for which the vote is taken makes it his business to be absent. The ministers who are concerned in the votes ought to make a point of

being here when they are being put through. If they do not, their absence is going to retard the business very much. I would like to know what the policy of the minister is in regard to the construction of immigrant buildings at these small places?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend desires, I will allow this item to stand until the Minister of the Interior can be here.

Item allowed to stand.

Roberval Public Building—revote of $1,000 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is required for post office purposes. There was an appropriation last session of $5,000, out of which we paid $4,000 for a site in April, 1909. The lot has a frontage of 70 feet by a depth of 170 feet. Roberval is a rapidly growing town. It has three churches—two Roman Catholic and one Episcopal, twenty-one stores, three hotels, three flour mills, a branch bank, telegraph and express office. The population of the town is somewhat over 3,000. The revenue is $3,334.18. The money orders issued amount to $30,168.10 and the money orders paid amount to $22,443.79.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there arbitration on the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that I am unable to tell my hon. friend at this moment, as my deputy is absent, but will be here shortly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated at $25,000, exclusive of the site.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will that cover lighting and heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the custom of the minister to grant to towns of 3,000 inhabitants and with a similar amount of revenue, a public building similar to the one he proposes to build at Roberval?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To a certain extent that is correct. We have laid it down as a principle that a county town, with a population of 2,000 or 3,000, might very well be given a public building; but we have not decided as to when that should be done. We cannot give all the county towns public buildings at once. We have to proceed gradually, according to our financial ability; but speaking generally, I myself would be favourable to giving a county town, with a population of 2,000 or 3,000 people, a public building at as early a date as possible. Of course, if the town has ample post office accommodation, situated in a good building and suited to the requirements of the people, we might very well postpone for a considerable time the erection of a public building.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister set apart a certain portion of the moneys of the department for the building of post offices in towns of about 3,000 inhabitants or is it only to party friends that he allots this money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say no to both my hon. friend's questions.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there any particular policy about it or is it all surmise? It would be well if the public could have some idea of what may be expected in these matters. For instance, some years ago I brought to the attention of Sir William Mulock, then the Postmaster General, the post office at Grimsby, a post office that produces a revenue of over $4,000, serving a population in the village of 1,400 or 1,500 and including the immediate surrounding portion of the township of North Grimsby which is thickly settled by fruit farmers, a population of about 3,000. The postmaster's salary is about $1,300 and he is allowed a rental of $120 a year for the use of his store where the space for the accommodation of the public is about four feet by perhaps eighteen or twenty-five feet, so that in inclement weather hundreds of people have to wait on the sidewalk for their mails as not more than two or three dozen people can enter the post office at once. Sir William promised that he would have this remedied within a year but nothing has been done yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is this a county town?

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are there any public buildings in the county?

Mr. LANCASTER. There are in the county, certainly. Grimsby is half way between the two county towns, Hamilton and St. Catharines. It is a very prosperous and up to date place. The people of Grimsby and the district being engaged largely in the fruit business, have a great deal of correspondence in connection with the disposal of their fruit and the postal revenue would justify much better accommodation than they now receive. I am not finding fault with the government for not having erected a public building in that particular place, but I do say that when money is being expended for the erection of post offices the fact that a town is not a county town is not important. The government are not using a good system to ascertain whether the needs of the public require increased postal accommodation. There is no need to have better accommodation than the business warrants, but there is a class of places like Grimsby that I think should have some attention from the Public Works Department. The customs business at Grimsby is large but the citizens have to go to Hamilton or St. Catharines to make payments. A build-

ing costing $4,000 or $5,000 could be built there with the customs office up stairs and the post office down stairs. It would be a mighty good investment for the country. I hope that next year the minister will do something to bring about a more equitable and fair arrangement, generally speaking, throughout the country to serve the people in regard to these public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would judge from what my hon. friend says that speaking in a general way the town of Grimsby is about of equal importance, from the standpoint of post office receipts and business, with the town of Roberval, in regard to which we are now asking a vote for a public building. But, if I know anything about the people of Grimsby, I am satisfied that they would not be content to have a public building erected there for post office and customs purposes not to cost more than $4,000. If my hon. friend, speaking on behalf of the people of Grimsby, is prepared to say that they would desire a public building and would be thoroughly satisfied with a building costing $4,000, I would take the matter into my favourable consideration with a view to complying with their request.

Mr. LANCASTER. I shall take the minister up right now on that, he can take it right into his serious consideration forthwith, because many prominent people in Grimsby have told me that $4,000 would build a building that would give five times as much accommodation as we are now getting, for which the country is paying $120 a year. They said that the interest on a building of $4,000, at the rate at which the government can borrow money, would involve little more expense than the $120 rent which is now paid annually, and for which practically no accommodation is obtained. The people of Grimsby would be very glad indeed, rather than have the present state of affairs continue, to see a little, narrow $4,000 building built there that would accommodate them. The people of Grimsby know that they cannot expect such a building as a city or large town would have but they do think that the revenue they pay entitles them to a better service and more accommodation than they now enjoy. The people of Grimsby would thank the minister if he would erect a $4,000 building as soon as possible.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has spoken several times of county towns, justifying his expenditure where it was not otherwise justifiable largely upon the fact that although the population was very sparse, still it was a county town. I submit to the hon. minister that that is no justification for expenditure, if the expenditure be not otherwise justifiable, and he ought to revise his opinion. In any case there can be no additional claim by reason of the fact alone that the place is a county town. I do not understand that this government erects the public buildings required for the administration of the law or municipal government. What reason therefore is there why a small place of two or three thousand inhabitants should be supplied with a public building while places with a population of from five to ten thousand are denied the same accommodation, and denied it simply because they do not happen to be county towns? We are continually getting these lame excuses, these palpably unfair excuses, for the expenditure of public money, and I hope, therefore, the hon. minister will change his policy and not select county towns, no matter how small and insignificant, in preference to larger and more important towns.

Mr. ARTHURS. I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister again to the claims of Parry Sound. That town fulfils all the requirements stated by the minister as essential. It is a county town with a population of four or five thousand. It has a postal revenue of over $9,000 per year, and during the last fiscal year the Postmaster General's report shows that the post office money orders issued there exceeded $200,000. It is also a customs port with a revenue of over $50,000 per year and is quite a large and progressive town, and so far it has not any public building. Last session I drew the matter to the attention of the minister and he said he would consider it and I again call his attention to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had the claims of Parry Sound under consideration. When my hon. friend brought the matter up last session, I said that I was considering the possibility of erecting a public building there; but as my hon. friend knows, there were very few votes for public buildings in the estimates of last session, and in the estimates now under consideration there are few new items. They are nearly all for public works provided for two years ago, but which were allowed to stand over. I fully realize the fact that Parry Sound is a growing town, and that it has claims for a public building, and I do not think it will be long before I shall ask parliament to recognize its legitimate claim.

Mr. OWEN. Might I bring to the notice of the minister the claims of the town of Campbellford? It is a flourishing town with a population of probably 3,000 and a postal revenue of between $5,000 and $6,000 and a customs revenue of about $15,000. Our assessed valuation is slightly over a million dollars. There is not a government building in the riding I have the honour to represent, and I think we are entitled to a customs house and post office combined. I know that all

I have to do is to bring this matter to the notice of the minister and he will grant my request.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to know by what process the minister arrives at his estimates of the population of the different towns he is favouring with public buildings. Roberval, he said, was a place with a population of 3,000 and so on. Well, the official figures show that the population is but 1,248.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is taking the village of Roberval as it was in 1901.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am taking the last official figures, and these are the figures which are given us in the case of other places in Ontario or Quebec. If we take the estimates given by other parties, we know how utterly unreliable they are, so that we have to fall back on the official figures, except in the case of some town which is growing very fast. I have frequently drawn attention to the fact that the riding I represent has not a single public building. We have not any place in which we can do our customs work, and have to go to Toronto to get anything through the customs in the district where I live. I have been informed by the manager of one of the leading concerns in the town which I represent that they have to put goods through the customs house amounting to a million of dollars annually, and one can easily imagine what trouble and difficulty that entails on that firm. Perhaps the postal business is not suffering to the same extent, but it is utterly unfair that the minister should leave these places out and give his preference to places with a revenue of a thousand dollars and sometimes less, simply because larger places do not happen to elect government supporters. After all it is the public money which is spent on these buildings, and when a constituency sends a representative to parliament it does so on other grounds than simply the amount of public money spent there. It is not right that the minister should single out those smaller places for the erection of public works and discriminate against more important places simply because the latter do not favour the government. I hope he will revise his method of determining in what places he will put up public buildings and select instead places yielding the largest postal revenue and which have no public buildings. He is now putting up public buildings in such places as Roberval and other little villages in Quebec and Ontario and the other provinces, which entail an average annual expenditure of $2,400 each, when an expenditure of $300 or $400 at the outside would be ample. In fact, I have heard of one place, not in my riding, where the people do not want the government to put up a post office. They said that the government would be called upon to pay an enormous amount to some favourite for a site and that would remove the property from the tax roll.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might I ask the name?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will give it when I am ready. I said it was not in my riding. I think it is time to look at this thing seriously. It is a serious matter when we are rolling up a vast debt in this country, going to the old country and borrowing money to put up these buildings in places where the country gets no return for years to come. When we are obliged to borrow enormous sums of money annually to meet this deficiency, it is time that we put an end to the custom of a minister carrying through the estimates of another department when the minister charged with that department is not here to justify the expenditure. Some of us might wish to inquire as to the necessity of this public building, and there is no one here to give us any information about it. That is altogether wrong. There is no one here to tell us whether this post office ought to be built or not. Did the hon. gentleman go to the Postmaster General and get him to say that this place was in sad need of a post office, and that there would be a return from the office that would justify its erection? Nothing of the kind. But somebody comes down from the riding and says: We want so much money spent in this riding; and the hon. gentleman will tell us that he cannot put up a post office in some place where it is much needed because he is building a wharf or something else there. What in the world has that got to do with it? If a post office is needed, it ought to be put up; and if it is not needed, it ought not to be put up. It seems to me this whole thing is altogether wrong.

Mr. BLONDIN. Last year the minister put in the estimates a sum of $5,000, if my memory serves me right, for the erection of a post office in the town of Grand-Mère. I do not see such an amount in the estimates for this year. I would like to know why it is that the minister has failed to put in such an amount this year for a post office in a place of the importance of Grand-Mère? Grand-Mère has a population of considerably over 5,000; I could not say what the revenue is, but I am sure there is sufficient revenue to justify the government in allotting the amount which I mentioned. I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell me whether he will make such a provision during the course of the present session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that it is quite true that two years

ago there was an amount put in the estimates for a public building at Grand-Mère, and I have left it out of the estimates this year. But I may say to him that my attention had not been called to the urgent necessity of that building at Grand-Mère, and as I had not heard from my hon. friend on the subject, I thought perhaps the matter was not extremely urgent, and that possibly there might be sufficient post office accommodation at present, and that the erection of a new building might be postponed, at all events, for a short time. Therefore, there is no item in the estimates for this building, and I am not able to give my hon. friend any assurance as to when a public building will be undertaken there. Now, with regard to Campbellford, which has been so forcibly presented to my attention by my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Owen), and who also mentioned the necessity for a public building during the last session of parliament. I will say to him now, as I said then, that I am impressed with the arguments he has advanced, and I think the claims of Campbellford are entitled to my careful consideration. A little later I will have the matter more carefully looked into, and I trust it will be possible before long to take the necessary steps towards the erection of a public building at Campbellford.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), I desire to say that he does me a great injustice when he makes the statement to this committee that we pick out places for the erection of public works simply in view of the support which we have got from the constituencies. If it were necessary, I could appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, going over different constituencies all the way from Prince Edward Island to the Pacific ocean, and I am sure that if the hon. members from these constituencies were to rise in their places, they would bear testimony to the fact that I have endeavoured to do complete justice to the various constituencies which they represent, as well as to those which have returned supporters of the government. Let me ask the hon. member who represents the district of Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) whether he thinks the charge of the hon. member for Muskoka is well founded. Let me ask the hon. member who represents the constituency of Digby (Mr. Jameson) if he thinks the charge is well founded. Let me ask my hon. friend who represents the constituency of Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) if he thinks the charge is well founded. Let me ask my hon. friend who represents the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) if he thinks the charge is well founded. The people of St. John, by a majority of the votes, supported the hon. gentleman who represents that city, and whom I do not now see in his place. I might go all over the Dominion of Canada, I might go to the city of Vancouver, to the city of Victoria, to the city of New Westminster and to various other constituencies in the province of British Columbia, and the hon. gentleman will find that I have recognized the legitimate claims of the various sections of that province, entirely irrespective of political and party considerations. Go to the city of Toronto, a city which for years has been sending only members in opposition to this government, and where we are spending, not merely $100,000, but in the vicinity of $700,000 in much needed improvements. I say we might go all over the Dominion, and the facts will show that I have endeavoured, and it has been my honest endeavour, so far as I possibly could, to recognize the legitimate claims of the various sections of Canada. I know there are many public buildings and there are many wharfs which ought to be attended to, but we are not able to do all these things at once. I am doing all I can with the limited amount of money which has been placed at my disposal by the Minister of Finance, and have endeavoured to meet the most urgent needs, and have done so, as I say, entirely irrespective of political and party considerations. It is a matter of regret to me that I am not able now to meet the demands of all sections of the country, but the best I can do is to attend to those needs as I have the means of doing. So I can assure my hon. friends opposite that any legitimate demands which they present to me for consideration with respect to public buildings, wharfs, dredging, or other improvements, will receive my most careful consideration.

Now one word with regard to the erection of public buildings in the smaller towns. Some hon. gentlemen opposite take the view that any kind of a building is good enough for the smaller towns and cities throughout the country, and that we ought not to put up a public building in any city or town where the interest upon the cost and the expense of caretaking will amount to more than the postal revenue. Now, Sir, I entirely disagree with that proposition. In the larger cities, in the city of Ottawa, in the city of Montreal, in the city of Toronto and other larger cities of Canada, when we are proceeding to erect public buildings, we do not limit the class of building to one which is immediately sufficient for the purpose, but we look to the question of beauty, we look to the providing in that city of a public building of which the people will be proud, in which they will take a just pride and which they can point to strangers as being worthy of the Dominion of Canada. Now, if that is the case, why should we not do a little something in the smaller cities and towns towards the erection of suitable public buildings which will be somewhat ornamen-

tal in character and to which the people in those communities can point with pride and say, this is a public building which has been given us by the Dominion of Canada. In the great majority of these towns there is no other public expenditure. They have no harbours to be dredged, they have no navigable channels to be improved, there are no wharfs to be built, and the only public expenditure which they get is the small amount of money which may be expended in the erection of a public building. Therefore, I am prepared to say that so long as I remain Minister of Public Works I shall give reasonable and fair consideration to the requests which may be made to me for the construction of public buildings in the thriving towns throughout Canada no matter in which counties they may be situate and no matter what may be the political complexion of the representatives whom they send to parliament.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am delighted to hear the remarks made by the Minister of Public Works. I am not inclined to too severely criticise him, but as he has made the statement that his aim as Minister of Public Works is to distribute public money over this country regardless of what may be the political complexion of any particular constituency, I have a case right in point. He did not ask me, he asked others, but I think I might as well state the situation with reference to my own constituency. There is the constituency of Brandon and there is the constituency of Souris immediately south of Brandon. Brandon has had hundreds of thousands of dollars of expenditure in it because it was the home of the late Minister of the Interior, while the constituency which I have the honour to represent, lying immediately south of Brandon, has never had one dollar of public money expended in it although I have several times, during the last two or three years, tried to bring the claim of my town and my constituency before the Minister of Public Works. I do not ask for a large amount of money. I do not just exactly agree with the Minister of Public Works that it is necessary to expend as large an amount of money in a town of 2,000 or 3,000 inhabitants for a post office as it would be in a larger place. If you could erect a solid brick building, say, 30 x 50 or 60 feet in dimensions for $6,000 or $8,000 I know you would have a very good building, and I believe it would be adequate for post office purposes in any of these towns and that these towns would be very glad to get it; in fact, if a larger amount were expended upon such a building they would consider it a matter of extravagance. The town of Souris is in the constituency of the late Minister of the Interior and the late Minister of the Interior has the town of Souris to thank for his seat at the present time. He formerly had a majority of some 800 or 900 but he came out of the last election with a majority of 65. I brought up the question of the dismissal of the postmaster at Souris, another which must be added to disgraceful acts of the late Minister of the Interior in connection with that post office. He turned a man out of that office who had held it for years and years and who had gone to considerable expense in preparing the office according to the instructions of the inspector. But, that is not what I am talking about now. The town of Souris and my own town of Boissevain are about the same size. I have asked the Minister of Public Works to give me a post office in Boissevain. I think that for $12,000 you can buy a corner site in the centre of the town and erect the building. I believe a site can be secured for between $3,500 and $4,000 and the remainder will erect a building with which we will be well satisfied. I find that the little town of Souris is down in the estimates this year for $15,000 for a public building. I have been unable to get anything. Will any hon. member of this House say that the political complexion of the constituency of Brandon had nothing to do with putting $15,000 into Souris and nothing to do with absolutely refusing to give me anything for my constituency. I think the minister will have to take back some of the arguments he used in that respect. I could not present to this House a better argument to show that the political complexion of the constituencies is very largely taken into account in giving necessary public buildings to this country. However, he has got so near to my constituency now that I want to put in a plea for the town of Boissevain to be considered and I want to express the hope that in the supplementary estimates provision will be made for a $12,000 building in that town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the population of Boissevain?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. About 1,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend guarantee me against the most—I shall not say violent—but against attack from the other side?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, sir, I will defend you against all comers.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know if the minister justifies this Roberval vote on the ground that it is the county town aside from the question of whether the business requirements of the place warrant the expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I did not mention that Roberval was the county town, but I understand that Roberval has a population of some 3,000 and that it is a rapidly growing town. Its population has increased

from 1,248 in 1901 to something over 3,000 at the present time.

Mr. CROCKET. Where does the minister get his figures as to population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that it is a county town as well.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) referred to the census figures as, I think, 1,200. Where would the minister get any figures showing the population since that time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had a petition from the municipal council of the town, but I do not know whether that states the population or not. Then, we have an assurance from the member for the county that the population is over 3,000. I made inquiry from other sources and that is verified.

Mr. CROCKET. Certainly the minister made some reference to the rule upon which the department has been acting as to the propriety of public buildings being erected in county towns, but I think he laid it down that there must also exist the condition that there is no other public building in the riding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not lay down any hard and fast rule. What I said was that it had been laid down as a rule that each county in the Dominion might fairly claim a public building and that, as a rule, that could be placed in the county town, but I did not say that there should never be more than one building in a county. There might be a county town, a thriving town, and there might be another town somewhat larger and at a considerable distance away from the county town. One cannot lay down a hard and fast rule.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to lay down the rule that the Minister of Finance laid down two or three years ago and that was that claims would be recognized for public buildings in county towns and in constituencies in which there was no other public building. That is the rule, as I understood the Minister of Finance to lay it down a few years ago, and the one which I understand the Minister of Public Works to rely upon this afternoon.

Mr. CROCKET. In what constituency is Roberval?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. CROCKET. Are there no other public buildings in that county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one at Chicoutimi.

Mr. TALBOT. Roberval is the chief town of the county of Lake St. John. Lake St. John and Saguenay, for local purposes, are two distinct counties, and they are of immense territory, occupying the northern part of the province of Quebec and extending as far as Labrador. In that federal district there are two chief towns for judicial purposes, and Roberval has a population of at least 3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any request from the Post Office Department for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I assume there was not or otherwise I would have a record of it here.

Mr. CROCKET. On whose request was the building erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a petition presented from the municipal council of the town of Roberval, and also a strong recommendation from Mr. Girard, the member for the constituency.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it not a rule that the Post Office Department should send a requisition to the Public Works Department for a building which it considers necessary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the rule.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it not customary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there an arbitration on the value of this site which cost $4,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. We sent Mr. Gingras, clerk of works at Montreal, who reported this was a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the owner offer it for $4,000 in the first instance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He wanted more, and Mr. Gingras recommended $4,000 as a fair price. The lot is a large one having a frontage of 70 feet and a depth of 170.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to tell us the other night that it was the practice of the department to have the value of these sites determined by arbitration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not intend to convey that it was a general practice. We did it in the case of the St. Roch property, and the arbitrators in that case were: Thomas M. McCarthy, C.E., acting for the government, J. A. Gignac for the property owners and Joseph Gauthier was the third arbitrator. We have in the department some officers who are accustomed to value property and upon whose judgment we rely when we do not have arbitration.

Mr. CROCKET. Upon whose recommendation was the government arbitrator in the St. Roch case appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is that in that case I consulted with the Prime Minister. We satisfied ourselves that he was a reliable man and acquainted with the value of property.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister spoke about buildings that the people could point to with pride as beautiful in architecture and meritorious from the aesthetic point of view, and that is all very well if we had money to burn. But the minister is limited in his expenditure on these buildings, and the business people of the country would prefer to have ten $10,000 buildings suitable to accommodate the business offering rather than five $20,000 buildings which were not necessary except as beautiful pictures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman say that, in reference to these buildings in Ottawa which could be erected for half the money if they were plain buildings?

Mr. LANCASTER. This is the capital of the Dominion and the buildings here are a concern of national pride, and you cannot compare them with a post office building in a small town of 3,000 inhabitants.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But why waste money on ornamentation?

Mr. LANCASTER. The buildings in the capital city of this Dominion are in a different position altogether from the small buildings in country towns, and even in the capital it is just a question whether you should not erect buildings free from expensive ornamentation but which would supply twice as much space and light in which to transact the business of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman think that in a town where the people take a pride in their private buildings, we should put up a plain building which the citizens would be ashamed of?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the other extreme, and I do not go that far.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we should aim at is to be moderate in our expenditure.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And at the same time recognize that these people in the smaller towns are just as much a part of the Dominion as are the people in the larger cities. My hon. friend from the constituency in which the town of Boissevain is situated stated that the town of Souris gave to the Hon. Mr. Sifton a majority, and so saved his election in that constituency, and that is the reason why we are giving it a public building. My information is that the town of Souris went strongly Conservative in the last election, giving a majority against Mr. Sifton. So that the reason assigned by my hon. friend falls to the ground.

Mr. ROCHE. If the minister looks up the figures, he will find that although Souris is strongly Conservative, the majority was very small.

Mr. LANCASTER. It seems to me that the item for that building first appeared in the estimates before the general election, when it gave a different majority.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it appeared before the general election.

Mr. G. GORDON. The hon. gentleman referred to Nipissing as one of the constituencies which has been fairly treated in the matter of public buildings. I am pleased to be able to say that that is the case. In fact, the minister has done more than I expected. I want to speak fairly and frankly. In North Bay, which is a county town, and which yields a postal revenue of $12,000 or $14,000, a good building has been erected. For Sudbury I notice an appropriation of $20,000 in the estimates this year. That town produces a postal revenue of $8,000 or $10,000, and is larger than any of the towns mentioned here to-day. The town of Cobalt, which has a population of over 6,000, while there are over 12,000 people in the immediate vicinity, has at present very poor postal accommodation. I called the minister's attention to this last session, and he told me that owing to the falling revenues of the country he could not do anything then; but I hope that this year he can see his way clear to do something. The fact of the minister being pretty fair to Nipissing I attribute to our asking for public buildings only in places which absolutely require them. I thank the minister very much for what he has done for us, and I hope he will keep on in the good work.

Mr. SMYTH. I am delighted to hear that my hon. friend from Nipissing is so well satisfied with what the Minister of Public Works has done for his riding. I would be delighted if I could say the same thing about my riding, but things are entirely different there. In almost every part of the riding where I went last fall, I found that public works of various kinds had been promised from the platform; but in looking over the estimates I find that only two points in my riding have been taken notice of at all—Providence Bay and Little Current. The town of Sudbury, which my hon. friend from Nipissing has mentioned, is a growing town which, in the near future, will be a city. The Ontario government has spent a great deal of money in erecting public buildings there. My hon. friend is satisfied with an appropriation of $20,000 for

a public building in Sudbury, whereas a little town of 1,500 inhabitants is getting a $25,000 post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000 is only the start.

Mr. SMYTH. Perhaps the minister will give us the estimated cost of the post office at Sudbury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the information when we come to that item; but the amount of $20,000 is only for the work to be done during the coming year.

Mr. SMYTH. I will be delighted if the the minister will take notice that there are some very large towns giving large revenues to the Post Office Department in my constituency which have great need of good buildings; for instance, the town of Thessalon with a population of 2,000, Blind River with a population of over 3,000, Massey, Webbwood, Gore Bay, Little Current and Manitowaning; and they would be entirely satisfied with buildings costing $4,000 or $5,000. So, while everybody is asking the minister to think of their ridings, I hope, out of the goodness of his heart, he will not forget the most important riding in the province of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are Sault Ste. Marie and Michipicoten in the hon. gentleman's riding?

Mr. SMYTH. No.

Mr. MAGRATH. I am not going to ask the minister out of the goodness of his heart to do anything for me. I take for granted that this country can afford to pay officials to attend to the public business. I take for granted that there is a Post Office Department that knows its needs and is able to communicate them to another department. If that were done in a businesslike way, I would not be placed in the humiliating position of having from time to time to come here and urge the necessity of a post office at Lethbridge. The difficulty is that the minister seems to think that his function is to please certain people, whereas it seems to me that the function of parliament is to spend the public money where the requirements of the people demand it. I put a question to the hon. member a few days ago. I asked him in simple English:

Has the Post Office Department made any demand or representation to the Public Works Department for better post office accommodation in the city of Lethbridge?

Evidently the hon. gentleman thought himself exceedingly clever in the way he answered the question. He did not give me the information I asked, if he had I would have been satisfied. He told me a story about the building that was erected in Lethbridge in 1892 or 1893, which he said was used for customs and inland revenue purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I say to my hon. friend that when I received the answer from my department I thought myself there possibly might have been some later request to which my hon. friend was referring, but I am informed by my deputy and was then informed that there had been no late request from the Postmaster General and therefore the answer was correct.

Mr. MAGRATH. I should be very sorry to misrepresent the hon. gentleman or any one else. I do not want to waste the time of the House in matters of this kind but I wish to place before the House the exact situation that exists. The hon. minister does not seem to know it. If he will come to the House when asking for a post office and say that the application is endorsed by the Post Office Department, well and good, but when he says these applications were endorsed by boards of trade and by town councils, it is time for us to have something to say in this matter. I picked up a copy of the Montreal 'Star' only on Saturday last in which reference was made to the business activities in various cities in this country. It gives a list of 21 cities and refers to the value of the building permits for the month of October. Here is the order in which they stand: Toronto 1; Montreal 2; Winnipeg 3; Vancouver 4; Calgary 5; Hamilton 6, Lethbridge 7; Victoria 8; Fort William 9; Edmonton 10. Thus Lethbridge stands next to Hamilton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that not simply the percentage of increase?

Mr. MAGRATH. It is the actual building permits for October, 1909. The city of Lethbridge last year had a postal revenue of $19,000 and I venture to say that by now it has reached $25,000 a year, and they are suffering from the lack of postal facilities. I do not want the money of this country shoved into Lethbridge to put up buildings, the people going in there can put up the buildings, but I want to see the people there put in a position to attend to their business in a proper way and if it is a question of getting petitions from boards of trade or city councils, the hon. gentleman can get all he wants. Political snipes went through that constituency at the time I was running that election, saying: It is no use electing this man; you want a post office and if you elect him you will not get it. Yet, in the face of that, the hon. gentleman gets up here and says there is no politics in this matter. Is the hon. gentleman satisfied from the clipping I have sent him that the reference was to building permits?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the hon. gentleman seems to be correct.

Mr. MAGRATH. Lethbridge stands next to Hamilton and Edmonton, which stands 10th on the list, has a $200,000 building while Lethbridge has nothing. The hon. gentleman knows nothing about the situation there or he would have brought down some appropriation for Lethbridge. This appears to me to be the only opportunity of bringing this matter forward. It is humiliating to have to do this; I do not conceive that the people of Canada sent me here to do this work, I think there is something else to attend to, and if the hon. gentleman had a force of competent men going through the country to pass on these things there would be less said about them in the House. I hope I shall not have to discuss this again and that I have said enough to convince the hon. gentleman of the necessity of granting this building. Every one is crying out for it, and why the minister is giving a small place with a population of 1,300 and a postal revenue of $1,500, a public building costing $25,000, without a request as the hon. gentleman himself admitted, from the Post Office Department or from the Customs Department, is something that I cannot understand in any country where they are attempting to have their affairs administered with some system of business.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the rental and salary at present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postmaster's salary is $1,192 besides $75 for commissions on money orders and $7.65 on postal notes. The rental paid is $175, a total of $1,308.97.

Mr. MAGRATH. I want to hear from the hon. gentleman about this matter. Has he got this thing thoroughly in the back of his head?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is so genial and he has such a good cause to plead, that I cannot refrain from saying a word in reply. The hon. gentleman sent me a statement of figures showing the number of building permits in Lethbridge, and they show, what I was told when I was in the west, that Lethbridge has recently taken on a very rapid growth. If my hon. friend will look at these figures which he has sent me he will see that in October, 1908, there was not a single building permit in Lethbridge.

Mr. MAGRATH. There were building permits but this paper did not get them, that is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be. At all events, by the statement the hon. gentleman sent me, there does not seem to have been a building permit in Lethbridge in October, 1908. That, of course, would show that there has been a very sudden increase in growth. But I know and my hon. friend knows that it is within the last year or so that Lethbridge has suddenly begun to forge ahead, and it is forging ahead with great rapidity. I told my hon. friend the other day and I tell him now that I recognize the strong claims of Lethbridge for better postal accommodation. I have unfortunately no amount in these estimates for the purpose, but, as I explained to the committee before, there are very few new items in these estimates, they are mostly for public works provided for two years ago. But I would say to my hon. friend that I will consider carefully the claims of Lethbridge, and if there should be supplementary estimates—I do not know whether there will be—these claims will be noted for consideration in connection with these estimates. I can make no promise further than may be implied in this statement at the present time, but I beg to assure my hon. friend that no one can recognize more strongly than I do the necessity for giving better postal accommodation in Lethbridge than they have there now.

Mr. MAGRATH. Will the hon. gentleman take this up with the Post Office Department? He said that there is nothing from the Post Office Department in connection with this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing beyond what was returned to the House.

Mr. MAGRATH. My information is different, I am sorry to say. I would like to get the minister in touch with the Post Office Department. I am sorry to have to say that if the Post Office Department does not know its business better than that there is something wrong there. I was given to understand the hon. gentleman had been written to about this matter in April last by the Post Office Department.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to say that there was some requisition from the sitting member for the county. Will he read that communication?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the communication here but can give the gist of it.

Mr. BLAIN. We ought to have the document itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give it now. The effect of the communication was that the town was increasing rapidly, that it has a population of over 3,000, that numerous tourists frequent it in the summer months, that the post office is in the postmaster's house and not at all suited to the public convenience, and that, in the interest of the good reputation of the Dominion, a public building should be provided adequate to the wants of this growing town.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a very nice statement, but it would be only fair to the committee that the minister should bring down the letter itself. It would be interesting to have that part of the communication which he has not quoted, and I suppose he has no objection to bringing down the letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. None whatever, but I have really stated all it contains.

Mr. BLAIN. What we are trying to find out is, if possible, the policy of the department in the construction of public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That policy is to construct, to as reasonable an extent as possible, public buildings where they are required in the public interests.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course we could not expect the hon. minister to say anything else, but I think he was rather severe in his criticism of my hon. friend from Muskoka. My hon. friend suggested that possibly somewhere in the department there was political partisanship, and if that suspicion be aroused, the government is responsible for it. Before the hon. gentleman was Minister of Public Works the department had a clear cut policy, well understood in the country. Prior to the general election of 1900, the Department of Public Works sent out a letter, a copy of which I have under my hand. The late Mr. Tarte, who was then Minister of Public Works, had absented himself a little while from the department, and Sir William Mullock, who was then Postmaster General, was acting in his stead, and Sir William Mullock sent out a circular to Reform members of parliament and defeated government candidates, but was careful to leave out altogether Conservative members and the defeated Conservative candidates. In that circular he called upon those to whom it was sent to state what public buildings they wanted in their counties, whether they would recommend that the contracts be given after public competition, and also a number of other inquiries along that line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps he was merely seeking information.

Mr. BLAIN. But it was rather peculiar that he only sought it from government supporters. My hon. friend says there is no partisanship in his department. Would he then explain how this circular came to be sent to government members and government defeated candidates and not to any others?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sir William Mulock may not have thought that hon. gentleman opposite would give him the information he required.

Mr. BLAIN. There is another reason far more likely. My hon. friend ought certainly to be sparing in his criticisms on my hon. friend from Muskoka, who suggested that somewhere in the department there was a taint of political partisanship. Who can be responsible for that suspicion, if not the government that sent out a circular of that kind, more especially as the circular was issued shortly before the general election of 1900 and read on the public platform in every province. The hon. minister cannot therefore complain if the public suspect that instead of spending public money where the public interests may best be served, he selects here and there a county, where the issue is uncertain, and where it would be likely such expenditure would have the greatest effect, and where the proposed expenditure for the purposes of erecting a public building or a wharf or doing some dredging in that locality might influence the public vote in the government's behalf. Since the hon. gentleman will not explain what the policy of his department is now, we are perfectly justified in assuming that this policy, which was inaugurated in 1900, is still in force. I understand my hon. friend to say he will bring down the letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps in the future it will be better for the hon. gentleman to produce the original documents than give synopses of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not unless specially desired.

Mr. BLAIN. It would be less troublesome for the department to give him the letter itself, than to copy passages out of it which might suit his purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These selections which I have quoted never came to my knowledge, but were simply made by the officials of the department with the view of giving the requisite information as to who had applied for public works. I had no more to do with the selections than my hon. friend.

Rock Island public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the village of Rock Island, Stanstead county. The proposed building is required for post office and customs purposes. I may say that this matter had been under consideration some little time, and when first pressed upon my attention by the member for that constituency, I made particular inquiries of the Minister of Customs. He in turn inquired of the officials of his department and I am in a position to say that this building is urgently required there for customs purposes, and I can say the same with regard to its necessity for post office purposes.

Rock Island is close to the boundary between Canada and the United States, and it is necessary to give accommodation there for the customs officials. A good deal of postal business also is done there.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was only 615 in 1901, but has grown considerable since.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,013—very much larger than one would expect from its comparatively small population.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From $15,000 to $20,000 including the site.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Salary $1,252, besides commissions on money orders. The rent is $175 per annum.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the hon. minister read the requisition from the Customs Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The commissioner came to the department and gave verbal assurance that this building was urgently needed. This item was agreed to after consideration extending over several weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. How many customs officers are there permanently?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say, but quite a number. Then some three miles away from Rock Island there is another place where a good deal of customs business is transacted. But Rock Island is the principal place.

Mr. MAGRATH. Has there been any demand for this particular service from the Post Office Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No demand from the Post Office Department.

Mr. MAGRATH. I think the time has arrived in this country when these departments that are being served should be held responsible. I realize that the hon. gentleman is in a very disagreeable position, he has to put these matters through. I say that these departments which are being served should be held responsible, and the hon. gentleman should not be allowed to pass an item until he produces evidence from the department that they need the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know whether Rock Island is a customs port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the actual customs port is about three miles away, at Beebe Plain, but Rock Island is an important place.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is Rock Island from Stanstead Plain?

Mr. FISHER. Rock Island itself is not the customs port, but it is the place at which the customs work of the port of Stanstead is done. Stanstead village which, in years gone by, used to be an important village, has not grown, while Rock Island is a manufacturing and industrial place on the border line, and has been growing rapidly. I think it has a population of about 3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Public Works told us it was 615.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave that population as of nine years ago.

Mr. FISHER. I have been there several times, and I was told the population was about 3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that there are twelve stores, two hotels, a grist mill and ten factories at Rock Island; also a bank, and the ordinary express and telegraph offices.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it intended to close down the customs office at the other town?

Mr. FISHER. The real business of the Customs Department is now being done at a place called Stanstead Junction, which is, I think, a little over two miles to the west of Rock Island. The reason the business is done there is that it is a junction of the railway. But Rock Island itself is the place where nearly all the duties are paid, being an industrial centre. Beebe Plain, where the railway junction is, and where the manifesting is done, is a hamlet of only three or four houses and a railroad station. Rock Island is an important industrial village on the border line; there is a little spur from the railroad which runs up to Rock Island, and which serves the Canadian village as well as the American village. The station is almost on the boundary line. The real business of the port is largely done at Rock Island, and it is at Rock Island that the customs officers want their accommodation.

Mr. FOSTER. How many customs officers?

Mr. FISHER. At the whole port, I think five. A part of the work is done at Beebe Plain where the station is.

Shawenegan Falls, revote, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a public building at Shawenegan Falls. The commit-

tee are aware that Shawenegan Falls is an important manufacturing centre. It has a superior water-power, a large number of factories, and the population is growing rapidly. The population is estimated at 2,300. The postal revenue last year was $2,586, and from the Customs Department, $42,000. The cost of the building will run from $30,000 to $35,000, and is intended to give accommodation, not only to the Post Office Department, but to the Customs and Inland Revenue also. That price does not include the site, which has been given free by the municipality. At present we pay a rental of $175 per annum for the post office, and $143 for customs. The salary of the postmaster, including commissions, is $1,300. That is outside of customs.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman really think a building of that price is required under those circumstances?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so. My hon. friend will observe that it is to accommodate three departments, post office, customs and inland revenue. Last year, as I say, the customs revenue amounted to $42,521.53; the year before it was over $80,000, when, I suppose, a considerable quantity of machinery was imported.

Mr. LANCASTER. There are a great many places where comparatively small buildings would answer the purpose, costing $10,000 to $12,000, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that instead of spending so large a sum of money at a place like Shawenegan Falls, he should spread it over a larger number of places, putting up less expensive buildings. At present he is erecting expensive buildings at some places, and leaving other places, perhaps with a larger population and more business, entirely unserved, or served inadequately.

Mr. BUREAU. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has not chosen a good instance to illustrate his theory in the case of Shawenegan Falls. If he does not know, let me tell him that Shawenegan Falls was practically a desert ten years ago, whereas during the last two years alone between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000 have been invested to develop the water-power. There has been invested by the Northern Aluminum Company, which is a branch of the Pittsburgh Reduction Works, over $2,000,000 in establishing and enlarging their works. Besides, there is a vast amount of capital invested by foreigners, for instance by the Belgo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Company, who are supposed to have the most modern and best equipped pulp and paper mill in Canada. It is true that last year the revenue fell off from the preceding year. In 1907-8 the customs revenue at Shawenegan Falls was $83,539.41, whilst in 1908-9 it was $42,521.53. I see that the customs entries have decreased all over the county in the last fiscal year. The population decreased at Shawenegan Falls because of the fact that the Northern Aluminum Company had to close down their works for a while for want of orders. When the aluminum business was started at Shawenegan Falls there was a great demand for the products of this industry and prices were very high. The large prices that they were getting for that commodity caused new mills to spring up and induced those that were already in existence to enlarge their plants. Therefore, there was an over production which caused a falling off in the orders of the Northern Aluminum Company. They had to close down their works for a while which caused a considerable emigration from Shawenegan Falls because a number of men were left without employment. I may say that they have entered into a number of contracts lately and that the shops have been re-opened. They have had a contract from the government of Ontario for a transmission wire for the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. For the last seven months the customs revenue collected at Shawenegan Falls, including the entries for Grand Mère, amounted to $27,367.36.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us the nature of the imports there?

Mr. BUREAU. New machinery was imported from the United States to be installed in the Northern Aluminum plant. Machinery is now being imported for a large cotton mill which is being constructed on the same improved principle as the mill of the Wabasso Cotton Company at Three Rivers. They propose to manufacture a finer kind of cotton than is now manufactured by the other mills in Canada. They will manufacture the kind used in underclothing and shirts—what we commonly call linen.

Mr. FOSTER. Linen faced?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know what they call it, but it is the linen used in shirts, collars, cuffs, &c. When the Shawenegan Falls was divided into town lots the Shawenegan Water and Power Company, who owned most of the land, would not sell a lot unless the buyer agreed to put up a house of certain dimensions, a certain height and plan and costing so much money. They wanted to have a fine town.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman remember the minimum amount that they had to spend on each building?

Mr. BUREAU. It depended on the street where the building was located. They had to spend more on business streets than on residential streets. I do not know but that certain streets were exempt from that. Shawenegan Falls is a growing town, and

it will grow more in the future because they are putting up new plants every day.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman has not disposed of the suggestion that I was making to the minister. I am not objecting to Shawenegan Falls or any other part of the country being properly served with a public building, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman has proved that a $10,000 or $12,000 building would not serve that town. You can put up quite a chunk of a building if you are not going in for a lot of style and waste space for $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely my hon. friend does not pretend seriously to assert that you can erect a suitable building for the post office officials, for the accommodation of the public, for the customs officials and for the accommodation of the public doing business with that department, for the inland revenue officials and for the accommodation of the public doing business with that department, provide accommodation for the caretaker, as there must be a caretaker for these public buildings, all that for $10,000—a good substantial building of stone and brick with proper sanitary arrangements, heat and light.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had a great deal of experience in building and I am unable to agree with my hon. friend. I do not think that a suitable building for the accommodation of these three departments, such a building as one ought to put up in an important town like Shawenegan, which is destined to be a very important place in the near future, could be erected for less than $30,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. All you would need in that place is practically three good large rooms. You could erect a building of three, or perhaps two stories, and have three good large rooms in it, one for the post office, another for the customs and another for the Inland Revenue Department, and you could do it for $10,000 or $12,000 if you did not want to waste the money.

Mr. BLONDIN. I agree with what the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) has said. I think that if there are any young towns which justify the government in spending money certainly Shawenegan is one of them. I must say that Shawenegan and Grand-Mère have grown and are growing very quickly. I think that before long these towns will have a population of at least 20,000 and it may go beyond that mark in the near future. But I must remark that what the hon. gentleman said with reference to Shawenegan Falls applies with doubled force to the town of Grand-Mère. While Shawenegan Falls has a population of 2,000 and a few hundred, and while I agree that it has a right to have this public building, we have in Grand-Mère a population of 5,300. While they have a gross total revenue of $2,500 from the post office we have a total revenue of $4,221. I see that the government are spending large sums of money in towns which give little or no promise of future development. For instance, there is the town of Nicolet, which has a gross total revenue of $3,800, and I think I am safe in saying that the post office which the government are building there will not cost less than $20,000 or $30,000. The same applies to Roberval, where the revenue is only $3,300. I would say to the minister that petition after petition has been sent to the government asking for the erection of a public building in Grand-Mère. I remember coming as a delegate to ask the government to erect a post office in that growing town. We were promised that something would be done, but while $5,000 was granted for the erection of a building the government made it a condition that the corporation should supply the land. We did not accept this offer, because we maintained that $5,000 would not erect the building which we would like to see in our town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was only to make a start.

Mr. BLONDIN. I think I have a right to ask the minister to grant us at least $5,000 for a building in Grand-Mère.

St. Henri Post Office—improvements—revote of $270 lapsed, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to be applied to the erection of a one-story addition to the post office at St. Henri, as requested by the Post Office Department as long ago as 1908. The acting Deputy Postmaster General asked for this extension, and as one argument in favour of it he said that the letter-carriers for St. Cunegonde, Cote St. Paul and St. Henri are massed at the St. Henri depot and that an enlargement of the building is absolutely necessary. The appropriation for 1908-9 was $1,200, of which we expended $930 upon inside improvements and $270 lapsed. The chief architect estimates it would take $7,000 to make the addition required. St. Henri is an important suburb of Montreal.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will that complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

St. Jacques de l'Achigan public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards the erection of a building for post office purposes. There is a largely

signed petition of the people and also of the municipal council. The site was purchased in October, 1909, for $3,000; it is 53 feet on the main street by 123. The population at the last census was 2,580.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $779.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not exceed $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Including the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the site.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the present cost of that post office, salary and rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $340, and commissions $42.

Mr. NANTEL. Is it in the county of Montcalm?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the present rental for the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very small, only $38.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister received any request from the Post Office Department for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole revenue here is $779, and with a population of 2,500 in the town, that is not much of an argument for the expenditure of $20,000 on a post office building. We must protest most strongly against this. I agree with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) that in these cases there should be a request from the responsible minister of the department whose business is to be conducted in these buildings. I had always supposed that to be done and that there was consultation between the minister for whose department the building was to be erected and the Minister of Public Works as to what kind of accommodation would be necessary. The moment this building is erected it will mean an annual charge of $2,000 which will swallow up more than three times the entire revenue. I do not know whether this is a growing town or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has a tobacco factory, a branch bank, three saw-mills, and it is on the line of the new Canadian Northern.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it is a large recommendation that it is on a railway line. Is it the policy of the government now to build $25,000 buildings in each county town and $20,000 buildings in each town that is on the line of a railway? This is one of the worst cases yet, and as a protest against that kind of thing, I move that the vote be reduced by $10,000.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

Yeas 17; nays 33.

Mr. LENNOX. The practice indulged in by the Minister of Public Works this session is to present an item on behalf of say the Post Office Department, for the erection of a building and then to tell us that he knows nothing about it. In this case he has told us that the request for the building did not originate with the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department is supposed to know the needs of the country for increased postal facilities. The Postmaster General should know how much money is to be expended and having looked over the whole Dominion he would, if his department were properly conducted, select the most deserving cases for public expenditure in view of the means at his disposal. But nothing of this kind is done, and the Minister of Public Works, simply because he gets a petition from some people in a locality, decides to erect a post office without consulting the Postmaster General as to the necessity for it. The head of the Post Office Department, having determined upon a scheme of public expenditure within the resources of the country, shall submit to the cabinet his proposals, showing just what is required and why it is required. This, having been properly brought before council, it will be or will not be, according as it is considered right, brought in as an estimate and submitted to this committee. If we, as a committee, do not insist upon procedure of that kind, we are not discharging our duties to our constituents. All these preliminaries have been disregarded in this case. But assuming that they had all been complied with, that is not enough. When the Minister of Public Works submits an estimate to the committee, it is most unreasonable that he should be alone in the matter. He does not profess to have, and we could not expect him to have, a competent knowledge of the requirements. It is absolutely necessary, in the consideration of estimates for another department, that the responsible head of that department should be here to explain why the money is demanded. We are proceeding to-day on an entirely improper basis. We have the fact that no demand has been made by the Post Office Department for this expenditure. We have the fact that the Minister of Public Works has no competent knowledge of the matter. We have the fact that there is no pretense that the Post Office Department has taken a broad, general survey of what should be the expenditure in Canada as a whole, and how that expenditure should be distributed. We are pro-

ceeding on a piece-meal policy, based on certain local and perhaps political demands made upon the minister and based upon those alone. I appeal to the members of this committee on both sides. It is our duty as a committee to insist that this matter should be dealt with in a different manner. I do not often talk on the estimates, but I wish to enter my protest as earnestly as I can against the manner in which we have been proceeding.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the hon. minister has promised so much to my hon. friend from Medicine Hat, I would like to put on record the fact that Lethbridge has eleven banks, that the value of goods which have passed customs at that port of entry was last year $800,000 and the duties collected thereon $136,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very important town and is growing very rapidly.

St. Lambert public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a public building to be used chiefly for post office purposes. There has been a petition signed by influential inhabitants of the town as early as March, 1907. This came to the Post Office Department first and was transmitted by the deputy Postmaster General to the Minister of Public Works. It is represented, I have no doubt correctly, that St. Lambert is rapidly increasing in population, having doubled in ten years, and that it is a town with all the modern improvements —waterworks and a sewerage system—and is going ahead very rapidly.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine years ago, according to the census, it was 1,362; but that is no criterion of what it is to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister ought really to have that information in definite form.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not carry in my pocket information as to the population of all these places.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister's first duty is to give us information as to the number of people to be served.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can only give the hon. gentleman the population according to the last census. I am not supposed to go and take a census of these places from year to year. The population of St. Lambert to-day is probably from 2,000 to 2,500. The revenue last year was $2,615, and the year before it was $1,756.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the site cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been purchased yet.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost of the building and site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not exceeding $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the plans been prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. No plans, no estimate, no statement of population?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In whose riding is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Chambly and Verchères, represented by Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $730.

Mr. FOSTER. And what is the present rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $100.

Mr. SPROULE. One would naturally expect that when the Minister of Public Works is submitting his estimates to Council, for the consideration of that body, he would supply them with better data than he furnishes this House to justify council in passing the estimates. There does not seem to be any system whereby he can reach a conclusion regarding the absolute need of buildings or the wisdom or otherwise of erecting buildings in these places. He has a request from somebody and cannot tell us, in some cases, from whom Not from the Post Office Department, the Post Office Department does not seem to give him any information whether there is a need for a public building or not. He does not seem to go to the trouble of making any inquiries from the Post Office Department or from any other source as to what the population of the place is or what its needs are. In defending the building of a post office costing about $20,000 in one place he said that it was on a railway. He could find places of three, four, or five times the size and importance of that place on railways all over this country that have no public buildings and no post offices erected by the government. I think that is no justification at all and no information.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Manufacturers Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Roy (Montmagny).

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before recess, we were at the item for a post office building at St. Lambert, which, I think, I explained very fully. I might, however, add that the present post office accommodation there is very poor. The postal service is transacted in a small grocery store with little or no accommodation for the people waiting for their mails, and there has been a very strong request from the people of that locality for a suitable building.

Mr. SPROULE. How did the hon. gentleman happen to get that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From a petition of the inhabitants.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the way in which he usually gets his information regarding the necessity of a public building in any locality? In my part of the country, whenever the public need demands anything in the post office line, we usually apply to the Postmaster General, and one would naturally expect that he would be better posted on the matter than the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works has no one to rely on. He may have the member for the constituency, and it would be natural to expect that he would urge the requirements of his constituency as strongly as possible. In other cases he may have the defeated candidate, who may not happen to be in the locality and may pay very little attention to it. It would be natural therefore to expect that there would be some communication to the Postmaster General from the locality and that the minister would look to him for information. Take the Public Works Department, when a public work has to be done in connection with harbours and rivers, the department usually sends its own engineer to examine the locality; and if the department desires to get information regarding postal matters, it can call on the post office inspector to examine and report; but in none of these cases has the minister said he applied to the inspector for information to know whether the public building asked for is needed or not. What is the result? We have items in the estimates for the building of post offices in small places where there is little or no revenue and larger places are neglected, and in those small places buildings are provided at a cost out of all proportion to the needs of the locality. It seems to me that the minister ought to have some businesslike system by means of which he could obtain reliable information which he could submit to council and afterwards to the House in justification of the proposed expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought that before recess I had shown clearly the needs of this town for a public building. The place in the last eight years has about doubled its population. Its population is given by the directory to-day as 2,500. It is a very important suburb of Montreal. A large number of very fine residences have been erected in it, and the present post office accommodation is utterly inadequate. I did not depend solely on this petition but made inquiry of the sitting member who at first did not say he would urge it at present, but I asked him to look into the matter further, and give me his more matured judgment. After he had been to St. Lambert, he urged very strongly that I should comply with the request of the petitioners. The building will not cost more than $25,000 at the outside. It will be a substantial structure which ought to serve the wants of the people there for the next half century, and I do not think I am asking any extravagant amount. With regard to consulting the Post Office Department, my hon. friend rightly says that, in respect of post office matters, the people generally communicate with the Postmaster General or his department. Speaking in a general way that is true. But that remark applies to postal services such as the establishment of additional post offices, and the giving of increased accommodation. I venture to say that not once in a hundred times do the people, when they desire a public building erected for a post office, apply directly to the Postmaster General, they make their application to the Department of Public Works. That has been my experience, and it is then my duty to get the best information I can as to the need of that work, and I do not know of any more reliable source to which I can apply than the sitting member for the county. When my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Owen) told me of the population and needs of Campbellford, I felt that I could rely on his statement, as I feel I can rely on the statement of any other member of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not opposing this expenditure, I am only speaking in general terms with reference to what principle the Department of Public Works adopts in determining whether these buildings are required or not. The minister said he depends on the member. I do not object to that. But there are many places where there is no supporter of the government, and he does not seem to rely quite as much on the information he gets from an opposition member as he does on that he gets from a supporter of his own side. But I was speaking more particularly with regard to the general principle. Take the case we dealt with before six o'clock, a proposal to expend $20,000 in a village where the

revenue is only $700. I gave to the House a list of cases in a radius of, perhaps, less than 100 miles, in a locality with which I am well acquainted, where there are villages and towns much larger than this, and where the revenue was ten times as great, and yet there was no effort displayed on the part of the Minister of Public Works to serve the needs of the public in these places. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the principle which guides the Minister of Public Works is not the urgent needs of the people. I do not think he can justify these expenditures in so many instances in the province of Quebec and so few in the province of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as many in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think so, but I have not verified it. He cannot justify passing by so many places like Lethbridge, and other places in the west and in Ontario, where, notwithstanding every effort on the part of the people to get better accommodation, it has been heartlessly refused them; whereas in other places where the people scarcely asked for it, it has been given them. Now the minister says that when people want additional postal service and the like of that, they apply to the Post Office Department, but not in the matter of buildings. Now I know, speaking from long experience, that the very reverse of what the minister says is the case. Over and over again, in my own constituency and in others, have I been consulted, written to and urged by the people who told me that they had communicated with the Post Office Department and could get no satisfaction.

Three Rivers—new public building—to replace buildings destroyed by fire, June 22, 1908, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for a new post office and customs building in the city of Three Rivers to replace those that were destroyed in the great fire. We have been using a temporary building in the meantime, but we think the time has now arrived when we should begin the erection of a new and permanent building. The appropriation for 1909-10 was $40,000. Of that, however, we only expended $10,000 to provide temporary quarters; so $30,000 is a revote, and we are now asking for an additional $30,000. This amount of $60,000 will be sufficient to enable us to enter into a contract for the construction of the building. We estimate it will probably cost somewhere from $125,000 to $150,000 when the building is entirely completed.

Quebec province—immigrant buildings generally, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask the committee to go back to this item in regard to which the hon. member for North Toronto asked some explanations before recess. I mentioned that in addition to those at the city of Montreal and the city of Quebec, there was an immigrant building at, I think, Peribonka, Nominingue and, I think, Temiskaming. The question was asked as to the principle upon which these small immigrant buildings were erected, and now that the Minister of the Interior is present, I thought he might make some statement.

Mr. NANTEL. What kind of immigrants do the government provide for at Nominingue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ordinary immigrants. I may say to my hon. friend that there is an immigration society which is working quite industriously in bringing immigrants into that locality and settling them upon the land.

Mr. NANTEL. The only settlers there are from the province of Quebec. They are not, as I understand, from outside.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is mistaken, because there is a considerable repatriation.

Mr. NANTEL. From where?

Mr. FISHER. From the United States into the northern parts of Quebec. This work is carried on by one of the immigration societies formed in Quebec, which societies are subsidized by the government for that express purpose.

Mr. NANTEL. So much the better.

Mr. S. SHARPE. If these societies are paid for that work, what is the necessity of the government erecting buildings for them? Is it for the accommodation of the immigrants?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How many would be brought in at a time?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. OLIVER. The immigrants are not brought in, they come in of their own accord.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I thought the society was bringing them in.

Mr. OLIVER. The society employs special means of bringing the attractions of a special district before the immigrant. The government's business is to bring the advantages of the country at large before the immigrant, but the society is organized for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the immigrant a certain district, and that is the business of the societies that my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) has alluded to.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What are the buildings that are used for this purpose?

Mr. OLIVER. There are, first, the Quebec immigration building on the Louise embankment; second, the Detention Hospital erected in 1907 at a cost of $75,000; third, the immigration building at Montreal, which serves the purposes of a hospital and immigration quarters, on St. Antoine street, and which costs $3,000 rental per annum. Then, there is the immigration building at Nomininge. This is a shelter for immigrants, the building being 45 by 27 feet 10 inches, and being the property of the government. This building is at the point which was the terminus of a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway system and was the distributing point for immigrants in the northern part of Labelle. It was built for the purpose of giving accommodation for these settlers at the end of their railway journey before setting out for their locations in the surrounding country. In this building, and for the accommodation of the settlers, the Quebec government have their local land agent. The building contains four large rooms, two downstairs and two upstairs with cooking stoves, so that the immigrants have the advantage of being able to rest and cook during the time that they are preparing to go on their locations. There is an immigration building at Roberval, in the Lake St. John district, or a shelter for immigrants, the dimensions of which building are 60 by 30. The conditions are the same as in the case of Nomininge. There is the Peribonka immigration building, also in the Lake St. John district, for the same purpose. The dimensions are 45 by 25. This is the list of immigration buildings in the province of Quebec.

Mr. NANTEL. Is the minister in a position to give the cost of the building in Nomininge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot do so to-night, because the amount we are asking for is simply for repairs for the different immigration buildings in the province as a whole, but I will get it and lay it on the table.

Mr. NANTEL. Is the building used for post office purposes or only for immigration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only for immigration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister whether he knows anything with regard to the report which appears in the press to the effect that several thousand Doukhobors are coming to our country in the near future and whether they are likely to be received?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no knowledge of any such movement, and I have no belief that any such movement is likely to take place.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister any information as to the number of immigrants who have come into these localities within the last few years?

Mr. OLIVER. The estimates under consideration are those of the Public Works Department, and I am not able to give my hon. friend the information at the present time, but when the immigration estimates are up, and I have the assistance of the officers of the department, I hope to be able to give my hon. friend an answer.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the minister if it is the policy of the government to erect these immigration buildings in all of the provinces for local needs? I thought that would rather be an expenditure which would be expected from the provincial governments. Do they do that in other provinces where immigration work is carried on by the provincial authorities?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it has been done in other parts of Canada, for instance, I think in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPROULE. But these have been under the direct control of this federal government all the time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, the Dominion is just as much interested in securing immigrants for the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces—

Mr. SPROULE. But you do not put up any buildings in these provinces?

Mr. PUGSLEY.—as it is in securing immigrants for the west with the exception that it has land in the west. Still, to the ordinary settler, that land is given away upon the ordinary homestead conditions but even then the federal government is just as much interested in getting immigrants into the eastern provinces as it is in getting them into the western provinces. It is not undesirable to take care of the immigrants when they arrive in a new and unsettled district and make them as reasonably comfortable as you can until they set out for the land which they are going to occupy. There seems to be a considerable immigration into the Lake St. John district and to the westward. There has been quite an extensive movement in the way of repatriation from the United States and I think that the small amount of money which has been expended upon these immigrant buildings has been very well expended and certainly has been productive of good results.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not complaining of the amount of money which has been spent there. I am only asking what is the general principle, if it is the principle to erect these buildings in the different provinces, or have the provinces been doing this work themselves? There is a good deal of immigration going into the northern

part of Ontario, but I am not aware that the government has gone to the trouble of erecting immigration buildings to accommodate those who go there. The minister says that we have done this in the northwest. There is good reason why we should do it there because we practically owned that country until the new provinces were established. Are there any other provinces where this is being done except that which the minister has referred to to-night? We should do the best we can for the immigrants who come to our shores, and I am not complaining if this is to be a general policy, but I was not aware that the federal government provided accommodation for immigrants brought here under the auspices of the different provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have immigration buildings in all the provinces, in Halifax, St. John, Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. But these are sea-port towns.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What difference does it make in principle whether the immigrants come by train or by steamer; should we not provide accommodation for them? I can quite conceive that an immigrant building in the Lake St. John district from which the immigrants are distributed may do as effective work as an immigrant building in St. John or Halifax.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a good deal of immigration into the Cobalt district; would a proposition to erect an immigration building there be entertained by the minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the immigrants were sent to Cobalt and distributed thence through that northern country and it would be desirable to house them comfortably, I think such a proposition might be entertained. For instance, we have an immigration building at Port Arthur.

Mr. SPROULE. That again is a sea-port and immigrants come to it by water and by rail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The object is to make the immigrant comfortable until he gets located, and it does not make any difference by what means of transportation he arrives.

Mr. SPROULE. I see all the difference in the world between providing a building for immigrants at Port Arthur whence the immigrants are distributed all over the country, and providing a building at Lake St. John.

Westmount Public Buildings, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Westmount is a very important suburb of Montreal, and this vote is asked to make provision for the purchase of a site and towards the erection of a post office building. It will be known as the St. Catharines Street West Postal Station. It will be admitted that the building to be erected in Westmount should be of a substantial character and in keeping with the other handsome buildings in that city. The rent paid for the post office and letter carriers' depot last year was $1,200; the postal revenue was $9,131.43; money orders issued, $41,330, and money orders paid, $10,791. We have not prepared the plans as yet, nor purchased the site, but I should think that the site and building, all complete, will cost somewhere in the vicinity of $100,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population of Westmount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that two or three years ago it was 11,000, but Westmount has grown rapidly and the population is now estimated at 15,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not think it is quite as large as that. I understand that in some of the smaller cities of from 10,000 to 12,000 population the post office has practically been closed, only a small portion of it being used for the purpose of getting the mail matter ready for the carriers. That brings up the question whether we should expend such a large amount of money on a post office in a small city.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If what the hon. gentleman says is the case, it is a matter for the post office authorities to consider. But I am not aware that the establishment of free delivery in any city has been the means of doing away with the post office or lessening the business done there. This building is going to be a centre from which the mail will be distributed over all that western part of Montreal.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I understand that Westmount is a part of Montreal or will ultimately be brought within the city; and if so, the postal business will be done through the general post office, this building will become a sub-station, and should not cost more than $15,000 or $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this building expected to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $100,000 and $125,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister how many of these expenditures in the province of Quebec, covering about 40 items, are in constituencies represented by members on the opposition side. I ask this question because this afternoon we were endeavouring to ascertain the policy of the minister as to the expenditure of public money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will tell me how many opposition members there

are from the province of Quebec and in what constituencies there are demands for public buildings, I will give him the information. I think my hon. friend is not serious, because he can tell as well as I. For instance, there are expenditures at Lachine, at Sherbrooke, in the city of Montreal and in the city of Quebec. So if my hon. friend counts them, I think he will find that they are doing pretty well, considering their numbers.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps a little more specific answer would be more satisfactory to the committee. I understand there is a small item for repairing the post office in Sherbrooke. My hon. friend would not suggest that that is an expenditure of public money other than to keep up a building erected several years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. An absolutely necessary expenditure, like all the others.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not objecting to that. I am asking the minister to state how many expenditures for new buildings are to be made in counties represented on the opposition side. My hon. friend would be able I am sure, having all the information before him, to give us an answer to that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret to say that I have not had that classified in that way and therefore I could not just at this moment give my hon. friend all the information, but really I do not think it is fair that my hon. friend should ask me. He knows that I am the target of a dozen or more of my hon. friends opposite; I have to answer legitimate and proper questions. My hon. friend is entirely a gentleman at leisure just at the moment and he could make up the figures just as readily as I could, and he would be obliging me very much if he would do it himself.

Mr. BLAIN. That may be all right for my hon. friend the minister, but I do not think the committee will gather very much information from that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will take my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I will ask the minister to give an answer to the question with a list of the expenditures, and if my hon. friend is unable to do it now, he has a good many clerks in his department and perhaps it could be made up and submitted at a future sitting, if my hon. friend would say he would bring a list——

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I cannot say I would like to undertake that.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps he had better take it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend intimate that he is going to force me to do this? In what way does he propose to force it?

Mr. BLAIN. I have no thought in my mind of anything of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad of that.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend knows very well that we on this side are not anxious to force my hon. friend to do anything—he is doing too many things now without any suggestion from this side. I think it has been made clear that what the committee are anxious to know is whether it is the policy of the government to grant public buildings in all towns where there is a large revenue from the customs and postal service or if that is a policy that applies only to constituencies represented by supporters of my hon. friend. I thought my hon. friend would be glad of an opportunity to assure the committee that there was no partisanship in the expenditure of this money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that before my hon. friend asks whether these improvements are in constituencies represented by Liberals or Conservatives, he ought to be able to show that in some case in the province of Quebec represented by a Conservative there has been a real necessity for some public work which I have refused. The only cases which have been referred to are those of Grand-Mère and Ste. Thérèse, and I explained that in these towns the public buildings have been allowed to stand over simply because I had no representations made to me before these estimates were prepared that public buildings were urgently required in those two places. This afternoon I was able to appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite representing constituencies in all parts of Canada as to whether or not I had discriminated against their constituencies and my hon. friend must remember that strong testimonly was borne to the fact by at least one gentleman on his side of the House—and I think if other hon. gentlemen had an opportunity they would bear like testimony—that their constituencies had been treated not generously, because we do not treat constituencies generously, but justly, that the reasonable requirements of the people had been met as far as their constituencies were concerned, and I do think, under these circumstances, that my hon. friend will see that it is not reasonable that he should take up the time of the committee by asking consideration of this matter. If my hon. friend wishes to point out where I have done any injustice to any constituency represented by a Conservative let him do so, but I am not aware of any such case.

Mr. BLAIN. I need not go very far to answer that. Take my own county, for example.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not Quebec, these are Quebec buildings that are under consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that, but my hon. friend knows that the statements made by the hon. gentlemen on this side were from other portions of Canada and not from Quebec at all. My hon. friend from Nipissing was the member to whom the minister particularly referred. That was not in Quebec. My own county is an example. My hon. friend's two immediate predecessors both stated in this Chamber that a very necessary expenditure of money in the county of Peel would be made. When I directed the attention of my hon. friend to that statement in 'Hansard,' my hon. friend was not prepared to fulfil the pledges of his predecessors to this House, and to my constituency. I do not wish to make a personal matter of this. I am expecting, of course, that out of the fulness of my hon. friend's heart the work will be done this coming year, and therefore I shall not enter into any severe criticism of that matter.

Quebec Citadel—drill shed for school of gunnery, $16,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The object of this is to afford a school of gunnery for the whole Dominion in which lectures can be delivered and the use of every type of gun in Canada illustrated and taught. There will be lecture rooms for instruction on ammunition, coast defence, electricity, range, &c., a complete gunnery school.

Military Buildings—additional storage to ordnance stores, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an additional story to the ordnance stores as requested by the Department of Militia and Defence, May 26, 1909.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is simply additional accommodation absolutely required.

Quebec Military Buildings—additional storage to ordnance stores.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is to provide additional accommodation for stores of every kind. There is a large storage building in Quebec, but it has become too small. The stores there are issued as required in different parts of the country. In many respects perhaps next to Ottawa, and in some respects larger than in Ottawa, stores of the Dominion are lodged there. In particular there is a much larger quantity of rifles stored in Quebec than any where else.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the building fire-proof?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I hope the new part will be at least.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the capacity of stores buildings in Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 10,000 square feet.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the total capacity for storage in the city of Quebec for military purposes?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could not say just now but will get the information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have tenders been asked for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not started this yet, but of course will call for tenders.

Mr. CROCKET. Are any buildings provided for military purposes without requisition from the Militia Department?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. CROCKET. Why is that rule not adopted in the case of the post offices and customs houses?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because that never has been the rule, and the conditions are entirely different.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not see that they are. It seems most extraordinary that the Minister of Public Works should go on spending money erecting post offices and customs houses in different constituencies without any report from the Post Office or Customs Department that such buildings are required. I should think that a new practice ought to be adopted and that in every case there should be a requisition from the department for whose use the building is provided, and such requisition should set forth the necessity for it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Are the stores under the care of the Ordnance Stores Department and are they for the use of the permanent corps or active militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All the stores are issued from the same building. The stores, both for the permanent force and active militia, are put in this building. I believe the stores are entirely under the control of the ordnance store corps except in so far as some police protection naturally would be given by the city authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the stores there under the same supervision as here in Ottawa?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. No insurance?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. No watchman?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there are watchmen.

Mr. SPROULE. The care taken seems to be of very imperfect character. In Ottawa by one fire we lost $120,000 in stores and $30,000 in damage to the building. There was neither insurance, nor regular watchmen who visited the building at stated periods in twenty-four hours.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The government never insure but simply follow the rule which has been followed in every department since confederation. The $30,000 loss was caused by damage to the building, and I hope that the loss in clothing will not amount to $120,000. Some of the clothing, I might mention, was clothing which would not have been issued again.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that I put a question on the paper as to whether this $120,000 worth of goods was a total loss, and his answer was yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand that the damage to the building was $30,000 and the damage to the clothing $120,000. As to whether proper precaution was taken that might be a matter of opinion, but we believe that we were taking proper precautions, and it was understood that the building was fire-proof. I have had a careful investigation made, and when the time comes I propose to make a statement to the House. But I may mention that the result of the investigation went to show that the fire resulted from a defective electric wire.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the value of the new clothing in the building?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About $900,000.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is it not a fact that the regulations of the ordnance stores department require that where a large quantity of stores are kept, it is necessary to keep a military guard at night?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the consensus of opinion of good business men would be that there ought to be some insurance in the case of valuable property stored. It seems to me that would be money well invested. Only a short time ago a portion of the legislative buildings in Toronto was burnt down. The present government there did what this government might do to good purpose. When they came into power they found that there was no insurance on the building; they put an insurance on it, and now they have something to fall back upon in the way of insurance; otherwise there would not have been a dollar to help replace the building that was burned. Would it not be better for the minister to consider making a new departure, and to provide, either insurance, or better care by watchmen?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree that that is a fair question for investigation and inquiry. It would be necessary to carry the inquiry over a good many years, and to see what amount of property would be risked in this way, what the actual losses have been, and what it would cost to insure the buildings. I think that is a very desirable thing to do.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Do I understand that the total value of the clothing destroyed was $900,000?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the total amount in the building was $900,000, of which about $120,000 was destroyed. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. A question arises in connection with this fire which I think the minister should seriously consider. The equipment and clothing of most of the militia men in Canada is kept in a stores building at Ottawa. In case war or trouble of any kind should occur, it would take three or four weeks to get that clothing out of this central depot and distribute it all over the country. Should not the minister consider, when we are building barracks or drill sheds in various places, whether the policy of decentralization would not be better in regard to these stores than the present system under which the country has lost $120,000? It has often been a subject of comment by military men, that if they wanted a pair of trousers, or a Glengarry, for one of their men 200 miles away, they had to send along a requisition and that has to come from Ottawa. Under the system that obtains in other countries, every district is equipped with its own stores, its own ammunition, its own rifles, it is a complete unit by itself, and is capable of taking the field armed inside of two or three days. Under no system could this clothing be distributed from Ottawa in case of war, and sent to the various quarters inside of four or five weeks. It seems to me that the old policy of the department of centralizing everything at Ottawa in order that somebody may have a job of overlooking it, is at the bottom of this, and when we get to the bottom of the whole thing, we find there is nobody looking after it when it takes fire. These stores might just as well have been at Toronto, at Kingston, at Esquimalt, distributed equitably amongst them in that way, and then in case of emergency the stores could be got out in two or three days.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think it desirable to enter into this discussion now very fully. But I may tell my hon. friend that he is quite mistaken if he

supposes that all the stores are here in Ottawa, that is not the case.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I did not say that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is true that the reserve stores are here. But I quite agree with him that it would be desirable to distribute these stores more than they are distributed now, and that is our intention. Unfortunately at the present time we have not a suitable building, and we have been unable to get one. We are now occupying some buildings rented before this fire, a year ago, a large building in Montreal and one in Toronto, and it is intended to distribute the stores more than they have been. My hon. friend refers to other countries. Well, this country, for instance, compared with the mother country, is a country of magnificent distances; and while in England the stores are kept pretty much together, and possibly we might have been governed to some extent by that fact, we must remember that the centres in Canada are widely distributed, and it will be necessary for us to have several centres of distribution. At the present time we keep a certain amount of stores in Winnipeg, considerably more than the usual quantity; nearly all the saddlery stores are in Toronto, and there are stores at London, some at Kingston, some in Montreal, a large quantity; there are stores in Halifax, in Quebec, and on the Pacific coast. I agree that the point raised by the hon. gentleman is worthy of consideration.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is the ammunition distributed in such a way that it can be got at?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand there is a small quantity stored at various points; but what proportion of ammunition is centralized and what proportion is at Ottawa?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a question which I think my hon. friend, being a military man himself, must understand is not one that it is desirable to answer. That question has been raised more than once, and the answer I have given is that if any hon. gentleman, a member of this House, will come to my office, I will be glad to tell him the distribution of the ammunition. But I do not think it is desirable to publish to the world exactly how the ammunition in Canada is distributed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is like the right hon. gentleman when an embarrassing question is asked him; he takes refuge by saying: If you ask me privately I will tell you this, that, or the other thing. Let me tell the Minister of Militia that in the mother country a government was upset on this question of ammunition. The question was brought up in the House of Commons, and the minister had to answer that he had not sufficient ammunition to meet the country's needs, and the government was thrown out of office. Questions of this kind must be answered in some place where the people will know. The minister says he will answer me privately how this ammunition is distributed. I am not asking how many cartridges he has at various points, but if he has inaugurated a fair system of distribution, in order to avoid the abuse that has occurred where, when a man requires a shell, he has to wire to Ottawa to get it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I don't think that is the case.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The minister says that questions of this kind have been asked several times in the House. I asked the other day something about the stores on the Great Lakes, and I received the same answer. Now, as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) says, you can always find out these things in the United Kingdom. You can go most anywhere and buy a little manual for one and six and find out where the different stores are. I do not see any objection in giving the information to the public.

Mr. FIELDING. To return to the question of insurance, particularly to what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey as to the good luck that the Ontario government had in having its building insured at the time of the fire. It might be a wise and proper policy for a provincial government to insure its property, and not necessarily a wise policy for the Dominion government to do so. From my own experience in the provincial government, it seemed desirable that we should carry a large amount of insurance. But in every large business the principle is adopted that, as you increase the volume of your property, the need of insurance in a certain sense diminishes. A man can afford to insure for himself, but the steamship people who have a large number of vessels do not find it advantageous to do so. If a man has only one or two vessels, he may insure them; but those who are fortunate enough to have a dozen vessels, in many cases do not insure; they simply open an insurance account; and they have found that, take it all in all, they were making a profit by not taking their business to the companies. I am not saying the province of Ontario was not wise, and from my own experience in the provincial government, I believed in carrying an insurance. But when you have the vast volume of property which the Dominion government has, stretched over the whole continent, it might be the best policy

not to insure. That seems to have been the policy of all the governments in Canada. I am bound to say the fact that we occasionally have a fire does not by any means prove that that policy is a mistake.

Mr. SPROULE. If the government had gone into a calculation to determine whether, from their experience of the last 50 years, it would be better not to insure, I could understand such an argument. But this day and age, when insurance is so very reasonable in cities and towns, where you have good fire protection, waterworks and fireproof buildings, it seems to me that it is doubtful wisdom to have great stores of supplies in any building without being insured. I would at least expect that the government would be in a position to present the House with some data which would justify that conclusion. If they have not got it, I think it would not be amiss for them to take the earliest opportunity to make some such calculation. I think the experience of most business people would be that it is not the part of wisdom to allow large collections of property to remain anywhere without some insurance, or some better protection, than that which we had for the military clothing and supplies that are stored in Ottawa, Quebec and elsewhere

Mr. FIELDING. So far as protection is concerned, I am with my hon. friend when he says that the government is bound to see that every possible care is taken for the protection of its property. I do not differ from him on that. If there be a large volume of property accumulated at one centre where the risk is very great, certainly it calls for insurance, but where you have the same volume of property distributed over a wide area the risk is reduced to a small figure and I do not think it needs any calculation to justify the non-insurance of such property. It is a principle that where your property is widely distributed you can just as well insure it yourself as any insurance company could do it. It might be a matter of convenience and of curiosity to make a statement, but a government is not bound to do it to the same extent as a private corporation. Even if a big fire burned down these magnificent parliament buildings I do not think it would necessarily prove that the policy of the administration is wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Assuming that we have $50,000,000 worth of property belonging to the government and that the average insurance rate would probably be one per cent, there would be $500,000 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, the average insurance rate would not amount to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Put it at one-half per cent, which is very low; there is $250,000 a year. I doubt if, in the forty-two years since confederation, there has been a million dollars worth of property destroyed, whereas the insurance premiums would have amounted to a great deal more than that. As my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance said, it is purely a question of the amount of property you have. The experience of our St. John ship-owners is just the same as that of those to whom my hon. friend refers in Nova Scotia. These firms, owning a large number of vessels, never thought of insuring their vessels because it would be cheaper to lose a ship ocasionally than to pay the premiums. If we could tell when a fire was going to occur and insure just before it took place it would be all right, but we should have to take the insurance year by year and it would cost a great deal more, as experience since confederation has shown, than the fire losses would amount to.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that there might have been a loss of a million dollars since confederation. Why, two or three years ago we had a loss of a good portion of a million dollars when the fire in the west block occurred. Then, take the fire which occurred in the militia stores building when $120,000 worth of clothing was entirely destroyed and $30,000 damage was done to other clothing, not entirely destroyed, besides the loss to the building. These are only two fires out of others which could be mentioned. But then the same principles would apply to a private corporation or to the government. Would any business man in this country follow out the same principle in dealing with his own private business?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ship-owners do it constantly.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not familiar with their business, therefore I do not know, but the argument that because the risks are distributed amongst a large number of centres reduces the need for insurance I do not think carries any weight at all, because a man worth $10,000,000 having property distributed all over the continent insures on the same principle as though he had it only in one province. He regards that as a good business principle, and it is generally recognized as a good one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the loss is lessened by the distribution of the property?

Mr. SPROULE. It may be lessened to a certain extent by distribution of property, but if it is lessened the insurance will cost less. Take the mill owners, factory men or merchants who are handling produce or cattle—they all insure, but the government do not think it wise to insure. I do not think they can give any data to justify them in reaching that conclusion.

Mr. MILLER. I think there is quite a difference between the Dominion government insuring its property, scattered all over the broad Dominion, and the case of a private party insuring his property whether it be a large or a small property. An insurance company, calculating its rates and business, expects to reach an average rate of loss and be able to fix, on that average, the premium it should collect. The Dominion government has so much property scattered all over the Dominion that it will reach about the same average of loss that the insurance company will and that being the case the government, in doing without insurance, saves the commissions paid to agents, office management of the insurance company and all the profits that the insurance company expects to receive.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman's argument is worth a cent it applies to insurance in every line, whether there is one centre or a dozen, because every man who insures pays for carrying the risk and pays a profit to the party who is carrying it whether it is upon a barn in the country or a factory in the city. If it applies to the government property that may be distributed in a hundred centres it applies on the same parity of reasoning to the property which is distributed in three centres, or is in one place.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I have not made myself clear, but it would be utterly impossible that all the property of the government would be destroyed at or near the one time. Because of the law of average, the saving that through non-insurance will be effected at the very many points where no losses occur will make up, or more than make up, the occasional losses of properties that do burn.

Mr. SPROULE. You might say that of any business.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Might I suggest to the minister that buildings containing valuable government property should be in the future built with a system of sprinklers and the protection called for by the insurance companies which reduces the risk, they claim, from about one per cent to one fifteenth of one per cent. It does not add very much to the cost of the building and if the government is not going to carry any insurance it would be a very wise investment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is worthy of careful consideration.

Military Buildings—barrack accommodation for Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps, $8,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is to provide accommodation for 25 officers, non-commissioned officers and men. These troops have been stationed at Quebec during the last two years and no baracks have been available. They have been temporarily quartered at the Riding School. This vote is to provide new quarters for them. The proposed site is in the Cove Fields near the Riding School.

Mr. SPROULE. What is to be the cost of the building?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $8,000.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia—Annapolis harbour — improvements, ice piers, $15,000.

Mr. JAMESON. This matter was under discussion at considerable length last year and the minister gave a very fair statement to the committee so far as he was able at the time. Who has the contract, what is the amount of the contract, and does the minister believe that the work will be satisfactory in fulfilling its purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was first awarded to Messrs. Reid and Archibald for $34,400, but they declined to sign the contract as drawn by the department because it made them responsible for the work during construction. New tenders were called for and three tenders were received, ranging from $46,736 to $47,000. The lowest tender was that of the Nova Scotia Construction Company, Limited, and the contract was awarded to them. Their tender was a little above the chief engineer's estimate, which was $45,625. The work is going on satisfactorily and it is expected that this amount will complete the payments to the contractors. The work is designed to resist the flow of the ice coming down the river and so keep the harbour of Annapolis open all the year round.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention to connect these piers with any superstructure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the present intention.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it intended to do so in the future?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; it is not like the wharfs at St. Geneviève that were referred to the other day.

Mr. DANIEL. It is not intended to make a bridge of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of; it could not be.

Mr. CROSBY. Who are the officers of the Nova Scotia Construction Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The names are on the contract, but I have not the contract with me. I shall be glad to get the names if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. CROSBY. I should like to have them.

Arichat wharf, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is understood that the Plant line of steamers are going to make Arichat a port of call when this wharf is completed. The total estimated cost is $25,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it the intention to have this work done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there any policy in the department as to when work shall be done by contract and when by day work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In all cases where the work can be as well done by contract as by day work we call for tenders, but where there is repairing to be done it can often better be done by day work where you have a good foreman. However, we prefer to call for tenders whenever we can.

Black Point breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Will this work be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it will be, unless it should be better to do it by day work.

Mr. CROSBY. What would make it better?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be more economical. This is an out-of-the-way place, and it might be better to send a competent foreman to do the work.

Mr. CROSBY. Will this cover the whole cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we will require $3,300 more. The total cost of the work will be $8,300.

Blue Rocks Island—breakwater at western end, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost of this work is $15,000.

Bluff Head—breakwater extension, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the breakwater 90 feet, recommended by the resident engineer. This amount it is expected will complete the work.

Breen's Pond—breakwater, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a breakwater to provide shelter for fishing boats. The estimated cost is $14,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Will tenders be asked for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. The minister mentioned that the Bluff Head breakwater extension had been recommended by the resident engineer. Do I understand that such a recommendation is peculiar to that item alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no. My memorandum happened to be to that effect. The course pursued with regard to all works is that when an application is made, it is referred to the chief engineer for the purpose of obtaining a report from the resident engineer as to the public necessity which exists for the work, the extent of traffic which will be accommodated or the protection which will be given, and the estimated cost of the work.

Mr. RHODES. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that the wharf or pier at Parrsboro is in a very bad condition. The planks upon it are so rotten that horses and carriages cannot go on it with safety. Parrsboro is an important point, not only as a railway terminus, but because there is a daily steamship service between that point and Canning in the county of Kings. The condition of the wharf has been a serious matter to the ship-owners this year. The repairs would not cost much, as there is on the wharf a large quantity of plank owned by the department which could be used for the purpose. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister and the deputy minister some time ago, and was informed that it would be referred to the resident engineer for a report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Direction was given some time ago to have a report made on the wharf at Parrsboro. I do not at this moment remember what the report was, but the matter will receive consideration. It may be that the work can be done out of the general vote for repairs.

Mr. RHODES. I inspected this wharf personally last summer and I think $50 for labour, with the material on hand, would put the wharf in repair. It is very urgently needed.

Brooklyn—towards reconstruction of breakwater, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not a new work, but it is to rebuild a work which was constructed a good many years ago, and which has gone to considerable decay.

Mr. JAMESON. In this connection I wish to mention the landing wharf at Centreville. This work is not only in the interest of the people of that locality, but in the interest of the department itself. As I am informed, owing to the fact that the toredo has eaten off the lower end of the piling, the whole work is in danger of collapsing in any heavy storm. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister by correspondence, and he informed me that it would be put into the hands of the engineer for inquiry. Has the minister ascertained just what the state of the work is, and if so, will steps be taken to protect

it at an early date in order that the work will not be entirely destroyed? The work itself is not sufficient to furnish the facilities required by that place. It was constructed prior to confederation and lengthened twelve or fifteen years ago and a comparatively small expenditure of $500 or $600 was made later. A prosperous settlement has developed there and the business now warrants much greater harbour facilities than are available. A steamboat makes connection with St. John, and there is perhaps the largest manufacuring plant for the putting up of fish in the county of Digby. Many hundreds of people are absolutely dependent on the industry prosecuted within the protection of this particular harbour. If the wharf or breakwater were extended, or indeed if a new structure were built, as I believe will be necessary, further to the right of the present structure, a much larger business would develop there. But in the meantime it is absolutely necessary that some work should be done to protect the present structure from destruction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As there is no item in the estimates for the wharf at Centreville, I have no memorandum with me about it, but I shall look the matter up and give my hon. friend the information later on. I regret that I have not the information.

Brulé wharf—repairs and extension, revote of lapsed amount, $2,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for repairs and extension of the wharf at Brulé. This is the total estimated cost.

Burk's Head or Robert's Cove, North Ingonish—breakwater, $28,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the total estimated cost of this breakwater. It is to be 300 feet in length with an 'L' on the outer end, 75 feet long. It will have to be heavily built as it is exposed to severe gales, and the full sweep of the Atlantic.

Mr. CROSBY. What accommodation will this afford and how many vessels or ships will be accommodated by it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) who is personally familiar with the situation could give the most satisfactory information.

Mr. McKENZIE. The breakwater at Burke's Head is required like the few breakwaters we have along North Victoria for the purpose of protecting the fishermen. We have at Ingonish, North Bay and South Bay a large settlement of fishermen who are entirely dependent for their living upon fishing. The coast is exposed to the full swing of the Atlantic, and when it is blowing at all they cannot go out or come in without something in the shape of a breakwater. The making of a harbour is out of the question and this protection is absolutely necessary. This breakwater has been asked for many years to create a shelter behind which boats can run when coming in and where they can be moored at nights in safety even in a storm. Hon. members who are familiar with the use of breakwaters will not require any further information about it except that it is absolutely necessary for the protection of the fishermen, that without it they are suffering great loss. We are very pleased indeed that this vote is in the estimates. No hon. gentleman who is familiar with the needs of the fishermen will object to it.

Mr. CROSBY. I have no desire to object to it but I wish to know what accommodation it is going to afford to people in that end of the province. We require many breakwaters in Nova Scotia, our fishermen require a great deal of assistance, and I only wish to ascertain whether it is essential that we should spend so much money at that particular point or whether it would not be well to spend some in other ports. If the hon. gentleman would state whether there is any shipping there, we would have more information than we have at present.

Mr. McKENZIE. It will serve as a wharf at which the steamboat now plying between North Sydney and North Victoria will call. It is impossible for the boat to call without a dock and the fishermen, in order to send out their fish and land supplies, have to run out a couple of miles to meet the steamboat. That is a very inconvenient and hazardous way of doing business and one which causes a great deal of loss to these men because they cannot make any definite contract to send away their fish as they have to depend entirely on weather conditions as to whether they can put their freight on board the steamer or not. This will enable the steamer to come in in all reasonable conditions of weather. I cannot promise that any large shipping will get shelter there because to make a breakwater which would protect large vessels would involve much more expenditure than the comparatively small amount required here. It will, however, afford shelter to 50 or 60 boats that are fishing off there and to other boats from Neill's harbour or North shore which may be caught in bad weather when fishing off Ingonish.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the size of the steamer which this breakwater is to accommodate?

Mr. McKENZIE. The 'Weymouth' is the steamer doing the business now but I cannot tell her size. We are getting a new steamer called the 'Aspey', a very much larger boat, built recently at Shelburne and fitted out at Weymouth. My hon. friend may perhaps remember the 'Scotia' running between Halifax and somewhere

down in Guysboro. The 'Aspey' is largely on the lines of the 'Scotia' and a little larger.

Mr. CROSBY. Now that the Minister of Public Works has handed over his task to my hon. friend, we cannot fail to be convinced that there is no question of politics in this. I have no desire whatever to interfere with any estimate because the only trouble we have is that we have not sufficient money to go round, but when he says this breakwater is to accommodate a steamer of between ten and fifteen tons, one cannot help questioning the necessity for it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not think my hon. friend would like to venture on the North Atlantic along that coast in a ten ton steamer.

Mr. CROSBY. I know the steamer very well and he does not. She is not over fifteen tons, as he will find if he refers to the blue-book.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am quite willing to have the records in the blue-books produced, and if so my hon. friend will find himself in a very ridiculous position. The 'Weymouth' is seven times that capacity.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not understand there was more than one boat running to this place. When will this new boat commence running there?

Mr. McKENZIE. There is only one boat making regular trips along that shore as there is not enough traffic for more than one. The 'Aspey' is taking the place of the 'Weymouth' which has been running there the last ten years, subsidized both by the Nova Scotia government and this government. She is getting to be old and not equal to the business, and a new boat has been built called the 'Aspey', but I do not think she is yet on the route. The hon. gentleman will find a photograph and description of her in the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the tonnage of this new boat?

Mr. McKENZIE. Not being a shipping man myself, I do not carry her dimensions in my mind, but my hon. friend can get all the details he requires from the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. LAW. When the hon. gentleman says that the 'Weymouth' is only ten or fifteen tons, he cannot have ever seen her. She is five times that tonnage. I know the boat for she ran between Weymouth and Yarmouth a number of years.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many feet of water does she draw?

Mr. McKENZIE. About 8 feet and the new boat about 10 feet.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the depth of water at low tide?

Mr. McKENZIE. That will depend on how far you run out the breakwater. This breakwater, when built will have a depth of water at low tide of ten feet to accommodate that boat.

Mr. LANCASTER. We ought to know, before we vote to build a breakwater, how far out we shall have to build it and what are its dimensions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have said already that the breakwater is to be 300 feet in length with an L on the western side 75 feet in length.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How comes it that in the province of Nova Scotia with a population of 450,000, you have 111 separate items in the estimates and are going to spend there just about the same amount as in Ontario with a population of 2,114,000, not including the city of Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The principle which has guided me, is, as far as possible, to get appropriations for what seems to be necessary for public works which have been brought to my notice. The size of a province or its population is not always the governing factor as to the amount of money required to be expended there on wharfs and breakwaters. Ontario is a very large province but a great deal of it is inland and does not call for expenditures on wharfs. But when the hon. gentleman speaks of the amount being expended in Ontario, he forgets altogether the very large expenditure made in Toronto, amounting to something like $700,000, which alone overtops all the expenditures in all the harbours along the whole coast of Nova Scotia. He leaves out altogether also the expenditure of some $900,000 at Fort William and Port Arthur, which is $300,000 more than all the expenditures asked for upon harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia. He likewise omits the expenditures at Tiffin and Victoria Harbour, which together amount to one-half the total expenditures on wharfs and breakwaters in Nova Scotia, also the expenditures at Collingwood and Goderich.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do these appear under the heading of expenditure in the estimates for Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Tiffin and Victoria do not, Goderich does.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend knows they are in Ontario, does he not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tiffin and Victoria are in capital account, and do not appear in these items, because there is no capital account for the province of Nova Scotia, whereas there are $1,200,000 for harbour im-

provements in the province of Ontario which are charged to capital account. You have in those three places alone twice as much as we are asking for in respect to all the harbours, breakwaters and wharfs in the province of Nova Scotia, and that leaves out altogether the large improvements going on in the city of Toronto.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let the minister look at his own book in the matter of current expenditures, and he will find $684,000 is spent in the province of Ontario on current expenditure. While some of these other expenditures are being made in Ontario, the large ones have been made in the eastern provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Look at page 55 and you will see the harbours in Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am taking the items in Ontario, 44 items, and 111 separate items in the province of Nova Scotia. I merely ask the minister to explain that.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has in his hands the estimate which shows that for harbours and rivers in the fresh water province of Ontario you have $1,262,000; while in the inland province of Nova Scotia out in the ocean, you have $600,000. Yet the hon. gentleman thinks it is too much.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to say just a word here. Since I came to Ottawa I have heard in the corridors, and outside as well, this same remark made by some members from Ontario on both sides of the House. I think they forget the fact that every one of the 18 counties of Nova Scotia fronts on the sea, and it is necessary that these counties should be provided with wharfs. As a matter of fact, whichever government might be in power, I have no doubt that there will be misappropriations and male expenditures from time to time. But in any case it is necessary that these expenditures should be made, and there is no other body to make them but the Dominion government. I think it ill becomes members from the other provinces to criticise the small amount the province of Nova Scotia is getting, which is only a fair proportion of the amount expended on public works.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was just asking for my own information. If the hon. gentleman will look at the province of Ontario, he will see that there are a large number of counties fronting on the great lakes and on the river, and he will recognize that they have important wharfs to build and maintain. If the Minister of Finance had been here this afternoon he would have heard from a number of gentlemen from the province of Ontario who have been pleading with the Minister of Public Works for years, not only with this minister but with his predecessors, begging him, I might almost say, to spend a small amount of money in making public works where they were really necessary. We know that he has been making expenditures in other parts of the country where they were not nearly as necessary as many of the towns mentioned this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not believe the people of the great province of Ontario will justify my hon. friend in seeking to raise prejudice against one section with respect to these expenditures. He asked how it was that there was only the small sum of $600,000 being expended in similar works in Ontario, while there was about an equal amount being expended in Nova Scotia. But as the Minister of Finance has pointed out, for public works chargeable to income in the province of Ontario, the amount which we ask is $1,262,850, for harbours and rivers only, outside of public buildings altogether. To that is to be added the amounts found in page 55, $800,000 for harbour improvements in Port Arthur and Fort William, also in the province of Ontario, $120,000 for improvements at Tiffin harbour, in the province of Ontario, and $145,000 for improvements at Victoria harbour, also in Ontario. There you have altogether upwards of two million and a quarter dollars being expended in the inland province of Ontario for harbours and rivers alone.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish the minister to try to lead this House to believe that I am attempting to raise prejudice between the provinces. Of the amounts that he has mentioned, a large portion is for capital account.

Mr. FIELDING. What difference does it make?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I might say the same in Nova Scotia, a large portion, I suppose in Halifax would be.

Mr. FIELDING. Nothing in capital account for harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Possibly not this year.

Mr. FIELDING. For harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia I do not recollect a dollar being voted on capital account.

Mr. LANCASTER. For harbours and rivers in Ontario, has a dollar been voted on capital account?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, here to-day my hon. friend has just shown you sums amounting to $2,000,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. These were for special improvements such as were necessary on the Welland canal. You might as well call that harbours and rivers.

Mr. FIELDING. It is for the harbour of Fort William, the harbour of Port Arthur, the harbour of Collingwood, the harbour of Goderich. What are these but harbours?

Mr. LANCASTER. Are they on capital account?

Mr. FIELDING. Many of them. Tiffin and Victoria harbours and Fort William, these are all capital account, and there is not a dollar for capital account in the province of Nova Scotia, in that service.

Mr. LANCASTER. Some of the harbours and rivers are put into capital account and some into current account. Explain your system of book-keeping.

Mr. FIELDING. Large development works, such as the class of works in the river St. Lawrence, have for years been charged to capital account. They differ only in volume. The smaller works are usually charged to income account. The province has nothing to do with it.

Central Economy Wharf—renewal of stem —revote of $1,200 lapsed, $2,000.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some four years ago this work was damaged by ice, it had not been completely close piled. There was a heavy run of ice and the wharf was damaged, and it required to be repaired. I may say the stem of the wharf at a distance of 120 feet from the shore was lifted by the ice, and the crib-work abutment at the shore end was undermined.

Chapel Cove Breakwater—revote of $3,000 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a breakwater 240 feet in length and twenty feet wide on top. It is to be constructed partially of creosoted timber. The estimated cost is $7,800.

David's Cove Breakwater—wharf extension, $4,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of extending the breakwater and is urgently required.

Mr. JAMESON. Will that work be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this will probably be done by day labour, but we have not decided.

Mr. JAMESON. I know the locality and the people there and I would like to suggest to the minister that tenders should be asked and that if possible the work should be done by contract. I think it could be done more satisfactorily for a variety of reasons. I think the department will get much better value for the expenditure, and that the people would be better satisfied.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter will be carefully considered.

Deep Brook—pile wharf—revote of $500 lapsed, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards constructing a substantial wharf and pile work about 200 feet long with a return at the outer end, giving a frontage of 150 feet. It will cost about $3,500. We will have probably next year to ask for a further vote, but $1,500 is all we require this year.

Delap's Cove Breakwater—part reconstruction of shore end—revote of $800, lapsed, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the reconstruction of a portion, being about half, of the shore end block of the breakwater at this place. This will finish the work.

Delorey's Beach, Monk's Head—breakwater —revote of $4,000, lapsed, $6,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the breakwater which is 300 feet long.

Devil's Island—breakwater—extension of— revote of $4,800, lapsed, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the extension of Devil's island breakwater with an arm at the outer end. The object is to provide a shelter for motor and other boats of the fishermen. There is a large fishing industry at this place.

Digby Harbour—improvements, including repairs and additions to pier, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the improvements now under way at Digby harbour.

Diligent River Harbour—breakwater—revote of $1,600, lapsed, $7,500.

Mr. RHODES. How much money has been expended at Diligent river, what is it proposed to construct and what is the total cost of the work estimated at?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the construction of a breakwater to make it safe for vessels going in and out of this harbour.

Mr. RHODES. How much has been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only a small amount— $400.

Mr. RHODES. What is the estimated total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $7,500.

Mr. RHODES. Would the minister state what the dimensions of the wharf are?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 360 feet in length, 14 feet wide on top and 30 feet high at the outer end.

Mr. RHODES. Is it the intention of the department to call for tenders and begin operations on this work during the coming year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say anything beyond this to my hon. friend, that we are now asking for the amount in the estimates and I have no reason to suppose but what the work will be proceeded with during the coming year. Of course, we have a great many works and we have to get the plans and specifications all ready before we can call for tenders, but I have no reason to suppose that there will be any unnecessary delay in connection with the work.

Mr. RHODES. That answer does not convey very much meaning to me. I can see that this item is in the estimates, and apparently it is the intention at some time or other to construct this work. But am I to understand that the department say that they will spend $7,500 to construct this wharf, and that after the plans and specifications are brought down they will go ahead and construct it? Surely the department does not do business in that slap-dash sort of fashion. I would like seriously to know if it is the intention of the minister to see that this work is constructed. That is a plain question and I would like to have a plain answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The fact of the amount appearing in the estimates is evidence of the intention of the government to proceed with the work. But, before going on with the work, after this appropriation is passed, there will be a very careful survey made by the engineer, plans and specifications will be prepared and in the ordinary course, speaking generally, tenders will be invited. When the tenders come in it may be that the amount will be very considerably higher than what we estimate. I happen to have in my mind a case in my own province last year where an amount was put in the estimates and I expected to go on with a work, but when the tenders came in the amount was considerably higher than the chief engineer estimated and we did not proceed with it. Therefore, I am unable to give my hon. friend the positive assurance that the work will be proceeded with.

Mr. RHODES. I do not profess to be an expert wharf builder but I can say without any hesitation that the department can construct a wharf of splendid quality and of the dimensions mentioned by the minister for the sum placed in the estimates. He need not have the slightest worry about exceeding the amount in the estimates. I find, on looking at the Auditor General's Report for last year V—150, that the sum of $367.77 has already been expended upon this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was that on election day?

Mr. RHODES. Just prior to the election. Am I to understand from the minister that this amount has been expended without any serious intention on the part of the department to proceed with the work, no plans or specifications having been prepared? The minister is unable to say when this work is to be constructed. He even intimated that if the work cost more than the amount in the appropriation it might not be constructed. It surely is a most remarkable position for a minister of the Crown to be put in. Could the minister give me an explanation of what this sum was spent for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has not given me the particulars of the expenditure.

Mr. RHODES. I indicated the page of the Auditor General's Report V—150.

Conductor, Douglas Lambe, services, July, 1908, 15 days at $2.50, $37.50.

This man proved to be so expert that he lost his life in the operation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That appears to have been some work done on the Diligent Harbour breakwater. I see there was a foreman and there have evidently been a rock driller, a quarryman and some labourers employed.

Mr. RHODES. I can see that quite as well as the minister can by reading the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon. friend desire me to give him?

Mr. RHODES. I am asking what this sum was expended for and was it expended as a matter of experiment to know whether this wharf should be constructed at a certain point, or was it intended to be a partial sum expended on this wharf which will be completed with the estimate now under consideration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend at this moment but I will look at the engineer's report and give him the information at a later date.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to have the information because it is in my constituency, and if one of my constituents wants to know when the department is going to proceed with this work I want to be able to answer him. That is one of the reasons why I am here. I do not object to the work; indeed I may say it is a very necessary public work. I want to be able to say to my constituents when I go home that this work will be constructed and I feel like pressing the Minister of Public Works to tell me

when he will have it done. There is a very large lumber district around here and large quantities of lumber are shipped, so that the immediate completion of the work is of great interest to Liberals and Conservatives alike.

Mr. FIELDING. If every hon. gentleman should demand a similar pledge with respect to the particular work in his constituency the Minister of Public Works might have a larger contract on hand than he could fill. I take it that the presentation of these estimates shows the desire of the minister to carry out the work. If he is asked to say that every one of these works should be commenced at a particular time and carried to completion during the year I certainly should advise him not to give such a pledge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would assume that the $367 was for making the testing and boring in the bottom of the harbour which is necessary in all works of this kind in order to estimate the cost.

Mr. RHODES. I do not wish the Minister of Finance for one moment to think that I am unreasonable, but this item has appeared in the estimates at least once before.

Mr. FIELDING. There are quite a number like it.

Mr. RHODES. It is an old friend in the county and I wanted to know whether it was the intention of the minister to complete it in the near future, so that I may be able to tell the shippers in that locality when they will have a wharf on which to land their goods.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman can tell them what has taken place to-night.

Dover Wharf, $5,000.

Mr. CROSBY. Will this be done by tender and contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided.

Mr. CROSBY. I thought that all public works were to be done by contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have explained that all work which can be done as economically by contract as by day work will be done by contract. It sometimes happens that the tenders are higher than the estimate of the chief engineer and he recommends that it be done by day labour, or that the work is so remote from the contractors that it can be more economically done the other way.

Mr. CROSBY. Dover is not far from Halifax and there is no difficulty in getting contractors.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Dover is in Guysboro' county.

Mr. CROSBY. I might have supposed that it was not in my county.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are some public works to be done in your county.

Dublin Shore—breakwater pier, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect to finish the work this summer.

Duncan Cove, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build an adequate shelter for the lifeboat station, to protect the wharf, and to accommodate fishing boats. The estimated cost is $19,000. This is in the county of Halifax.

Eastern passage harbour, $8,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is also in the county of Halifax. It is for the improvement of the boat harbour which has become almost filled with sand to the great inconvenience of the fishermen. The total probable cost is $13,500.

Mr. CROSBY. Will this be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this will have to be done by day labour.

Mr. CROSBY. This work is badly needed but I think that every working man applying for work there, no matter what his politics, should have a fair show. Of course, there is a lot of favouritism shown and it always will be shown by politicians, but at the same time when a man asks for a day's work he should not be asked what his politics are or to bring a certificate from some party man before he is employed. Men living in the locality should be employed regardless of their political opinions or of anything else except that they give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see how impossible it is for the minister to interfere in these cases. We endeavour to get a competent foreman, and we leave him free to employ good men in the locality. We give him no instruction about their politics at all. He is expected to use his own judgment and to select men who will give an honest day's work for a fair day's pay.

Fox Island—extension of beach protection work, &c., $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a breakwater. The materials were purchased in 1908-9. This is to complete the work.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this to be in the nature of beach protection or the construction of a breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a breakwater there now, which operates, I take it, as a means of protection from the sea. This is merely for an extension of that work.

Mr. JAMESON. Last year there was an item for beach protection, if I remember rightly, in the county represented by the Minister of Finance. On that occasion the Minister of Public Works justified the work as being necessary to protect certain properties on the water-front which were being more or less carried away from year to year by the action of the water and the tides. At that time I drew his attention to the fact that a certain property owned by the Dominion government, and known as Battery Point, at Digby, was becoming from year to year worn away by the action of the tides and the water. Not only was the property diminished in area, but the earth and rocks which were being washed away were being carried into the harbour and forming a very serious sandbar. The minister said he would make a note of my remarks, and he thought some protection would be thrown up in front of the Point to prevent this erosion. Guns owned by the Militia Department are mounted there, and I think the property is under the control of the department. I would ask the minister to bear it in mind and provide for it in the estimates, if not this year, then next year. It is a very serious detriment to the harbour of Digby.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have a note made of it and perhaps confer with the Minister of Militia about it.

Gulf Shore—to complete breakwater between Pugwash and Northport, $1,200.

Mr. RHODES. A year or a year and a half ago the government partly constructed a wharf at the Gulf Shore in the county of Cumberland. At the same time a survey was taken between Pugwash and Northport. These are two entirely different places. Northport and Pugwash are 18 miles apart.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is six miles from Pugwash. There was expended on the work last year $2,489.95, and the total cost will be $3,700, and this vote is to complete it.

Mr. RHODES. Gulf Shore, Pugwash and Northport would form a triangle. There has been no work other than a survey between Northport and Pugwash, and these points are 18 miles apart. I would ask the minister to make a memorandum and let me know later if it is the intention of the department to also construct a wharf between Northport and Pugwash, or if this is only to complete the breakwater at Gulf Shore.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the breakwater at Gulf Shore. We have expended $2,489.85, and this amount is asked to complete the work. The hon. member says that the statement that it is between Pugwash and Northport is an error.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. RHODES. Yes, it was in contemplation at one time to construct a wharf near Northport.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is probably how the error has occurred. I would move to amend the item by striking out the words 'between Pugwash and Northport.'

Mr. RHODES. It is not the intention to do anything further towards the construction of a wharf between Northport and Pugwash?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We cannot at present, because there is no appropriation.

Habitant River—to lengthen and complete approach to wharf at Canning, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost of this extension is $25,000. The expenditure to the 31st of March, 1909, was $2,763.17. The expenditure for this year has been $5,256.83 and we are asking for $2,000. That will make $10,000 which will have been expended, and if the further extension is carried on it will take $15,000 more but we are not asking for that now.

Mr. JAMESON. That is merely to complete the approach to the wharf at Canning?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. And the additional $15,000 of which the minister spoke would be required to complete an extension of the wharf, not on the approach.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that would extend it 750 feet down stream.

Mr. JAMESON. Where is this public work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the county of Kings.

Mr. JAMESON. Represented by the Minister of Militia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Hampton Breakwater—extension—revote of lapsed amount, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the existing wharf about 100 feet. The object is to prevent the silt and gravel from being washed into the schooner berths which are there alongside the pier. There was a previous vote of $3,000 of which none was used, and we are asking a revote to complete this work.

Harbours, rivers and bridges generally—repairs and improvements, $37,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the usual general vote, but it is less than last year.

Mr. JAMESON. I spoke to the minister with reference to Churchpoint breakwater a few days ago. The minister was kind enough to say then that out of this general vote he would endeavour to provide a berth

on the shoreward end of that wharf which would cost a comparatively insignificant sum, $300 or $400. I would like to have the matter noted now so it may appear as a matter of record.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under consideration and if it is decided to proceed with it it can be done out of the general vote.

Mr. CROSBY. I would ask the minister to consider the breakwater at Portuguese Cove. They have a very good breakwater there, but it is not as useful as it would be if it had a T across the end. That would make it much more commodious for the people there and would greatly improve the breakwater. I brought the matter to the minister's attention last year and would be glad if he would take it into his consideration with this general vote and could see his way clear to do the work in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be an improvement but still it is not an actually necessary work, and I am afraid that the T would cost more than the amount we could take out of the general vote. The general vote is for repairs and small works not exceeding $500. We are providing for a good many wharfs and breakwaters and I did not feel that I could make a special provision for it this year, but I will have it carefully looked into.

Mr. RHODES. What has been the policy in the last few years in purchasing piles for the repairs on existing wharfs and for the construction of new wharfs? Have they been purchased in large quantities for the whole province, or does the department purchase a few here and there in the districts where the work happened to be? Is there any uniformity of price in the purchase of piles?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been annually in the maritime provinces an appropriation of a lump sum to purchase creosoted piling. That piling is purchased in the Southern States, creosoted there and used for various public works. We like to keep a quantity on hand to be used in the construction on wharfs, in the waters affected by the teredo. In harbours into which there is a flow of fresh water the teredo is not nearly so destructive as in harbours not so supplied with fresh water. We endeavour to get it under competition getting prices from the different firms dealing in creosoted timber. There are two large companies in the Southern States which deal in this and we endeavour to buy in fair quantities and at the lowest possible price.

Mr. RHODES. I had not in mind the question of creosoted timber because that cannot be purchased locally. My point was whether there was any policy of purchasing piling in quantities in order that it might be obtained at a uniform and comparatively reasonable price or if the piling was purchased from different persons in various parts of the province, where work happened to be going on, at any price that the person chose to charge the department, within comparative reason.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not in the habit of purchasing ordinary piling in large quantities. We purchase for each particular work. Where we let the work by contract the contractor buys the material himself. If we do the work by day work, we purchase the material for the particular wharf we are proposing to construct. Our engineer or foreman looks around and advises what is best to be done. The piling suitable for one wharf would not do for another. It may depend on the foundation, on the distance before you strike rock, on the rise and fall of the tide, &c., so that we have to buy the piling we require from time to time, and it would not do to buy in large quantities.

Mr. RHODES. I can quite understand that piling varies in size and is purchased at so much per foot. Does the department call for tenders for a certain quantity of piling at so much per foot, or allow the engineer or foreman to go into the locality and do what he thinks best?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is largely left to the judgment of the engineer to purchase at the lowest market price.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this creosote timber purchased direct from the company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two southern companies which supply the timber, and the custom of the department is to keep a fairly large quantity on hand.

Mr. JAMESON. It has been brought to my notice that this timber is not purchased from the companies direct, but from a purchasing agent or private individual, who gets the middle man's profit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the case. The government purchase from these companies through their authorized agents.

Mr. JAMESON. Have they agents in every province in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there are two in the lower provinces.

Mr. JAMESON. Then the rule of the department is to purchase from the agents of these companies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, from their authorized agents.

Inverness, Broad Cove Mines—harbour improvements, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the carrying on of the proposed works for the accommodation of vessels and to acquire the necessary property from the Inverness Railway and Coal Company. The matter has been under consideration quite a number of years and we have expropriated certain properties from the Inverness Railway and Coal Company. The resident engineer estimates the cost at some $60,000.

Mr. RHODES. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Joggin's Mines—breakwater wharf—repairs and extension, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the breakwater. The total estimated cost is $9,000.

Judique—approach to breakwater at Mckay's Point, $1,350.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the estimated cost to provide for an approach.

Kingsport breakwater pier — extension, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the breakwater piers some 200 feet. The present pier is 700 feet long and 40 feet wide, and it is necessary to extend it further to get deeper water and give much needed accommodation to vessels.

LaHave River—to provide for the disposal of saw-dust and other dredged material deposited on foreshore, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the removal of dredged material which was deposited at convenient places instead of being carried a good many miles further to the sea.

Lake Ainslie—protected boat channel leading to wharf at Kenlock (Lockbay railway station), $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to give a channel of 15 feet wide and 6 feet at low water at the eastern end of the pier and give access to the wharf.

Leitche's Creek—wharf, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to afford protection to that wharf. The total cost is estimated at $7,000.

Liscombe Harbour Wharf, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the estimated total cost.

Litchfield—extension of breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will be sufficient for the extension of the breakwater.

Little Anse—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to afford protection to fishing vessels. The total cost will be $24,000.

Little River—breakwater—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost will be $10,000. This is to construct a landing pier 165 feet long right out to the depth of 12 feet at low water to afford proper landing and shipping facilities.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it intended to call for tenders and give the work by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. Have the plans been prepared.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not the working plans.

Mr. JAMESON. I suppose that after the New Year this work will be taken in hand?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, after the Appropriation Act passes. There will be some 45,000 cubic feet of crib-work.

Little Tancook Island—breakwater pier, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This breakwater pier will cost about $18,000. It is to protect the cove formed by a long projection of the southwest part of the island. It is to afford a well sheltered harbour.

Lower Argyle—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an old wharf there now almost useless and this is to construct a new one. This is the estimated cost.

McNair's Cove—extension and repairs to breakwater wharf, $6,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $10,000 but we have expended $3,900 and this will complete.

Main à Dieu—wharf at outer end of eastern breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $15,000.

Meteghan—breakwater — renewals and repairs, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move that we amend that item to read 'Meteghan River Breakwater.'

Mr. JAMESON. I would be surprised if the minister made that change. There is a place known as Meteghan River wharf, where there is a breakwater, and there is also a place known as Meteghan where there is a public wharf now in a sad state of dilapidation, and which, unless it is speedily protected, will certainly be carried away by storms this winter. I had hoped when I saw this item that it was to be an expenditure at Meteghan where the work is sadly needed. The breakwater at Meteghan, as I have also shown the minister by means of photographs, is in a bad condition, and unless some repairs are speedily made upon it, it will be damaged if not destroyed. If the minister wishes to amend his estimates by inserting an item for the extension or improvement of the

Meteghan River breakwater, I will have no objection. But where the amount is mentioned in the estimates for Meteghan, which is an entirely different place from Meteghan river, I should object to the change.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is very much needed at Meteghan river, and it will take this amount to repair it, while it would take a comparatively small amount to repair the breakwter at Meteghan. This is needed for Meteghan river. But if it is necessary to get a special vote for Meteghan, I will consider that a little later. But I had thought that the repairs there were so comparatively small that they could be done out of the general vote. In the meantime, I ask that this be passed for Meteghan river.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the motion means a diversion of the vote from its original intent, I could not receive it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was originally intended for Meteghan river, and it is necessary to alter the reading of the estimate in order definitely to show where the work is to be done.

Mr. JAMESON. I have no desire to prevent the expenditure of this sum at Meteghan river. But I have to say with regard to Meteghan that I believe an amount is absolutely necessary to effect the repairs there which are required in the interest, not only of the people who have to use this work, but of the department itself which owns the work. The minister is confusing the breakwater at Meteghan, for which a comparatively small expenditure is required, with the public landing which is inside that breakwater, and which is an entirely separate structure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Supposing we voted the money for Meteghan breakwater, it could not be used for a wharf inside the breakwater. We would have to get another vote for that.

Mr. JAMESON. As the minister has inserted the word 'breakwater,' meaning a breakwater or a public wharf, I think the amount might be applied to that. But as an amount corresponding to this is necessary for that breakwater and public wharf at Meteghan, I do not think it would be desirable to divert the sum. I do not think the minister would be justified in saying that there could be any possible confusion between the two. I think the work at Meteghan stands in greater need of this expenditure than the work at Meteghan river. The latter is a comparatively new work, while that at Meteghan is in need of this expenditure to keep it from being carried away. If the minister, however, feels that under the circumstances he could not amend this then providing that a further sum corresponding in amount should be granted for Meteghan, I think would be the most suitable way of meeting the difficulty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not do that, I could not amend these estimates except inso far as the amount is concerned. As to Meteghan, that is a matter that would be considered later. Suppose that this amount had been allotted to Meteghan breakwater, it could not have been used for the purpose of repairing a wharf at Meteghan, as it is inside the breakwater, while the sum you require for the breakwater at Meteghan is very small, and could be done out of the general vote. There are two Meteghans, and there is a breakwater at each place. One is known as Meteghan river and the other as Meteghan. Now this was intended for Meteghan river, therefore I would ask the committee to change this to Meteghan river for greater definiteness. If you, Mr. Chairman, feel that you could not make the change, I shall have to ask you to strike the amount out of the estimates altogether. It is true that my hon. friend spoke to me about the breakwater at Meteghan, and he certainly led me to suppose, whether intentionally or otherwise, that only a small amount would be required to make these repairs.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not wish that there should be any misapprehension between the committee or the minister, and myself with regard to this matter. I did state that the expenditure necessary on the Meteghan breakwater would be comparatively trifling, but I also pointed out that the expenditure upon the wharf at Meteghan would be a more serious matter, and I understood from the minister that the matter was receiving attention, and that it would be provided for in the estimates. When I saw this item I concluded that the minister had conceded the necessity and was preparing to meet the emergency. As for his suggestion that if this amendment is not made he will have to move to strike out the item, if that is meant as a mild kind of threat, it does not affect me in the least. I do think that if the minister is unable to allow this item to stand, as it seems to me proper that it should stand, he should be prepared to take the matter of Meteghan breakwater and public landing into immediate consideration because, in the interest of the department over which he presides, repairs are very urgently necessary at a very early date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have to tell my hon. friend I would be very glad to do that, but I could not allow an amount which was voted for Meteghan river to go to a breakwater in another place, and I could not allow a single dollar of that to go to the wharf at Meteghan because it is for a

breakwater. Therefore, it would not help my hon. friend, but at the same time I would say that repairs at Meteghan can be met out of the general vote. I will look into the question. If the chairman does not feel that the committee can make this amendment then I shall have to do only what I have power to do and that would be to strike it out altogether.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it appeared that the change was actually a diversion of the vote I would be inclined not to receive the motion, but in so far as it appears to me to be for the purpose of greater definiteness I think I am at liberty to receive the motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I therefore beg to move that the word 'river' be added between the words 'Meteghan' and 'breakwater.'

Item as amended agreed to.

Middle Island—Port Medway—breakwater—revote of $1,800, lapsed, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a breakwater on the north side of Middle Island and this is the total estimated cost of the work.

Mira River—wharfs—revote of $700, lapsed, $750.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a wharf on the east side of Mira river 3½ miles below Victoria bridge. The total estimated cost is $1,160 of which $414 has been expended, leaving what we are asking for to finish the work.

New Harbour—repairs to breakwater at Black Point, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to repair the breakwater, some fifty feet of which was carried away by a storm. This is the total estimated cost.

Northport—pile wharf—revote of lapsed amount, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Cumberland and it is to construct a wharf 200 feet long 30 feet wide and 14 feet high. This will complete the work.

Mr. RHODES. Has any money been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is probably the one that my hon. friend spoke of.

Mr. RHODES. I think so.

Nyanza Wharf—extension of, &c., $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the wharf fifty feet, using creosoted timber and the object is to enable three vessels to lie at the wharf at the same time. It will provide an increased depth of from eleven to 14 feet of water and the total estimated cost is $2,500.

Mr. RHODES. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Cape Breton at North Victoria.

Mr. JAMESON. Perhaps it would not be inadvisable for the minister to say what he means by the word '&c'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Strike out '&c'. Mr. Chairman, if it is objectionable. This is only for the extension. I move that the word '&c.' be struck out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Owl's Head—to complete wharf, $900.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the completion of a ballast and crib-work wharf, about 180 feet long, 20 feet wide, for 120 feet from the shore and 30 feet wide for the outer 60 feet. This is to give increased depth of water at the end of the wharf. This will complete it.

Parker's Cove—harbour improvements—revote of $1,600 lapsed, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the breakwater on the west side of the stream flowing in at Parker's Cove, in order to improve and enlarge the sheltered area for fishing boats and schooners.

Pictou Island—removal of wrecked portion of east wharf and addition of new sheathed cribwork, &c.—revote of $4,200 lapsed, $6,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work.

Mr. McKENZIE. Before the committee rises, there was a statement made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) in connection with an item in the estimates which would give a wrong impression and I desire as a matter of explanation of the merits of the item, to present the facts. He made an attack upon the building of a wharf to accommodate a steamer of only 10 tons capacity which he said was the capacity of the 'Weymouth.' I have the record of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in which the name of the steamer appears and she is put down as being 102·7 feet long, 19 feet wide 7·6 feet in depth, gross capacity 154 tons, net tonnage 106 tons and 26 horse-power. He made a similar attack upon the new boat. That boat was built after the pattern of the 'Scotia' and has a tonnage of 350. This is a fair sample of the valuable information that we received from the hon. member from Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. It is necessary for me to give some explanation. I thought the hon. gentleman spoke of the 'Acadia' which is a very small boat. We do not consider this as anything more than an ordinary boat, a boat that runs along the coast and if we have to build a breakwater at Ingonish costing $30,000 for the accommodation of a boat that might run there once a week or

once a fortnight it is quite a large sum to pay for the service which we would receive. It is a serious matter for us in Nova Scotia where we have a great deal to do with the small amount of money that is spent. We think of our province as the wharf of Canada jutting away out into the Atlantic ocean and therefore we require a great deal. The province of Nova Scotia has done much for the west and for other parts of Canada. There is not a harbour in that province that does not require some expenditure in the line of providing breakwater accommodation for the fishermen. Therefore, I was anxious that this sum should be divided up amongst some of the other ports. I have no objection at all if the government are willing to spend $30,000 for the accommodation of a very small steamer which will run perhaps not more than once a week or once a fortnight to Ingonish. I think it is not fair to other parts of the province of Nova Scotia which are really in need of breakwaters and wharfs, and which will continue to be in need of them as everybody knows in that part of the country.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 6, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Oliver James Wilcox, Esquire, member for the north riding of Essex, by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Armstrong.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the name of Mr. Ross (Middlesex) be added to the following select standing committees: 1. Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines. 2. Miscellaneous, Private Bills. 3. Banking and Commerce, and (4) Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the name of Mr. Wilcox be added to the following select standing committees: 1. Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. 2. Miscellaneous, Private Bills. 3. Public Accounts. 4. Agriculture and Colonization, and 5. Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the budget, I would propose to move that Thursday be made a government day and on that day I expect to make the budget speech, if there be no objection to taking Thursday for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not often have to ask for delay in these matters but there is an engagement made several months ago that is due on Thursday, and I will not be able to be here. Of course, the Finance Minister may go on, but it would deprive me of the pleasure of listening to his speech.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not care to go on in the absence of my hon. friend. His face opposite is always an inspiration to me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Thursday is government day, I think, without any motion.

Mr. FIELDING. Not this week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One month after the opening of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought it was after the third week.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the fourth week. I believe it is the last Thursday which is private members' day. Thursday would be the only day available. The trouble is that if we get into the following week we are getting dangerously near the recess. However, I will not bring it up on Thursday, if my hon. friend will not be present. I will probably bring it up on Tuesday of the following week, but I will later make a more definite statement.

QUESTIONS.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What was the average price paid by the government per bushel for each of the different grades of wheat, oats and barley distributed as seed grain in the year 1908?
2. What was the additional cost incurred per bushel for cleaning the grain, sacking, freight, distribution, customs duties, and other expenses in connection therewith?
3. What was the charge per bushel for each grade made to the farmers to whom the seed grain was supplied?
4. What was the average price per bushel at which the surplus of each grade, not distributed as seed grain, was sold by the government?
5. What was the contract price paid for wheat and oat sacks and at what price were the unused sacks sold?
6. What was the total amount charged against farmers to whom the seed grain was supplied, and how much was paid on account of such seed grain by the farmers to the government up to March 1, 1909?

7. What was the net profit or loss to the government in connection with the seed grain distribution?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. Wheat—

No. 1 Hard	average	cost	per	bush.	$1·066
No. 1 Northern	"	"	"	"	1·095
No. 2	"	"	"	"	1·03
No. 3	"	"	"	"	·982
No. 4	"	"	"	"	·928
Oats—					
No. 1. White	"	"	"	"	·697
No. 2 "	"	"	"	"	·653
No. 3 "	"	"	"	"	·59
Ontario	"	"	"	"	·747
Prince Edward Island	"	"	"	"	·655
English	"	"	"	"	·706
Barley—					
No. 2	"	"	"	"	1·076
No. 3 Extra	"	"	"	"	·958
No. 3	"	"	"	"	·906

2. Average cost per bushel, ·215.

3. Wheat—

No. 1 Northern	price	per	bushel		$1 18
No. 2	"	"	"	"	1 15
No. 3	"	"	"	"	1 07
No. 4 Wheat	"	"	"		1 01
Oats—					
No. 1 Western Canada,	price	per	bush.		0 71
No. 2	"	"	"	"	0 70
No. 3	"	"	"	"	0 67
Prince Edward Island	"	"	"		0 85
English	"	"	"		0 85
Ontario	"	"	"		0 85
No. 1 Edmonton	"	"	"		0 86
No. 2 Edmonton	"	"	"		0 85

Barley—price per bushel, $1.13.

4. Wheat—

No.1—1·06 3-4.
No. 2—1·05 1-6.
No. 3—1·02 1-3.
No. 4— ·92 1-2.

Oats—

No. 1	·48
No. 2	·43½
No. 3	·67
English	·54½
Prince Edward Island	·45⅝
Regenerated Abundance	1·30
British Columbia	·86
Ontario	·86
Garton	1·30
No. 1 Special	·86
Barley	·87½

5. (a) Wheat, sacks ·09083 each.
Oat, " ·06994 each.
Barley, " ·07796 each.
(b) ·06445 each.

6. (a) $401,721.76.
(b) $132,883.47 to 31st October, 1909, of which $28,118.79 was received to 1st March, 1909.

7. $103,979.57 loss, including $21,590.02 for administration expenses.

Mr. LAKE.

BUILDING OF GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE:

1. Has the government called for tenders for the building of the ships for which this House voted money last session?
2. If so, when were these tenders called for and from whom?
3. Were any tenders received? If so, from whom, and what were the respective amounts?
4. Were the contracts let? If so, to whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1. Yes.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

2. Lighthouse and buoy steamer for the Great Lakes and Georgian Bay, 9th March, 1908—public advertisement. Ice-breaker for the Northumberland Straits, 5th March, 1908—public advertisement. Hydrographic survey steamer, 27th October, 1908—public advertisement. Fisheries protection cruiser, 2nd April, 1908—public advertisement.

Department of Agriculture:

Quarantine vessel for Halifax, N. S., 4th August, 1909—public advertisement.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

3. Yes. Buoy steamer—Great Lakes and Georgian Bay—Swan Hunter & Wigham Richardson, Wallsend, England, $158,527.78, or with Babcock & Wilcox natural draft boiler for $160,966.67. Vickers Sons & Maxim, London, England, $216,605.59, or with Babcock & Wilcox boiler for $219,360.13. Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ontario, $217,000. Polson Iron Works, Toronto, with Scotch boilers, $245,600, or with Thornycroft Marshall boilers for $248,600, or with Babcock & Wilcox boilers, $249,900. Ice-breaker for the Northumberland Straits, Fleming & Ferguson, Paisley, Scotland, £76,160; William Hamilton & Company, Port Glasgow, Scotland, £81,700; Swan Hunter & Wigham Richardson, Wallsend, England, £82,800; William Beardmore & Company, Near Glasgow, £90,570; John Reid & Company, Glasgow, £95,100; Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Glasgow, £97,638; London & Glasgow Shipbuilding Company, Glasgow £98,575, Palmer Shipbuilding & Iron Company, Limited, Jarrow, England, £101,100; W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth & Company, Newcastle-on-Tyne, £103,400; Vickers Sons & Maxim, Limited, London, England, £103,000; F. W. Hallstrom Bloom & Voss, Hamburg, Germany, £117,250; John C. Ticklenborg, Hamburg, £117,250; John C. Ticklenborg, Hamburg, Germany, £128,600. Hydrographic steamer for the Atlantic Coast: Fleming & Ferguson, Paisley, Scotland, $169,846.66; Swan Hunter & Wigham Richardson, Wallsend-on-Tyne, $177,633.33; Collingwood-Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ontario, $181,462; Polson Iron Works, Toronto, Ontario, $249,983.

Department of Agriculture:

Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ontario, $35,000; Toronto Ship Yards, Toronto, Ontario, $39,850; Philip &

Son, Limited, Dartmouth, England, $22,600; Edward Norman, Toronto, Ontario, (for Crabtree & Company, Limited, Yarmouth, England), $28,310; John Reid & Company, Montreal, province of Quebec (representing British builders) $28,500; Halifax Graving Dock Company, Limited, Halifax, Nova Scotia, $37,362; Laurie & Lamb, Montreal, province of Quebec (representing British builders) $27,215; Polson Iron Works, Limited, Toronto, Ontario, $36,450; La Cie Pontbriand, Sorel, province of Quebec, $37,750; The New Burrell-Johnson Iron Company, Limited, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, $32,750; Mordey, Carney, Cardiff, Wales (per Ed. Norman, Toronto, Ontario), $27,143; P. J. Powers Company, Limited, Ottawa, Ontario, $38,500.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

4. Yes. The contract for the construction of a buoy steamer for the Great Lakes and Georgian Bay was awarded to Messrs. Swan Hunter & Wigham Richardson. The contract for the construction of the ice-breaking steamer for the Northumberland Straits was awarded to Messrs. Vickers Sons & Maxim, whose tender was considered the most satisfactory. The contract for the construction of a hydrographic steamer for the Atlantic Coast was awarded to Messrs. Swan Hunter & Wigham Richardson; Messrs. Fleming & Ferguson's tender being irregular.

Department of Agriculture:

Yes. Philip & Son, Limited, Dartmouth, England.

LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. How many men, what are their names, and the length of time in the service, who were employed in the carpenter shop on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien, from May 1 to November 25, 1909?

2. Was there any one suspended or discharged during the same period?

3. If so, what are their names, their length of time in the service and the date of their dismissal?

4. Was there any one dismissed or suspended and reinstated during the same period? If so, what is their names and the length of time in the service?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. See statement No. 1.

2. Yes.

3. Names and length of time in service, given in statement No. 2.

4. See names in statement No. 3.

LACHINE CANAL—CARPENTER SHOP STAFF.

STATEMENT No. 1.

Name.	Occupation.	Wages per day.	First Appointment.	Length of Service.	Remarks.
		$ cts.		Years.	
F. K. O'Grady	Head foreman	3 50	Jan. 16, 1900	9	
R. Parsons	Asst. foreman	3 00	Aug. 1900	9	
E. Fiset	Carpenter and pattern maker	2 75	1897	12	
P. Demers	Carpenter	2 50	Sept. 1882	27	
Geo. Larose	"	2 50	May 1892	17	
L. Bouchard	"	2 50	Nov. 16, 1891	18	
A. Drapeau	"	2 50	Feb. 1897	12	
J. B. Tanguay	"	2 50	May 14, 1894	15	
Ls. Crevier	"	2 50	Mar. 1901	8	
J. Turcotte	"	2 50	1894		Died June, 1909.
N. Drolet	"	2 50	1897	12	
S. Gariepy	"	2 50	1904	5	
A. Tellier	"	2 50	1906	3	
J. B. Labranche	"	2 50	1896	13	
J. Langevin	"	2 50	Nov. 20, 1900	9	
J. Savard	"	2 50	Feb. 1903	6	
L. De Bellefeuille	"	2 50	Mar. 1902	7	
J. O'Grady	"	2 50	1904	5	
L. Page	"	2 50	1906	3	
S. Mayrand	"	2 50	1897	12	
E. St. Jean	"	2 50	1907	2	
W. O'Brien	Asst. Carpenter	2 00	1897	12	
J. H. Landry	Handyman	1 75	1906	3	
A. Larive	"	1 75	1901	8	
J. Dowton	"	1 75	1904	5	

Number of men to September 1st, 1909, 25 carpenters and handymen.
" November 25th, 1909, 10 " "

LACHINE CANAL—CARPENTER SHOP STAFF.

STATEMENT No. 2—WITHDRAWALS, SUSPENSIONS, &c.

Name.	Occupation.	Wages.	Length of Service.	Remarks.
P. Demers	Carpenter	$2.50 d.	27 years...	Laid off Sept. 1, '09, ill in hospital.
L. Bouchard	"	"	18 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
J. B. Tanguay	"	"	15 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
L. Crevier	"	"	8 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
S. Gariepy	"	"	5 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
A. Tellier	"	"	3 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
J. B. Labranche	"	"	13 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
J. Turcotte	"	"	15 " ..	Died June '09.
L. Page	"	"	3 " ..	Laid off Sept. 1, '09.
S. Mayrand	"	"	12 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.
E. St. Jean	"	"	2 " ..	" Sept. 1, '09.

LACHINE CANAL—CARPENTER SHOP STAFF.

STATEMEMT No. 3.—WITHDRAWALS, SUSPENSIONS, &c.

Name.	Occupation.	Wages.	Length of Service.	Remarks.
Jos. Savard	Carpenter ..	$2 50	6 years...	Laid off Sept. 1, '09, but later worked a few days in Nov.
L. DeBellefeuille	" ..	2 50	7 " ..	Laid off Sept. 1, '09, but later worked a few days in Nov.
A. Drapeau	" ..	2 50	12 " ..	Laid off Sept. 1, reinstated on Sept. 24th, '09.
L. Larive	Handyman..	1 75	8 " ..	Transferred to Staff as Bridgeman, Nov. 15, '09.

DOMINION POLICE FORCE.

Mr. SMYTH:

1. How many members of the Dominion Police Force were sent into the districts of Thunder Bay and Rainy River, West Algoma, East Algoma and Nipissing, at the last general election, respectively?

2. Upon whose request, and by what representations were such police sent into the ridings, and for what purpose?

3. Who ordered them to go, and what instructions were given them?

4. Were they, or any of them, in any instance sent upon a special train? If so, why, upon whose request, what was the cost of special transportation, and who paid it?

5. What was the total cost per constituency of sending out and maintaining these police?

6. Has it been the custom of the government to utilize the Dominion Police Force for this purpose? If not, why was an exception made in these instances, and upon what authority?

7. Was the sending out of these police preceded by any request of the Ontario government to provide such? If so, by whom was such request made, and with what result?

8. Was there any correspondence with the provincial government on the subject?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. To Thunder Bay and Rainy River, none; to West Algoma, three; to East Algoma, eight; to Nipissing, none.

2 and 3. It was stated in the Toronto Conservative newspapers of 19th October, 1908, that a number of men, not regular constables, were being given special authority by the government of Ontario to make arrests and were to go into the constituencies of East and West Algoma in connection with the elections then proceeding, to polling places called backwoods polls to patrol the approaches to such polls on the voting day and make arrests as they might think fit. It is the ancient and undoubted privilege and right of this House to conduct its own elections by its own officials, who are responsible to it alone. The House of Commons has at all times been jealous to guard this privilege and right, and quick to resent any interference with it. In these circumstances, believing the statements in the newspapers above referred to, to be true, I, upon my own responsibility as a servant of this House, directed that sufficient Dominion police to protect honest voters from intimidation or interference with the free exercise of their franchise and under instructions to arrest and prosecute under section 269 of the Dominion Elections Act any one guilty of such indictable offences should be sent at once from Ottawa to the Electoral Districts of East and West Algoma. I directed the Commissioner of Dominion Police to despatch the men and to give them their instructions in the words above stated.

4. Two of the men went on a special train

which, for a different purpose altogether, left Ottawa for Sault Ste. Marie on 25th October, 1908. No request was made by anybody that men should be sent on that train and there was no cost of special transportation. The circumstance that the train was going was simply taken advantage of.

5. $338.12 in all, for the two constituencies.

6. No, because this is the first instance, so far as known, in which any such interference with the conduct of elections to this House has been attempted. What was done in this case was done upon my authority alone.

7. Certainly not.

8. No.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE AT DUNNVILLE, ONT.

Mr. LALOR:

1. What was the total amount of postal revenue for the town of Dunnville, Ontario, during each of the years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive?

2. What was the total customs revenue of the Port of Dunnville, Ontario, for each of the years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Postal revenue of the town of Dunnville, Ont., during each of the years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive:

Year ended June 30,	1900	$3,057 72
" " "	1901	3,225 12
" " "	1902	3,628 28
" " "	1903	3,960 48
" " "	1904	4,178 63
" " "	1905	4,684 95
" " "	1906	5,686 87
Nine months ended March 30,	1907	4,437 98
Year ended March 31,	1908	6,010 86
" " "	1909	7,463 84

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

2. The total customs revenue of the outport of Dunnville was as follows:

Fiscal year ending June 30,	1900..	$ 4,644 16
" " "	1901..	5,747 28
" " "	1902..	7,202 25
" " "	1903..	9,017 51
" " "	1904..	13,653 87
" " "	1905..	16,367 51
" " "	1906..	30,856 00
Nine months ending March 31,	1907	24,398 27
Fiscal year ending March 31,	1908	25,286 44
" " "	1909	22,499 94

OTTAWA GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. PERLEY:

1. Does the government pay the taxes and local improvement rate on the building which it has rented on the northeast corner of O'Connor and Queen streets?

2. Who is to pay the water rates, street sprinkling and snow cleaning?

3. Does the government heat and light the building and pay the janitor and elevator expenses?

4. Who is to make the ordinary repairs and any changes that may be required by the government hereafter?

5. In figuring the floor space as 23,470 superficial feet, has any deduction been made for the halls, stairways, &c., and has the basement been included in such estimate?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. No.

2. The government.

3. Yes.

4. The government.

5. Deduction made for halls, stairways, elevator, boiler and fuel rooms.

ALBERTA COAL AREAS.

Mr. MAGRATH:

1. What is the estimated total area of coal-bearing lands in Alberta and the estimate total tonnage of coal within such area?

2. What is the total area of such lands disposed of up to 31st of March last, and the average price per acre obtained therefor?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. From the information at present available an estimate cannot be given of the number of acres of coal lands there are in the province of Alberta. Coal has been discovered in many parts of the province, but in the large majority of cases the development of these several discoveries has not been sufficient upon which to base an estimate as to the extent of the coal-measures. In addition to this, more than one-half of the province lies north of Edmonton, and as no great demand for coal in this northern part of the province has yet arisen, very little prospecting has been carried on. New discoveries of coal in the southern portion of the province are still being made, and while it is known that the coal-measures of the province are of very great extent no estimate has been attempted as to the number of acres of such lands or the total tonnage of coal within such areas.

2. The total area of coal lands disposed of up to the 31st of March last is: Disposed of by sale, 259,525·33 acres; disposed of under lease, 83,830·28 acres; the average price per acre obtained for coal lands under sale is: For surface and coal mining rights, about $10 an acre; for surface rights only, about $7 an acre; under lease, about 85 cents an acre per annum.

HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT DEFENCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is proper care being given to the expensive machinery in the workshops and other buildings taken over from the imperial government at Halifax and Esquimalt to prevent undue deterioration?

2. Is sufficient care being given to the defence works, fortifications, mines, buildings, machinery and defence appliances of every nature on ordnance, command or district

gunners charge at Halifax and Esquimalt, to preserve the same so that they may be constantly fit for service?

3. Have stores or material of any description whatsoever, taken over from the imperial government at Halifax or Esquimalt, been since sold? If so, under what instructions, description and quantity, what prices were obtained, and in what manner were such sales conducted?

4. Has the attention of the government been called to a speech alleged to have been recently made in England by Sir William Henry White, K.C.B., F.R.S., LL.D., B.Sc., in which great reflections are said to have been cast upon the administration of the Canadian authorities as respects the care of properties and materials handed over by the imperial government in connection with the defences at Halifax and Esquimalt? If not, will the government cause inquiries to be made and the correctness, or otherwise, of the assertions established?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. It is not practicable to reply to this question at once. Obsolete articles are disposed of annually under regulations for Canadian Ordnance Services, and it is impossible to state from records at headquarters whether some of the articles disposed of, such as tools, &c., formerly belonged to the imperial government or not. A report on this subject has been called for from the senior ordnance officers concerned.

4. The attention of the government has not been called to a speech alleged to have been recently made in England by Sir William Henry White, K.C.B., F.R.S., LL.D., B.Sc.

THE PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are all recruits of the permanent force required to follow such courses of instruction immediately after enlistment as will qualify them to act as instructors to the active militia?

2. How many competent instructors are the permanent force able to supply from its present strength of 2,710 for the training of active militia?

3. Does the permanent force at Esquimalt provide courses of instruction for officers and men of the artillery branches of the active militia? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. In the combatant branches of the permanent force the course of instruction given to a recruit is such as to qualify a man, who has the faculty for imparting instruction, to be an instructor to the active militia.

2. 441 hold certificates as first-class instructors. A large number are qualified to instruct, but are not so highly competent. It must be remembered that the duties of the permanent force include others beside those of instruction.

3. Yes.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are all officers of the permanent force who are performing command or district duties paid according to the scale of consolidated rates of pay and allowances fixed by regulations for their appointments?

2. If any such officers are paid according to the regimental or daily rates of pay and allowances, what is the additional cost to the public, how long have such officers been so employed, under what authority is the scale fixed by regulations departed from, and what reasons exist for such discrimination?

3. Are any public quarters, that are owned or rented by the Crown or any department thereof, occupied by any officers in receipt of consolidated rates of allowances, or by any government officials whose incomes were so fixed as to include the hire of quarters? If so, by what officials and at what stations?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes, except in two cases in which officers in command of permanent units were seconded to fill staff appointments with the same rates of pay and allowances as they were drawing previous to transfers. The staff officers of Winnipeg and Calgary are also drawing a special rate of lodging allowance.

2. The two officers in command of permanent units, seconded to fill staff appointments, above referred to, are paid the regimental rates of pay and allowances according to rank at following additional cost over the consolidated rates fixed for the appointments: Deputy assistant adjutant general, Eastern Ontario command, $200 per annum; district staff adjutant, military district No. 12, $705.75 per annum. The staff officers at Winnipeg and Calgary draw from $300 to $362 extra for lodging allowance on account of the high rents there. These rates have been drawn since the following dates: Deputy assistant adjutant general, Eastern Ontario command, May 1, 1905; district staff adjutant, military district No. 12 (previously D.S.A., military district No. 8), May 15, 1907; district officer commanding, military district No. 10, June 15, 1907; district officer commanding, military district No. 13, May 1, 1909; district staff adjutants, military districts Nos. 10 and 13, February 2, 1909. The regulations have not been departed from, as in the first two cases the officers are drawing the pay, &c., of their rank, and were only seconded for duty on the staff. In the other cases the rates were fixed by order in council and hence became regulations.

3. Yes. Officer commanding, Western Ontario command, Toronto; district officer commanding, military district No. 7, Quebec; chief staff officer, Quebec command,

Montreal. In each of the above cases the amount of lodging allowance included in the consolidated rates, is deducted from the salary of the officer concerned. In addition, the district officer commanding military district No. 1 has been permitted to occupy quarters at Wolseley Barracks, temporarily, until required by the officer commanding regimental depot, Royal Canadian Regiment, London.

ANNUAL COST OF PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What is the full average cost to the public per annum for one soldier of the permanent force?

2. What is the average cost per annum for the keep of one horse for the permanent force, inclusive of shoeing, veterinary attention and all other incidental expenses?

3. (a) What is the average cost per annum of remounts.; (b) where are they chiefly procured; (c) by whom are purchases made; (d) how many were purchased during the last financial year, and at what total cost inclusive of all expenses incidental thereto, such as commission to purchasing agents, travelling expenses of purchasing officers, and transportation charges of purchased animals to destination?

4. (a) How many horses have been cast by the permanent force during the five years ended 31st March, 1909, and (b) were any such cast within three years of their purchase? If so, for what causes?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. $564, with, in the case of mounted units, an additional $110 per man per annum for purchase of remounts and forage.

2. Approximately, $130.

3. (a) This includes travelling expenses of purchasing officer and all other incidentals. $184.65 average first cost each remount, based on three years' purchases. (b)Remounts are generally procured locally, but a few have been purchased in the Northwest for the use of the Royal Canadian Dragoons. (c) Purchases are made by the officers commanding the units requiring remounts, assisted by the veterinary officers, and acting under authority from headquarters. (d) 46 horses were purchased in 1908-9 at a total cost, including all incidentals, of $9,000.68.

4. (a) 73. (b) 27, for the following causes:

Diseases.	Number of horses cast.
Sprained shoulder and rheumatism....	1
Navicular disease..	3
Chronic laminitis..	1
String halt..	1
Ringbone..	1
Rupture..	1
Vicious and incorrigible..	4
Ataxia of hind legs..	1
Unsound in wind..	1
Thick leg..	1
Weak pastern joint..	2
Injury to pubic region..	1
Atrophied shoulder..	1
Muscular weakness of loins..	1
Sprained perforans tendon..	1
Dropsy..	1
Sprained and ruined tendon..	1
Valvular affection of heart..	1
Larnygitis and bronchitis..	1
	27

CONTRACT RE IMPROVEMENTS ON MONTREAL RIVER.

Mr. GEO. GORDON:

1. What is the name of the contractor to whom contract has been awarded for construction of improvements on Montreal river?

2. Is the contractor bound to commence and complete the work in any definite time? If so, when?

3. Have any arrangements been made to provide Cobalt with a suitable post office and customs building?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. Tenders have been called; the lowest tender received is from W. H. Sinclair and D. B. Campbell, $38,705. Contract has not yet been awarded.

3. No, as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned.

CRUISE OF THE 'ARCTIC.'

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Has Captain Bernier made an official report covering the last cruise of the 'Arctic' in the northern waters?

2. If not printed, will the report if any, be laid on the table of the House, and when?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. The reports covering the last cruise of the 'Arctic' in the northern waters are now being prepared.

2. These reports are generally included in the Annual Report of the department, which is laid on the table of the House at the beginning of each session of parliament. There is, however, no objection to these reports being brought down earlier, and when they are received by the department they will be laid on the table of the House.

FREE MAIL DELIVERY IN CITY OF SYDNEY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MADDIN:

Why has the free mail delivery service promised the city of Sydney, Nova Scotia, not been put in operation, and what has occasioned the delay?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The delay referred to has been occasioned by the fact that the department has only recently been

able to ascertain that the city had the necessary population to entitle it to free letter carrier delivery. Moreover, the service cannot be put into operation until after the houses have been properly numbered, and the streets labelled at intersecting points, and this latter requirement is only now being supplied.

IMPORTS OF MACHINERY STEEL.

Mr. RHODES:

What quantities of single-reeled and double-reeled machinery steel were imported into Canada during the years 1907 and 1908, and what was the value of each kind in each year?

Mr. PATERSON. Single-reeled and double-reeled machinery steel are not classified separately in the customs returns. The imports of round steel shafting not exceeding 2½ inches in diameter, during the years ended 31st March, 1908 and 1909, were as follows:

Year	Quantity.	Value.
1908..	43,387 cwt.	$89,428
1909..	28,322 "	53,747

FISHERMEN'S BAIT ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. What amount per ton has been paid to Fishermen's Bait Associations for storage of bait?

2. What amounts were paid during the years ending March 31, 1908 and 1909, as allowances to Fishermen's Bait Associations for storage of bait at Canso, Half Island Cove, Larry's River, New Harbour, Whitehead, Port Beckerton and Drum Head, in Nova Scotia, to whom paid and the dates of the various payments?

3. What is the total amount that has been paid by the government towards the cost of construction of the freezers at Larry's River, Nova Scotia, and to whom were these sums paid?

4. What quantity of bait was stored in each of the freezers mentioned in question 2, during the years ending 31st March, 1908 and 1909?

5. What are the names of the persons in these places who report to the government as to the quantity of bait stored in the freezers?

6. What amounts have been paid by the government to the steamer known as 'Drift No. 33,' during the years 1908 and 1909, and for what services has this steamer been used?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. $5 per ton of bait frozen up to twenty tons for the first five years of operation.

2. The bonuses to the Fishermen's Bait Associations were paid for the calendar years:

	1907.	1908.
Half Id. Cove..	100	$100
Larry's River..	100	100
New Harbour..	100	100
Whitehead..	...	...
Port Beckerton..	100	...
Drum Head..	100	100

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

11th February, 1908, and 28th January, 1909.

3. $915.92, made up as follows:

Material supplied..	$118.85
Cheque..	797.07

The cheques were issued in favour of the Larry's River Fishermen's Bait Association.

4.—	1907. Lbs.	1908. Lbs.
Half Id. Cove..	42,000	98,000
Larry's River	48,076	115,416
New Harbour..	60,923	104,826
Whitehead..	.....	.....
Port Beckerton..	49,912	.....
Drum Head..	53,894	112,615

5. Mr. Peter Macfarlane, the department's outside officer in charge of this service, on whose certificate the bonuses were paid.

6. Nothing has been paid to this steamer, as she is the property of the department. She is employed as a tender to the Canso-Dogfish Reduction Works.

POSTMASTER AT CAMBORNE B.C.

Mr. GOODEVE:

Was a petition received by the Post Office Department from the citizens of Camborne, B.C., complaining about the appointment of a postmaster there, and objecting to being compelled to go into an hotel to receive their mail? If so, what action, if any, was taken in regard to it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No petition has been received from the citizens of Camborne, British Columbia, complaining about the appointment of a postmaster there, or objecting to being compelled to go into an hotel to receive their mail, but a telegram and letter were received from Mr. W. G. Marten, who informed the department that he was acting on behalf of the citizens of Camborne, stating that there was objection to the appointment of the present postmaster, inasmuch as the post office would be kept in an hotel, but the department was assured when making the appointment that the post office would be kept in a drug store, of which the present appointee, Mr. Abey, is the proprietor, and has no reason to believe that the postmaster has not kept good faith with the department, and that the office is now situated in a drug store according to agreement. If the hon. member for Kootenay will assert that the post office is now being kept in a hotel, the department will have immediate inquiry made and take such action as will protect the public.

EXPORTS OF FARM AND DAIRY PRODUCE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many bushels of wheat, oats, barley and pease were exported from Canada in the year ending 31st March, 1909, and the total amount received in each case?

2. How many dollars worth of butter and cheese, respectively, were exported from Canada in the year ending March 31, 1909?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. The exports of the produce of Canada and imports for consumption, respectively, of wheat, oats, barley and pease during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, were as follows:

	Exports. (produce of Canada.) Bushels.	Imports. (for consumption.) Bushels.
Wheat..	49,137,449	46,366
Oats..	5,255,610	454,693
Barley..	2,959,335	97,730
Pease..	801,309	30,210

2. The value of butter and cheese the produce of Canada exported from Canada during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, was as follows:

Butter	$ 1,521,436
Cheese..	20,384,666

TITLE OF LOT 73, BAIE ST. PAUL, MANITOBA.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Is the title of lot 73, Baie St. Paul, province of Manitoba, vested in the Crown? If so, is it for sale? If not, why not?

2. Are there any unsettled claims against said lot?

3. If so, how many, who makes the claims, and what is the nature of the respective claims?

4. Has there been any applications made to purchase said lot? If so, who are the applicants and when did they make application?

5. Is it the intention of the government to offer said lot for sale? If so, when and on what terms and conditions?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes; not for sale, pending settlement of claims thereto.

2. Yes.

3. Two, Louis St. Denis and Susé Gladu, respectively, on the ground of ownership before the transfer of the territories, July 15, 1870.

4. Yes, John Merigold on the 14th September, 1876; Peter Kirton, 7th October, 1890; J. Lenfestey, 6th September, 1902; Alfred Hogue, 19th June, 1908, and John Cameron, 30th October, 1909.

5. No; pending settlement of claims referred to in answer to question No. 3.

ESQUIMALT ARMAMENT.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. What was the cost of transporting the six twelve-pounders, B.L. 6 cwt. guns with lumber, wagons, stores and ammunition, &c., to Esquimalt, British Columbia?

2. Where did these guns come from, what regiment had last been using them, and what guns have been supplied in place of them to such last mentioned regiment?

3. For what purpose were these guns sent to Esquimalt, British Columbia, and what unit is to train on these guns?

4. Has this type of gun been discarded by the imperial authorities as useless for modern warfare?

5. Has the department withdrawn these guns from eastern Canadian regiments and armed them with more modern weapons?

6. It it the intention of the department to send any more of these guns to the Pacific coast?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. $957.27.

2. (a) Montreal and Granby, P.Q. (b) 6th and 7th brigades, Canadian Field Artillery. (c) Q.F. 18-prs.

3. (a) To replace 13-pr. muzzle loading guns. (b) No. 1 company, 5th 'British Columbia' regiment, Canadian Garrison Artillery.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 2.

6. This will depend upon circumstances.

MILITIA CLOTHING.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Have articles of clothing issued to the active militia a fixed life, at the expiration of which the militia corps become entitled to a new issue, or is a new issue held back until the previous issue is produced, examined, and condemned as unfit for further service?

2. Have articles of clothing issued to the permanent corps a fixed life at the expiration of which they are replaced by a new issue, without reference to their fitness, or otherwise, for further use?

3. If, at the expiration of a fixed life for clothing issued to the permanent force, such articles are found to be still fit for further use, are men permitted to continue to use the same, and in lieu of a new issue, draw a cash allowance for their personal benefit?

4. Is the government aware that under existing regulations as to the issue of clothing to the active militia, purchases from the department have frequently to be made by militia officers, from private funds, in order to provide uniforms for their men?

5. If so, does the government consider it proper to exercise such discrimination in establishing regulations to govern administration principles, as operates to the financial gain of the permanent soldier and the financial loss of the active militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. A minimum period of duration of wear is fixed for all articles of clothing issued to non-permanent units. If, after this period has expired, an article is considered by the inspecting officer fit for further service, such article must be continued in use until worn out.

2 and 3. Clothing issued to permanent units is divided into two classes, 'public property' and 'personal property.' All articles of public clothing have a fixed period of duration of wear, during which

time the militiaman is financially responsible for the same. They are continued in use beyond this period until condemned as unfit by a board of officers. Articles of personal clothing are issued at stated intervals as part of the original contract with the militiaman. If an article of personal clothing is in sufficiently good condition to last another period, compensation in lieu of issue is authorized.

4 and 5. No. This should not be the case, as articles of clothing with a fixed period of duration of say three years, are, generally speaking, only used for three annual camps, that is for thirty-six days. The only charges made against officers commanding non-permanent units are for deficiencies or damages due to carelessness or neglect.

PROVISIONAL SCHOOL ALLOWANCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

Is the government aware that the allowance made to the officers of the active militia to cover lodging and subsistence while attending provisional schools of instruction is fixed at one dollar per diem, while that for officers of the permenent force detailed for duty at the same schools, is fixed at two dollars and fifty cents per diem? If so, what is the basis for the discrimination in favour of the permanent force and against the active militia for the same service?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

The permanent force officer makes soldiering his profession; is ordered to the provisional school, and has to be allowed a suitable rate of subsistence while away from his station.

As regards the active militia officer, the provisional school is opened in his neighbourhood at his request and to suit his convenience. Usually no allowance is paid, but, where such is granted, the same rate is paid as at the royal schools, viz., $1 per diem.

PROTECTION OF ARCHIVES.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Are the archives of the various federal departments secured against fire?

2. Are these archives now, or will they be, transferred to our Archives Building?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. The departmental buildings, at the time of erection, were of fireproof construction so far as then practised. When the west block was rebuilt after the fire, it was made entirely fireproof. The records, plans, &c., of the departments are nearly all kept in steel files, which system has been generally adopted.

2. About 350 old plans belonging to the Department of Public Works have so far been transferred to the Archives building and others will be transferred as may be advisable.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

CANADIAN YEAR-BOOK.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What amount has been expended during the last fiscal year for the book containing the annual statistics of Canada, called the Year-book?

2. What was the number of French copies distributed?

3. To whom is this book generally sent?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. $6,951.21.

2. $1,465.

3. Members of the House of Commons and Senate, provincial ministers, managers of banks, consular and diplomatic representatives, libraries of public institutions, universities, classical colleges, superior schools, school inspectors, boards of trade and newspapers as per file in the reading room of the House of Commons. The mailing list is revised each year.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY IN ALGOMA.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Has the Post Office Department had any application or applications for the organization of any system of rural mail delivery in any portion of the ridings of East and West Algoma? If so, when and by whom were such applications made, in respect of what territory or districts, and what decision was arrived at with respect to them?

2. Has the department under consideration any plans or scheme for rural mail delivery in portions of any or either of the above ridings? If so, in what portions, and what would be the nature of the service to be given to the public?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The only application for rural delivery in East and West Algoma was for the mail route between Goulais Bay and Sault Ste. Marie. Dr. R. J. Gibson, of Sault Ste. Marie submitted a petition on the 15th December, 1908. After inquiry and report by the chief post office superintendent, the delivery was authorized on the 29th March, 1909, but the inspector has since reported that only two of the seventeen petitioners have agreed to purchase boxes and the service has not yet been established.

2. The department is prepared to consider the establishment of rural delivery on any existing mail route on receipt of a petition from the residents on or contiguous thereto.

TARIFF COMMISSION AT MIDDLETON, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What members of the government composed the Tariff Commission of 1906?

2. Did the commission sit at Middleton, Nova Scotia? If so, upon what date or dates?

3. What subjects were then presented to the commission for consideration, and by whom, respectively?

4. Was the evidence taken by the commission printed and distributed? If not, why not?

5. Did the commission make a report? If so, was same printed and distributed? If not, why not?

6. What recommendations, if any, did the Tariff Commission make respecting the subjects brought before it at Middleton?

7. What action did the government subsequently take in regard to said matters?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. A committee of ministers of the Crown, commonly spoken of as the Tariff Commission, conducted inquiries into the operation of the tariff at many places throughout the Dominion in the autumn of 1905 and the beginning of 1906. The committee sat at Middleton, Nova Scotia, on January 16, 1906, and the ministers present were the Ministers of Finance, Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur).

All the proceedings of the committee at every point were open to the public and were widely reported in the newspapers of the day. The names of all witnesses and the full report of their evidence were submitted to this House in the session of 1906 and are on file for the information of any member who may wish to consult the reports. The House of Commons ordered that these reports be not printed. The ministers made no formal report, but the information received by them, during the inquiry, was used in the revision of the tariff at the session of 1907.

FISHERY REVENUES IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE:

What revenue has the government derived from licenses, fees, sales, &c., in connection with the fisheries of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, from 31st August, 1905, to date?

Mr. BRODEUR:

Saskatchewan—	
Leases and licenses	$3,693 00
Sales	13 00
Fines	155 10
Alberta—	
Leases and licenses	$1,170 90
Fines	67 50

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

1. For a return of such information as has not already been brought down, showing the purpose for which, and the persons to whom, the $18,118,133.58 mentioned in the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals of the 17th November, 1909, was paid, the information in the foregoing to be classified under the various heads.

2. The names of the 1,434 employees referred to in the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals of same date; the position occupied by each; the salary each received; the place to which each belongs; the place where each is engaged; the dates of their respective appointments, and upon whose recommendation such appointments were respectively made, and the several employees classified under the heads of the various positions they occupy.—Mr. Jameson.

For a copy of all papers, reports, correspondence, &c., between the Department of the Interior and its officers and agencies and any other persons, relative to the s.w. ¼ section 24-38-10 w. 3rd M., and the respective claims thereto of Allen R. Mudie and Thos. G. Warwick.—Mr. Lake.

For a copy of all letters, communications, petitions and correspondence with and by the government, or any minister, with regard to the acquiring or building by the government of terminal elevators at any point or points in Canada.—Mr. Campbell.

For a return showing in detail all the sums of money expended by the government of Canada in connection with the imperial defence conference held at London, England, during the present year, with the names of all persons to whom payments were made in connection with said conference, the date and reasons of payment and the department interested.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, and other papers between any person or persons and the governement or any member thereof, or any official thereof, with reference to the dredging of the Napanee river.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, documents and correspondence with reference to or in any way concerning the installation of free mail delivery in the city of Sydney, N.S.—Mr. Maddin.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and reports since the 1st January, 1908, between our immigration agents in Belgium and the Minister of the Interior.—Mr. Paquet.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, documents and papers touching the matter of the salmon fishery of Salmon river, Digby County, N.S., and the fishways or passes in said river.—Mr. Jameson.

For a return showing all moneys paid by the government in connection with the surrender of St. Peter's reserve, to whom paid, and for what; also, all moneys paid in connection with the moving of Indians to the new reserve on Lake Winnipeg, to whom paid, and for what.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the amount received by the Minister of Finance under Land Titles Act, section 159, chapter 110, R.S.C., 57 and 58 Victoria, chapter 28, section 116; how such fund is invested under section 160 of the same Act; the amount of interest which has accrued from said fund; and the amount paid for losses arising from bad titles guaranteed by said fund.—Mr. Macdonell.

For a copy of all letters, communications, petitions and correspondence with and by the

government, or any minister, with regard to the appointment of some one to fill the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners, caused by the demise of the late Hon. Thos. Greenway.—Mr. Campbell.

For a return showing how many officials of the government, or of the Senate or House of Commons, have residences or living rooms in Ottawa supplied by the Crown, with the estimated yearly value and the rent charged in each case.—Mr. Blain.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved:

That in the opinion of this House it is advisable that a commission of inquiry be forthwith appointed to investigate the needs of Canada in respect to technical education, and to report on ways and means by which these needs may be best met.

He said: During the session of this House in 1907, I had the honour to move a motion framed in terms very similar to those of the motion which I have now the honour of bringing to the attention of the House. But on that occasion the motion came up for discussion at a very late hour of the evening, and before a very thin attendance of members; the discussion was exceedingly limited, and the subject did not, I think, receive the attention which its importance deserved. I do not think that upon that occasion I was able to impress either the House or the government with the soundness of my argument, or with the propriety or necessity for the motion, strongly as I was able to impress myself. I may say that the views which I then expressed I still hold; and in presenting my case on this occasion, I shall discuss it from the same point of view as I did on the former occasion.

I hope that on the present occasion the discussion may become more general, as I am fully aware that there are many hon. members in this House far better able to discuss it than I am, men who have greater experience, more information, fuller knowledge in regard to the subject of technical education than I have. I bring it forward on this occasion, as I did on the former occasion, at the request of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, two very prominent and important bodies in this community. Both those bodies have passed very strong resolutions upon the subject, and have honoured me with the request that I bring the matter once more to the attention of this House.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association has not only taken action in concrete form upon the subject itself, but has gone to the trouble of consulting many of the men who are at the head of the leading educational institutions in this country, for the purpose of obtaining their views upon the proposal contained in this motion. I think almost without exception the association has received replies from those men who are leaders of education in this country, commending the course proposed in this motion. The association has also sought to find the opinion of the leading Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce in Canada on this question, and has consulted probably all the Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce from east to west, in all towns and cities of any consequence. Out of fifty or sixty communications received from these bodies, I think, without exception, they have passed resolutions in favour of the proposal contained in the resolution. Furthermore, the Manufacturers' Association, realizing perhaps what was the most serious objection to the proposal, have taken the trouble of consulting the premiers of the various provinces of Canada as to the necessity and propriety of the motion and as to the question of its being brought up in this parliament, and I believe that without a single exception the premiers throughout the various self-governing provinces in Canada have replied consenting to the proposal, or, at all events, offering no objection to the appointment of a commission by this government for the purpose of making an inquiry such as is asked for in this motion. I would like, for the sake of placing them upon the record, to read some of the resolutions which have been passed by the various bodies which I have mentioned. They are particularly pointed, and, to begin with, I would like to place before the House the resolution of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, which is in the following words:

Resolved, that inasmuch as the natural resources of Canada in its rivers, in its forests and in its farm lands—are of immeasurable extent and commercial value, and are urgently calling for the best and most approved means of development and utilization; and whereas the present methods of production require further scientific stimulus—more especially in the mechanical branches—of a broadly national character, through a proper and special educational system; be it resolved, that this Trades and Labour Congress of Canada place itself on record as in favour of the establishment of industrial technical schools throughout the Dominion, and it is hereby an imperative instruction to the executive of this body to use its best efforts, at an early date, in urging the importance of the subject upon the serious attention of the Dominion government with a view to the establishment of such a system of special education throughout Canada.

Then, the Trades and Labour Congress, in addition to the resolution which I have just read, have presented memorials to the government on more than one occasion in the same direction, and I quote from one

of the memorials which have been presented the following language:

The workmen of Canada are strongly of opinion that the welfare and development of Canada demand some large scheme of technical education. It is not a matter alone for the welfare of the workmen or of the employer, but of the whole Canadian people. We want Canada to be foremost in the arts and manufactures, and we are just at that stage of industrial development when the institution of technical schools would be of most value.

The Manufacturers' Association of Canada has passed a resolution very similar in terms to the resolution which I have just read, but I do not find that I have before me a copy of it, although it was quoted by me in the remarks which I made to the House in the session of 1907 and is upon 'Hansard.' The various boards of trade and chambers of commerce from the Atlantic to the Pacific have passed upon this question, but, without reading all the resolutions, I take that passed by the Halifax Board of Trade as a fair sample of the resolutions which have been passed by the other boards and chambers. It is in the following language:

Be it resolved, that in view of the facts that the foremost nations of the world have definitely proven that the technical education is the greatest weapon of modern industrial warfare, and that Canada's immense natural resources should be intelligently and efficiently developed by the most modern methods, and whereas, Canada owes it to Canadians to furnish them the technical training adequate to carry on such development, that the Dominion government be requested to appoint an able commission of investigation to ascertain the best measures for establishing technical education in this Dominion of Canada.

I quote these various resolutions for the purpose of showing that the demand for technical education is by no means local or sectional, but is entirely national in its character.

During the last thirty or forty years great changes have taken place in the educational methods of many of the older countries of the world. Notably is this the fact in the case of Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, Great Britain and the United States. Each of these countries has calmly sat down to consider its educational system, and each will be found to-day expending very large sums of money, not upon the old scholastic routine, but more particularly in looking after the actual needs of its great industrial classes for the purpose, in the first instance, of enabling the individual citizen the better to gain a livelihood, and, in the second place, for the purpose of enabling the nation itself to maintain its proper place in the markets of the world. The demand for technical education on the part of the craftsman, the artisan and the workman of this country arises, no doubt, from the laudable desire of the mechanic to better himself in his own art or his own trade, in the hope thereby that he might increase his remuneration, and in the hope thereby that he might perform his work under less laborious conditions than hitherto. The demand for a system of technical education on the part of the employer or the manufacturer arises from the fact that in recent years the manufacturers of this country have from experience found that it is a difficult matter for them, either in the home market or in foreign markets, to compete against manufacturers of countries where there is a large staff of technically instructed artisans at their disposal.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the most formidable objection which can be made to the proposal which I have the honour to lay before the House, will be the constitutional objection. The objection will be that under the constitution under which we in Canada are governed the whole question of education, by section 93 of the British North America Act, is a matter for the exclusive jurisdiction of the various provinces, and at first blush, upon a superficial examination of the question, that objection might be most formidable, indeed, might prove an absolute barrier to any action upon this subject by this House. However, I think that upon an examination of the Act and proper appreciation of what is meant by technical education the House will agree with me that there are many things that this parliament might do in regard to technical education which will in no way infringe upon the rights or the exclusive jurisdiction of the various provinces under section 93 of the British North America Act. Unfortunately, the term used, I think universally, in the English speaking world, to describe this particular kind of training, is technical education. A more correct phrase, to my mind, would be industrial training and probably, if the phrase were industrial training and not technical education, there would be less objection from the point of view of those who maintain that this is a matter now which infringes upon the right of the provinces in the matter of education. I am not positive that I can quote the exact language of section 93 of the British North America Act, but its provision generally is that, in regard to education the provinces shall have exclusive jurisdiction.

In answer to the objection upon the constitutional ground, I would state, in the first place, that one must consider the exact or precise meaning of the word 'education' as used in the 93rd section of the British North America Act. That Act was passed as far back as 1867. At that

time there was no such thing as technical education known within the confines of British America, and so technical education or industrial training did not enter into the contemplation of the men who framed that section. I submit that the word education as expressed in that section must receive its plain ordinary meaning, which is that course of instruction which we give to the youth of this country in the public schools, the high schools, the collegiate institutes and the universities; a training in languages, classics and moderns, in mathematics, in arts, in science and kindred subjects. It is entirely a scholastic training, one destined to turn out cultured and refined scholars in the Dominion, and that I submit is the meaning of the word education as used in the 93rd section. But technical education is an entirely different thing. It is a matter of economics rather than of culture; it is a matter of dollars and cents rather than of scholarship or refinement. That is the distinction I draw between the two, and in order to bring that distinction more plainly to the attention of the hon. members who hitherto have probably treated the subject with more or less indifference, let me place before the House the ordinary curriculum which is prescribed in the average institute of technology, whether it be in Europe, in Britain or in the United States. We all know the ordinary curricula of the colleges and universities of the country, but the curriculum of an institute of technology is an entirely different matter. In the average curriculum of a technical institute there will be a department of physics, including such subjects as light, heat, sound, electricity and magnetism; a department of hydrostatics treating of such things as liquids, gases, hydraulic engineering and machinery; a department of mechanics, treating of force, motion, gravitation and kindred subjects; a department of chemistry, where chemistry will be taught in all its branches, embracing theory and practical research; a department of mathematics, where mathematics will be taught so far as is required for practical application to scientific work; a department of free hand and industrial drawing and design; a department of machine construction and pattern making; a department of architectural design and decoration, clay modelling and leather cutting, and a complete course in mineralogy, metallurgy, geology, and engineering in all its branches.

Mr. SPROULE. Are not all these subjects now taught in the higher branches of education?

Mr. GUTHRIE. In a few institutions, yes. It may be argued that all the subjects I have enumerated are at the present day taught in some way or other in the schools of the country. We know that the University of Toronto has its faculty of applied science, that McGill University has a very elaborate faculty of applied science, that Queens University has its department of mines, and that other universities are similarly equipped, so that it is possible for one to obtain instruction in almost any of the subjects I have enumerated at one or other of the great Canadian universities. But, Sir, that is accounted for by the fact that these universities have gone beyond what was the original intention of their founders; they have deemed it necessary in order to meet the needs of the people to go beyond the scholastic or academic training which in former years was considered sufficient. But, Sir, these institutions are only for the favoured few, and it is for that reason that I urge the view upon the House which I now do. The demand for technical education in Canada does not come from the children of parents who can give them a university education; it does not come from the rich, it comes from the moulder and the machinist, the metal worker and the wood worker, the weaver and the spinner, the shipwright and the millwright, the stonemason and the bricklayer. These are the men who are today making demands, not only upon this government but upon the provincial legislatures, for a more advanced system of industrial training.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to argue that when the British North America Act was enacted these subjects were not included in the higher branches of education then?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that every subject I have read to the House as part of the curriculum of an institute of technology, with the single exception of chemistry, would not be found in the ordinary curriculum of any Canadian university in 1867. These subjects have only been taught in the university course within 15 or 20 years at the most indeed it is only within the last ten years that faculties of applied science in our universities have become of any very great importance. But, my argument simply is that when the word education was placed in the British North America Act it meant the scholastic training to which I have referred and it did not mean industrial training at all. But, another answer to any objections which may be taken upon constitutional grounds as against the federal government carrying into effect such a motion as I present, may fairly be found in the language of section 91 of the British North America Act. Section 91 prescribes among other things that in

matters concerning trade and commerce this parliament shall have jurisdiction, and I submit that the question of industrial training is really a matter pertaining to the trade and commerce of the Dominion. It vitally affects the trade and commerce of Canada, it vitally affects our manufactured product as to its quality, its quantity and its means of transportation. It also affects the question of obtaining foreign markets for our products and the prices to be obtained. Indeed the Department of Trade and Commerce is to-day carrying on what in the German empire is a distinct branch of their technical training, because our department is sending out trade agents to various parts of the world to secure trade and to make reports on trade conditions. I submit then that the training meant by the term technical education is a matter which closely affects the commercial standing of the country, that it is a matter which this parliament might well deal with, and that it cannot be open to the objection that it comes within the term 'education' in section 93 and so belongs to the provinces. Let me submit a parallel case. At the city of Kingston we have the Royal Military College, where this government is actually engaged in the work of tuition. A general education is afforded in that institution. They teach mathematics, languages, English literature, general subjects. They give a man a good all-round education apart entirely from military requirements. It may be asked, why does the government do that in the face of section 93 of the British North America Act? It is immediately answered that this is a matter of militia and defence, over which this government has exclusive jurisdiction. Might we not say the same of industrial training as related to the trade and commerce of the country? We engage in the work of tuition at Kingston simply as a sort of adjunct to militia and defence; why not engage in industrial training as an adjunct to our trade and commerce?

I think I may fairly ask the House to consider another answer to the argument that the adoption of this motion would be an encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the provinces of this Dominion, that is, that the question is of national concern, and not a local or sectional matter. Let us see how other countries have dealt with this question, and what they include under the term technical education. No other country so far as I know has a constitutional Act precisely similar to the British North America Act; but there are other countries in which are applied general principles very similar to those under which we live in Canada. Notably is this the case in Switzerland, where there is a federal authority with a number of autonomous cantonal governments. Notably also is this the case in the United States, under their federal system, with their state governments. I might also point to the great empire of Germany, which is made up of a great number of states or principalities, with a federal authority presiding over all. In each of these countries industrial training is looked on entirely as a national matter, not as a state or municipal matter, and not as a matter of education in the sense of scholarship.

Germany has been the great pioneer, the great progenitor, in this work. The first technical institute in Germany was established at Carlsruhe in 1825, another at Munich in 1827, another at Dresden in 1828, and another at Stuttgart in 1832. These were the pioneer schools of industrial training, no other country in the world having adopted the system up to that time. But the work that Germany started 85 years ago has spread enormously until to-dav it has the most complex system of industrial training known to the civilized world. That system is briefly as follows. They have their public schools very similar to those in this and other countries, and in connection with the public schools they have a system of manual training very similar to what we have in the public schools of Ontario and probably in those of other provinces. It is not with the manual training part of the work that my resolution deals. That may be looked on more as a matter of education in the strict sense of the word. Indeed, I do not think the Trades and Labour Congress is in favour of manual training, because it has a tendency to turn out on the country a great many unfinished mechanics. After the public school course has been taken by the German youth, he selects his trade or occupation, and, as an apprentice, is eligible for entrance into one of the technical continuation schools. This is really the first step in his industrial training. There are something like 2,200 of these schools in Germany to-day, attended by over 325,000 pupils. After having taken a course in a continuation school, the pupil is eligible for entrance to a higher grade technical institute, or specialized trade school.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of that course?

Mr. GUTHRIE. It varies from two to three years consecutively, a great deal of the instruction being given at night. Some of the schools are free, and in some a small fee is charged. At the conclusion of that course, on which the German youth enters as an apprentice, he comes out as a more or less finished mechanic. But there is a much higher grade in the specialized trade schools, to which he then becomes eligible. In Germany there are 524 of these, subdivided as follows: Schools of mechanics, 25; schools of mining, 58; schools of architecture and construction, 53; schools of

metallurgy, 10; schools of textiles, 117; schools of wood-carving, 24; schools of industrial art and design, 27; schools of ocean navigation, 41; schools of fresh water navigation, 52; schools of shipbuilding, 5. According to the curriculum of an ordinary building trade school, we find that a man who is otherwise looked on as a very good mechanic is taught there, stone-cutting and laying, brick making, plastering, carpentry, scientific construction, uses, strength and value of materials, designing, modelling and ornamentation, heating and ventilation, road and bridge building, drainage and irrigation. In that whole curiculum there is not a single subject that one would say came within the definition of the word education as used in the 93rd section of the British North America Act. The course of instruction in a textile school covers the whole process from the lowest grade of primary weaving to textile and mechanical engineering. This is taught not only in the 117 textile schools, but also in 8 universities. The course including weaving, spinning, bleaching, dyeing, machinery, properties of raw materials, manufacturing of all woven and all spun materials. In the curriculum of one of these textile schools there is no subject taught that one could argue came within the meaning of the word education as used in the 93rd section of our Constitutional Act. Take the curriculum of the art trade school and these schools are schools of the highest consequence. They are not schools in the strict sense of the word, but deal more with commercial art, more with ornamentation and design. The courses there consist of drawing, modelling, ornamentation, painting, furniture designing, wood carving, pottery and leather cutting. These are the highest classes of trade schools, but in addition they have in Germany nine technical universities and three technical mining universities.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there stated courses in these schools?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know the length of time. I have not come across that in my researches, but I fancy there must be some stated time and system of examination. To show the length to which the system has been carried in Germany, take the Principality of Wurtemburg, with a less population than Ontario, and you will find that in Wurtemburg there is one state university, one technical school, one textile school, one mechanical school, one building trades school, three weaving schools, two hundred and thirty-one industrial improvement schools, eighteen domestic schools for women, a commercial college and an agricultural high school. And all these are in but one state or province of the German empire, with a population less than that of Ontario. That great institute of technology instituted at Berlin and maintained entirely by the empire itself—the Berlin Royal Technical College—has 140 professors, 260 assistants, 3,500 students, and gives courses in engineering, chemistry, metallurgy, and there are besides free museums, free art galleries and free laboratories. The expenditure on technical education and industrial training in Germany amounts to a tremendous sum annually.

One question for us to consider is how is the cost of all these met? These are maintained according to the following contributions: Tuition fees constitute 23 per cent of the cost, municipal grants for school funds and other donations 49 per cent, and the German empire itself contributes 28 per cent. I mention this to show that in the empire of Germany, the question of industrial training is looked at as a great national undertaking and not as a local matter at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these schools all under the control of the empire or of the individual states?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I cannot inform my hon. friend on that point, but from such facts as have been brought before me, I think the control rests with the municipalities, though with regard to some universities, not only are they controlled but they are maintained to the extent of 28 per cent by the empire.

It may be asked what has that system resulted in? In the first place it has resulted in furnishing a population with a larger percentage of highly skilled artisans than can be found in any other country. It has resulted in transferring some of the trade heretofore enjoyed by other countries to the German empire. Its results can be found in the records of the manufacture of aniline dyes. Twenty-five years ago the dye stuffs of the whole world were manufactured in Great Britain. To-day the dye stuffs of the whole world are manufactured in Germany. This is one of the direct results of the work of the German students in the technical laboratories of the German empire. So with the coal tar products. To-day Germany controls the whole trade in these products, and the reason is that she has discovered improved processes through the researches in her laboratories. In textiles, the German trade became so enormous about 1890 that the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain, at their own expense, appointed a commission to inquire into the conditions and discover the reason for the increase in German trade and the diminution in their own. That commission reported that the reason was to be found in the improved machinery, methods and higher standing of the German mechanical workman. And that report being submitted to the trade at Manchester,

steps were at once taken to institute technical education, and a scheme has gradually been developed, not only in Manchester, but in other parts of Great Britain.

So in the iron and steel trade. Twenty-five years ago the British exports of manufactured iron and steel were five and six times as great as those of Germany. To-day, according to a recent article in the London 'Financial News,' German exports are almost on a par with those of England, and it is pointed out that raw material is more expensive in Germany than in England. According to this article, wages are higher perhaps in Germany than in England, and yet the German trade in iron and steel is rapidly equalling that of Great Britain. What is the reason? It is not to be found in the tariff legislation of either country but in the greater skill and improved methods of Germany arising from the development of her system of industrial training.

Turn for a moment to Switzerland as a fair example. It is made up of a number of cantons, with a federal government and constitution somewhat similar to our own In 1901 Switzerland spent, in round numbers, a million francs on technical education; 75 per cent was contributed by the various cantons and 25 per cent by the federal government.

Let us take a glance at the United States. Up to 1862 they did little or nothing with regard to technical education. During that year Congress passed an Act which provided that a substantial land grant should be given each state which would establish colleges with special courses in agriculture and mechanical arts. This offer was taken advantage of by many of the states. The State of New York received a land grant of some 800,000 acres, Pennsylvania 700,000 acres, Ohio 400,000, and other states lesser quantities. The Act was supplemented in 1890 by an Act which provided that each of the states which had established colleges, with these particular courses in agriculture and the mechanical arts, should receive a cash grant of $15,000 for the year 1890, and an additional grant of $1,000 for each succeeding year until the grant for each particular college should reach the sum of $25,000. That system of land grant and money grant has been in operation since that day, with the result that the federal government of the United States has paid in cash to such colleges the sum of $15,000,000 in round numbers and has given land grants aggregating about $16,000,000. The cash grant paid last year by the federal government of the United States to such colleges was about $2,500,000. What has that resulted in? It has resulted in the establishment of about sixty technical schools or colleges. In 44 of these colleges, courses are provided in mechanical engineering; in 38, in electrical engineering; in 37, in civil engineering; in 21, in mining engineering; in 6, in architecture; in 4, in metallurgical, technical and railway engineering. It is true that in all these cases where money has been granted by the federal authority in the United States, it has been to some college or state university where these courses were added to the ordinary courses of the university for the purpose, no doubt, of obtaining the land or money grant; but that does not affect the question and viewed from a constitutional point, it is of no importance whether the institute of technology be by itself or be an adjunct of a college or a university. If we undertook to establish it in Canada purely and simply as a matter of industrial training, it would not be necessary in any sense of the word—

Mr. BRODEUR. Are you aware that in the Act making these appropriations the federal government say:

> Nothing in this Act shall interfere with the right of the state to deal with this particular matter.

—acknowledging in full the state's right of control.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I was not aware of that, but I think it would be a very reasonable provision, and I am sure that no state or province would object to such federal grant.

Mr. BRODEUR. The federal grant does not interfere with the autonomy of the state.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think we might adopt some safeguard of that kind in this country. We find to-day that industrial training has been inaugurated practically all over the eastern and middle states of America. The New England states are full of technical institutes, and they have been of great benefit to American industry. One recent achievement in the schools of Massachusetts has been in regard to Canadian wool, which had for many years been regarded as a coarse wool fit only for the manufacture of blankets and carpets. Not long ago I had occasion to discuss this question and the question of leather goods with a man from Massachusetts who told me that, through the work carried on in one of the technical institutes in Massachusetts, it was found that the coarse wool of Canada could be used to a very large extent in the manufacture of the best quality of tweed and worsted they are producing in the United States, and Canadian wool is now being used in the proportion of about 70 per cent to 30 per cent of other wools and other materials in the manufacture of these high class cloths. That is one result, perhaps a minor one, of a system of industrial training and industrial investigation.

In Great Britain practically nothing was done in reference to industrial training until the Manchester manufacturers and merchants took the matter up in 1891 in the manner I have outlined. In the next year the British goverment appointed a commission to visit Germany and the United States, and I think France and Belgium, for the purpose of acquiring the fullest possible information in regard to industrial training. The result of these inquiries was that the question of industrial training attracted the attention of the great manufacturers of Great Britain and a large number of very successful technical institutes have been established there and are attended by a large number of workmen. Indeed, some British manufacturers have gone the length of offering bonuses to their workmen to take a course in some one or other of these technical institutes. One result of this movement on the part of Great Britain came to my attention recently in discussing this question with the same man who gave me the information on the question of wool. He said that until recently the United States was certainly supreme in regard to the manufacture of boots and shoes. They not only supplied their own market, but largely the Canadian market and very largely the British market. He said that recently British manufacturers of boots and shoes have been making articles of a quality that will sell in the United States and certain consignments have come in and have been sold in the United States. How was that done? That was done by the British manufacturer bringing from the United States certain American machinery, American processes of manufacture and American lasts, placing them in Great Britain, teaching the work in some one or other of the technical institutes of Great Britain and producing an article which resembles in appearance to all intents and purposes, the American shoe, but is of a superior quality. My information on that subject came about a year ago from a man from Massachusetts and I notice in this morning's newspaper that the editor of the Toronto 'Globe', speaking before the Canadian Club at Ottawa on Saturday, referred to this same question of the manufacture of leather goods from Great Britain being sold in the United States, this information having been gained last summer in Great Britain, mine having come from a man residing in Massachusetts. Information coming from two points so diverse is, I think, probably reliable. The change that has taken place in the shoe trade is certainly to be attributed to the courses of technical training which the British workman has undergone in one or other of the technical institutes of Great Britain.

May I point to one other answer which I think is a complete reply to any objection that might be raised on constitutional grounds, and that is that the Dominion government has already to a considerable extent entered upon the field of industrial training and that so far no objection has been raised. In regard to agriculture, we have established a system of technical education under this government in the experimental farm that is conducted here in Ottawa. Many of the institutes of Germany and some of the United States which are purely and simply technical institutes, do nothing more than what is done at the experimental farm here. They carry on experiments as to new and improved machinery and as to new processes, they issue bulletins and in that way inform the public upon these various matters—just the work that is being carried on at the experimental farm. That is certainly a work of instruction, and if you like, a work of education. It is educating Canadian farmers, it is done for that purpose and has had the effect of raising the standard of farming very greatly throughout the Dominion of Canada. What this motion asks is that this government will do in regard to manufacturers, or with regard to our natural resources, just what it has been and is doing with regard to agriculture. It is carrying on technical work, it is engaged in technical education in regard to agriculture, and we ask that the same principles precisely be applied to other natural resources of Canada, and also to the manufactured products of Canada. I mention also the work of education which we are carrying on at the Royal Military College at Kingston to-day. We are carrying on also work at the School of Navigation at Kingston, teaching the science of navigation. That is a technical work, and in the German empire they have a large number of schools specially appointed for the work of teaching navigation pure and simple which this government has engaged in. Then we have two marine biological research stations carrying on work at Gaspé and on the Georgian Bay. This government, through the Intercolonial railroad, is indirectly providing for educational work at the University of McGill; the Intercolonial railway makes an annual grant to the Faculty of Applied Science of McGill University for carrying on experiments and work in testing different materials. That is an indirect contribution of this parliament to the University of McGill College. Then we are carrying on extensive experiments and a good deal of research work under Prof. Haanel. He has been investigating various ways of smelting Canadian ores. That is the very work which is taught at all the greater technical institutes in Germany and the United States. He has been engaged recently in carrying on experiments with a view of rendering the large and valuable peat lands of Ontario of some value. That

is a work of technical education and technical investigation, which we ask should be continued. Those are works which the Dominion government is carrying on to-day, and carrying on successfully for the good of the people. We ask that the work be continued.

In what way would you suggest? I have not at my disposal or within my knowledge all the avenues in which the government might put forth some effort, but I think it certainly could make money grants to institutions that are carrying on this work. I think they could, as the German empire has done, establish experimental stations and museums throughout Canada, where the work might be carried on with new and improved machinery, in new and improved processes of manufacture. They might carry their investigations further in regard to electrical smelting, and the treatment of all native Canadian ores. They might carry on successfully serious experiments in regard to the great pulpwood growth of this country, in the way of seeing how this could be rendered a greater national asset than it is now, how that could be best manufactured and best transported. They could carry further their investigation, particularly in regard to naval construction and architecture. This is a mater which has been taken up very largely by Germany. Germany has five ship-building schools and about 100 navigation schools; whereas twenty-five years ago it had none. It is now building a number of its own craft, twenty-five years ago it did not build any. That is an achievement in Germany also due most directly to the result of technical education and training.

I know it is sometimes said that this is a matter which only pertains to a few of the larger cities, perhaps, and to bodies of workmen in those various cities. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in the villages and towns of this country there is a tremendous demand for opportunity on the part of our workingmen to improve themselves in the various trades and crafts. Time was not so many years ago when a certain institution in the United States, called the Scranton Correspondence School, was looked upon as more or less of a joke, as one of those sharp Yankee money making concerns which, by expensive advertising, would be able to gull the public and rake in the people's money. However, from what I know of that institution in Scranton, it is by no means a joke, and while it is a very successful commercial undertaking, and pays most handsome dividends, it has disseminated a tremendous amount of valuable information, not only in the United States, but in Canada. I was surprised to hear from a man interested in that school, that last year it drew from Canadian workingmen and artisans nearly $800,000 in fees for tuition, and from the city of Montreal alone last year over $100,000. That money was drawn directly from the pockets of mechanics and artisans in this country, from men who were endeavouring by all means in their power to secure what is necessary to give them perfect knowledge of their craft, and who have no opportunity either to go to McGill, or the University of Toronto, where schools in science are certainly afforded to the children of the rich. I am glad to say that in Montreal an institution of technology has been founded. I believe that when it is at work it will have the effect immediately of keeping that $100,000 of the workmen and mechanics of Montreal within the city of Montreal instead of sending it over to the Scranton School of Correspondence and others. The Scranton school is only one of many schools; but it is the most prominent of those in the United States, and has been the subject of a special report by the British commission who went thoroughly into the institutions in the United States. I am glad also that in Nova Scotia a very large institution has been opened, and work is to be carried on there, I trust, on a very large scale. In Ontario, too, something has been done. But if we compare what has been done by any of the provinces of Canada with what has been accomplished in the little principality of Wurtemburg, we can see in a moment what is yet to be done in Canada in regard to this great question.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of a motion like this cannot in any way prejudice the right or interest of any provincial authority. If such a commission were appointed, a small commission of five or six capable men, to visit Great Britain, and several European countries, and the United States, the expense involved would not be considerable. If it should turn out as a result of their investigation that there is nothing which this parliament could do in the way of furthering the great cause of industrial training, we will know it; that is one thing. But if the information will be of value to the various provinces of Canada, the money will not be lost, and I am personally satisfied that there are a great many things this government can do. I have not sufficient time to enumerate them, but I simply place before the House such facts as I have been able to gain from conversation, from the ordinary means of research. I know that I am but poorly equipped to discuss the question intelligently as it should be discussed. I sincerely hope that some other hon. members will continue the debate, as I know that there are those in this House who are well aware of all the facts and all the circumstances, and far better able to discuss the subject than I am.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART (Winnipeg). I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this House is under a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) for the able address he has just delivered. It is rich with information and replete with reasonings, conclusive reasonings, it seems to me, in affirmation of the proposition laid down in this resolution. I think this is one of the best things that have emanated from the other side of the House this session, perhaps because it was not inspired by a Liberal caucus or by a Liberal government. I have great pleasure in paying a personal compliment to the hon. gentleman who has brought this matter before the House. If this resolution were amended as suggested and instead of the word 'technical education' the words 'industrial training' were inserted I think it would better meet the occasion. As to the jurisdiction of this House, it has been said, and truly, that this parliament is doing to-day for the farmers what we are asking it to do for the industrial population. We are, by our experimental farms and by the machinery and efforts of the Department of Agriculture, acquiring information which is being used by the different agricultural colleges and other institutions. Even the public schools which are under the control of the provinces are availing themselves of this knowledge. In Belgium, Switzerland, Germany and all the older countries, they are doing this work of sheer necessity. For centuries their natural resources have been developed and their increase of wealth and importance come from the work of the hand and the brain. In our country it is perhaps different at the present time. The farmer, the merchant, the holder of bonds, the possessor of property finds, without any individual effort on his own part, that, by reason of the development going on around him, his possessions in four or five years have doubled in value. We may expect greater results if this question is taken up at the present time. If we can make one acre of the farmer's land produce what an acre and a half formerly yielded, if we can make two pairs of hands do the work formerly done by three pairs, that adds so much to the general wealth of the country. A trained industrial people is one of the best assets that any country can have, and if I were to look for some phrase to illumine or brighten this thought I would take the words of Whittier who, when paying a tribute to his own state, does not refer to the visible or latent wealth of the forest, the field or the mine, to the accumulation of capital or to the vast volume of commerce, but he says that:

The riches of the commonwealth
Are clear, strong minds and hearts of health:
And more to her than gold or gain,
The cunning hand and cultured brain.

I do not think there will be any objection from the different provinces on the score that this parliament is exceeding its jurisdiction. If the parliament is animated by the spirit of the people of Winnipeg, the city which I have the honour to represent, I am sure that its action will meet with the approval of the people generally. The city of Winnipeg has dumped down upon it a large foreign population. There are something like fifty or sixty languages spoken there, and the people of Winnipeg have established night schools during the winter season at a cost of thousands of dollars to themselves. There was nothing to compel them to do that, but they are satisfied to do it and there is no objection to it on the part of the citizens although it considerably increases the taxes. This motion does not commit the House to the principle of technical education or to any other principle. All it asks for is a commission of inquiry, a commission composed of the most competent men entirely clear of politics to get all the information available upon the subject and if they gain that information, whether in Europe, or Massachusetts, or in any other place, it will be available for the benefit of all the province and every educational institution in the different provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) that my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has made one of the most important contributions to the discussions of this House that has ever been made in my experience as a member and that he has dealt with a subject second to none in relation to the industrial and commercial development of this country. He has given us a very exhaustive explanation of technical education and of its application in the older European countries. He has given us some very exhaustive and lengthy reasons and arguments why technical education, so-called, should not be read into the conditions of the constitution which provides that authority with respect to education shall remain in the hands of the provinces. I want to emphasize those reasons and perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to add a few more practical reasons why this government should be prepared to take up this question as set forth in this resolution, appoint this commission, provide an appropriation and control the technical education of this country. I can quite understand how the government will be naturally cautious before taking upon itself financial responsibility which constitutional authority may declare legitimately was intended to belong to the provinces. When we consider the extent of this country, the enormous cost of its development in matters

appertaining exclusively to the authority of the Dominion parliament that the provinces cannot manage for Canada, I do not blame the Dominion authority for exercising some little care before it takes increased responsibility in reference to expenditures upon questions of education. But, I agree entirely with my hon. friend from South Wellington that the question of technical education is not associated or related to the question of general education, which, in my opinion, was placed by the constitution under the exclusive control of the provinces. My hon. friend made reference to two or three kinds of industrial training. He referred to the manual training schools and to the system of technical education. Considerable confusion has existed in the minds of some people as to the difference between these classes of education. I only know them as they exist in England and I noticed, as my hon. friend pointed out, that the labour organizations of this country had declared by resolution that they were opposed to any system of manual training, because a system of manual training turned out mechanics who were brought into competition with the ordinary artisans of the country. My hon. friend presented a resolution from an important body of men. Trade schools, as they exist in England, are schools that take the place of the old system of apprenticeship. The system of apprenticeship in England was based upon a contract between the man who owned a business and the son of some other man to the effect that the apprentice would confine himself to this man's business for a given number of years. The system of trade schools was inaugurated in England as a substitute for the apprenticeship system and in these schools young men are taught the specialties of a particular trade. If a man wants to be a carpenter he is instructed in these trade schools in everything that appertains to that calling and so it is with respect to all other trades. I want to put myself on record as being entirely opposed to the conclusion of anybody or organization of labourmen who would object to a system of manual training.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I go further and I say that I am astonished that any organization of labour men should oppose any system of education. In doing so they evince the very spirit that prompted certain classes of wealthy Englishmen, sixty or seventy years ago, to oppose in the British parliament appropriations of money for the advancement of education. These wealthy Englishmen proclaimed that it would be a serious disadvantage if the rural communities were educated, and there are yet men living in England who made the statement on the floor of the House of Commons that if the artisans of England had a knowledge of history and science then representative government would be in danger. I say, Sir, that the spirit which actuated these men of the classes in England to restrict the intelligence of the masses is the self same spirit which prompts a labour organization to seek to restrict manual training in this country. Why ! above all others, labour men ought to stand for everything which conduces to developing the intelligence of the great masses of the community. A few years ago Andrew Carnegie gave a contribution of $50,000 to the city of Ottawa for a library, and the labour associations of this city passed resolutions against accepting that contribution for the reason that they declared the money was gained from the blood and sweat of the men whom Carnegie employed in his mills. At that time I wrote a letter to the Citizen over my own signature repudiating that contention and I held that if the tyrannies which makes it possible for capitalisits to secure unreasonable divisions of the profits of a business is ever to be subdued it can only be subdued by increasing the intelligence and knowledge of the workingmen and using such donations as that given by Carnegie towards that end. I am opposed to all kinds of restrictions, and when it comes to restricting the intelligence of my fellow men I am its avowed and open enemy.

Now, I want to give the government two or three practical reasons why they should support this resolution and appoint the commission which it asks for. My first reason has been expressed by my hon. friend from Winnipeg, and it is because technical training contributes to the development of the country, to its increased wealth, and to the protection of its citizens. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) said that technically trained artisans were the greatest asset of any country, and let me add that no country in the world to-day is suffering a greater disadvantage in the development of its resources than is Canada because of this. She has to come into competition in the open markets of the world with the older nations who have workingmen trained under high class systems of technical education, and Canada has to draw her supplies not from the men who are the most technical in the old countries, but generally speaking from the men who are denied the same high educational advantages in this country. When I think of the rapid development of our country and when I see the few facilities for industrial training that we have, it has been a great surprise to me how our large industrial concerns and especially the railways, have ever managed to equip themselves with the number of trained men

required to carry on their enterprise. On the railways of Canada you have as highly trained men as are to be found in any craft, and considering the numbers necessary to cope with the extensive development of our railway system it has always been a surprise to me how the railways managed to procure the trained labour required. Now, it is a well established fact that the value of a product increases with the increased intelligence of the workman, and perhaps the noblest and certainly the most profitable contribution we could make to the welfare of our people would be the expenditure of public money for the purpose of increasing the intelligence of our craftsmen. That is the purpose of this resolution. Another thing which concerns us very intimately is the providing of increased safety for our industrial classes, and this can most effectually be done by affording them technical education in their particular calling. In this connection I shall make special reference to the coal mining industry on the Pacific coast. It is deplorable to think that the highest percentage of mine accidents in any country is to be found in Canada, and the province of British Columbia, I regret to say, is lamentably pre-eminent in that respect. I should say in justice to my friends from Nova Scotia who are largely interested in coal mining that the accidents in their mines are relatively fewer than in the mines of British Columbia. Now, the explanation for that condition of things in Canada is that a large number of men without training are employed in working the mines. We have been startled in the last few months by accounts of explosions in coal mines; sometime ago there was one near Nanaimo, and just a few days ago 300 men were buried in an Illinois mine. Now, the royalties from the mines go to the provincial revenue and the supervision of mines lies with the province; but in the United States the geological department has extended its authority over the operation of coal mines and whenever serious accidents occur there the federal government sends their technical officers to make investigation and to find the cause. The history of mining and mining accidents in England shows that it is the scientific men who discover the causes of these accidents. The Dominion government has a Mining Department with its technical officers, and I want to suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Mines that whenever a mining accident occurs in any part of this country one of those technical officers be sent to investigate the cause of the accident. Let me mention one or two mining accidents that occurred in British Columbia, the causes of which are not likely to be discovered by the ordinary practising engineer. The accident at the Fernie coal mine was due to a freak in the geological formation, which could only be discovered and remedied by scientific technical men who understand the business of mining. In England they have had very many explosions in mines, just as we have in British Columbia, and they have never been certain that they have found the real causes of these explosions.

Let me bring to the attention of the House another matter which has a very practical bearing on this question. Some months ago we were startled by the great number of accidents that occurred in the handling of dynamite in the construction of the Grand Trunk railway. Have we ever endeavoured to discover the cause of these accidents? In my opinion there is just one answer. In the first place, we have not the technically trained men who understand how to handle high explosives, and in the next place, we have no testing plant in Canada to enable even intelligent workmen to learn the properties of these high explosives. This is a matter that should be taken up by the Mining Department of the government. If we consider the practical importance of that department, it seems to me impossible for the government to avoid the responsibility of providing for technical education along these lines. Let us consider what the government has been doing. It has discovered from experience that it is impossible to avoid technical education in connection with the operations of certain departments. My hon. friend mentioned the Marine Department with its schools of navigation. The scope of these schools must constantly expand with the growth of the Dominion. My hon. friend also referred to the educational work of the Department of Agriculture. The lands in the settled parts of this country are owned by the provinces, and the revenues derived from them go to the provinces; and yet this government, on its own initiative, has established a very important system of agricultural education in the form of experimental farms, farming and dairy schools, and especially in the circulation of lectures that have been given by scientific men connected with the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I venture to say from my experience that there is nothing more appreciated to-day by the people of the west than the scientific agricultural literature distributed by the Dominion government. I do not believe it is possible to have the results of the technical education provided by the several provinces of this Dominion distributed throughout this large country unless it is done by the Dominion authorities. For instance, Nova Scotia has a technical school of mining at Halifax. It is to the credit of Nova Scotia that it has done so much along this line. As a matter of fact, Nova Scotia has practically supplied the mining engineers

for the Dominion. My hon. friend referred to the correspondence schools. Although British Columbia is a mining province, it has no institution for technical training in mining, and but for the correspondence schools of the United States, we could not have had a sufficient number of mining engineers for the mining operations of the province. The mining engineer who wants to advance in his profession, must of necessity increase his knowledge by means of these schools. Let me say also that this system of education is not central, it is one which has to be distributed. It has to be taken to the door of the men who labour. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that they only began this system of technical education in England in 1892. Let me say this, that 30 or 35 years ago the British government had a science and art department and spent thousands of pounds sending scientific lecturers all over the country, and let me add that the mining engineers of that country to-day are men who took advantage of these lectures. Further, 30 years ago there was a thorough system of technical education in the way of university lecture courses in the old country. The head men in the universities were distributed all over England to give lecture courses in technical matters and their expenses were to a large extent met by voluntary subscription.

My hon. friend has said a great deal about Germany, and no one will be disposed to undervalue the technical educational system of that country. But we know that the whole system of education there is part of their colossal militarism. Personally I prefer the free English system to the German. In Germany every man is compelled by the state to take advantage of the education provided, but I doubt very much that the German system has raised the mechanic and artisan of that country above the capacity of the British artisan. I have not yet been convinced that the system of educational training in Germany has done more for the workman than the British system has done for the British workman. But whatever system we adopt, it must be brought to the door of the ordinary workingman. You cannot expect a working man to leave his work at Vancouver in order to take up a university course elsewhere. Any system of education, to be useful to the industrial classes, must be distributed, so that the people can avail themselves of it without detriment to their daily work. Any system of education should provide for the sending out of lecturers all over the country. That could be done now by the Department of Mining. Scientific trained men could be sent out to the mining centres all over Canada to give lectures in the different mining schools.

I think sufficient has been said to induce the government to take advantage of this resolution and provide a good appropriation by means of which important evidence may be collected on this subject, and the Dominion authority is the only one which can make the information thus collected profitable to every part of this Dominion.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). The House is, I am sure, very much indebted to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) for the very able speech he has made on this important question. I was very much interested also in the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) and those of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Smith). I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the question of technical education itself. I assume that every hon. gentleman here is convinced that the question is one of the greatest importance to the Dominion, and it ought not to be necessary to say anything in favour of technical education at this stage in our history. My object in rising is to point out, in a few words, that the desire to have something done in this line by the federal authorities is not a local one, that it is not confined to the province of Ontario or British Columbia, or Manitoba, but that it exists in eastern Canada as well as the west. It is certainly not a new question in the province from which I have the honour to come. Some years ago I had the privilege of acting as chairman of a committee of the local legislature in that province appointed to investigate and report to the local government on this question, which has been a live one in Nova Scotia for a good many years. Some 15 or 20 years ago, when our present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was premier of that province, the demand arose that something should be done in the way of training the miners who were operating the coal mines. In answer to that demand, the local government established mining schools in the various industrial mining centres. These schools have been in operation ever since and have done very good work. Some 300 men have graduated from them and now occupy important positions of trust in the mines, not only of our own province, but of other provinces as well, and the United States.

Later on the fruit growers thought that something should be done for them, and an agricultural school was established in the Annapolis valley. That was carried on some years and then merged into the provincial agricultural college at Truro. That college has done splendid work. Some three or four hundred men trained there, go but that it exists in eastern Canada as and spread the knowledge gained in that

college among the farmers of the maritime provinces. There is no expense by the local government which has given better results than the money spent on the agricultural college at Truro.

But after the industrial expansion at Sydney, Amherst, New Glasgow and other places, it was felt something further should be done and two years ago, the Nova Scotia legislature devoted the large sum of $100,000 for the establishment of a technical school. The building has been erected and the college has been opened, and I trust it is doing good work.

I mention these facts to show that the subject of technical education is one which has taken deep root in the eastern as well as in the central provinces and the west. The technical school established at Halifax has formed branches throughout all the industrial centres of the province, and they are working together and no doubt will show very beneficial results. I might add that the progress which has been made is not confined to Nova Scotia. Similar good work is being done in Ontario. We all know that the agricultural college of Guelph has turned out men who have been of great benefit, not only to Ontario, but to every other province. We have some of those men in Nova Scotia. One of them is the principal of our agricultural college there and he is one of whom neither the college nor his province need in any way be ashamed. The Royal Military College at Kingston is also doing technical work and the McGill university students are known the world over. McGill university has earned a great reputation as a school of technical education. But, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from South Wellington, these larger universities, such as Toronto and McGill, are only for the sons of rich men who can afford to send them to the city to attend the regular courses and spend two or three years in training, but are not open to the general run of people, and the want is keenly felt for something to be done in a general way.

The mover of the motion has pointed out what has been done in Germany. Something also has been done in France, Austria, Sweden and even in Russia and also in Great Britain. The people of Great Britain were a little slow to take up the idea. It was not until the prestige of their industrial establishments was threatened to some extent by Germany and others that they did adopt it. But good work is now being done in Great Britain in this line. There is no country in the world to-day which needs technical education so much as Canada. It is not money we require for the development of our country so much as men. We want in every department captains of industry who can take hold of our undeveloped resources and turn them into wealth. We are about to embark on the construction of a Canadian navy and I will venture to say that the great difficulty the government will meet will not be the question of money, although money is always a serious question as the Finance Minister will tell you, but the question of men, of trained men to build these ships, to lay down plans, to make the models and turn them out as they ought to be turned out. This will be the most difficult question the government will have to meet. A few years ago we were all humiliated at the inception of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to find that the skilled men were imported from the United States. It may not have been absolutely necessary to do this but it was done to a very large extent in order to inaugurate that great enterprise. It will not again be found necessary to do this because we have now a considerable number of trained men among ourselves. The same thing happened at Sydney when the industrial expansion took place there. We had not a sufficient number of trained men and had to import them from a foreign country in order to start the steel works. I would suggest that something in the nature of the Morel Act be adopted in Canada, some scheme by which the local and municipal governments would contribute perhaps the largest share to this kind of education, the central government contributing a stated amount in cases where the local governments came up to a certain standard. I see no reason, under the circumstances, why that should not be done. I hope the government will take it into their serious consideration and that some forward movement will take place in regard to this very important matter.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I would like to say a word or two in support of this resolution before it is finally dealt with. I desire to preface my remarks by congratulating the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) who moved this resolution, both upon the resolution itself and upon the able manner in which he supported it. I am quite aware that the matter is not without difficulties if it is to be dealt with by the government, because it is a matter that calls for the expenditure of money, not a large sum, but still an expenditure of money along the lines of what is in a sense, at least, education. Now the fact that this question is of an educational nature has been mentioned as presenting a difficulty in the way of the federal government dealing with it. But I think that difficulty has been largely met by the hon. member who moved this resolution, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) and

others who have spoken. In a sense it is not a matter of education, using the word in a narrow sense, but it is a matter of practical training, of industrial training, in technical knowledge. There is no occasion to use the word 'education' in this resolution at all. It seems to me something apart altogether from education as the word is ordinarily used, even if it were necessary to differentiate the matter in that way.

As has been pointed out to-day, the government in years gone by has undertaken to deal with matters that are no less matters of education than this. For instance, the attention which the government devotes to agriculture has been referred to, and the sums spent on agriculture have been mentioned as a precedent for government action in relation to this case. Certainly the government has spent large sums of money in what is practically the education of the farming class all over Canada, a work which is carried on by the Department of Agriculture. Now I have no complaint to make with the government on that score. But this matter of technical training is to the mechanic and the artisan what agricultural training and the agricultural college are to the student of agriculture and to farmers' sons. I believe the government has undertaken the work of education in several other branches of public affairs in this country. For instance, the military college at Kingston has been referred to, and the instruction given by the government in marine navigation and the examination of candidates for various departments in navigation. So there are to-day abundant precedents for legislation along the lines of what we are now discussing.

But that is not the only instance relevant to the question of whether it is one within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces; because, as has been pointed out by the mover of the resolution, the object sought to be attained is primarily the appointment of a commission to take evidence. Even if the government acted upon that suggestion and issued a commission, and then chose afterwards, in accordance with the recommendations of that commission, to go further and embark on an expenditure of money for the purpose, it could still be done in conjunction and in connection with the various provinces or municipalities in different parts of Canada, whose moneys or other assets could be joined with federal assistance. So that, even if it were a matter of education, it need not be taken out of the domain of provincial control, because it could be dealt with primarily as a matter of education by the provinces, assisted by some substantial contribution on the part of the Dominion government. So that difficulty, if it be one, could be got over.

But what this resolution asks for is simply that a commission be appointed. Now if the government did no more than appoint that commission to take evidence, the commission would probably report its evidence and findings, it would bring down to this House its recommendations, and even if the government went no further, they would be doing a large measure of substantial justice in this matter. We know that in various provinces action is being taken along the lines of this resolution, and if every province were to act in turn and issue just as many commissions as we have provinces, it would mean looking at the subject from so many different points of view, and if followed by legislation it would mean probably legislation of various kinds, showing a want of harmony and of breadth of view in dealing with a matter which requires some broad and comprehensive scheme. Now this is not education in a primary sense, because, as we all know, the provinces have undertaken that work. Time was when the state did not consider it a duty to educate the youth of a country; that period has happily long since passed, and no sane man would to-day for a moment suggest that it was not a proper and essential thing for the state to educate the youth. But there has arisen a need of what may be called secondary education, an education that has already been undertaken by many modern civilized countries, and that is the kind of education we are now considering. It is an education that is needed to fit the youth for the business of life, and this secondary education at the present time is given freely and unstintedly by every important country of Europe, and very largely by Great Britain. One would think that the time had come in this country when we could not afford to lag behind Europe. We are accustomed to refer to certain parts of southern Europe as being backward and unprogressive, but those countries are far ahead of us in this matter, they have solved the problems of technical education in a way that those countries find highly satisfactory. As has been pointed out this afternoon, some of the European countries have undertaken specially to deal with particular trades or callings, and in that way such trade or calling is dealt with in the most efficient manner possible. The days of apprenticeship are past, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Nanaimo, and an age has succeeded by which the state has intervened and assumed the burden of what was formerly performed by the master to the employee. Technical education is engaging the attention of every large city in Canada. These communities naturally look to the government for something to guide them in putting into actual practice this method of education. They naturally look to the government to provide them with the very latest knowledge available on this very important

question. It is too much to expect that municipalities, even if they be large cities like Toronto and Montreal, will go on a meandering trip around the world to find the latest system of technical education, and they are looking to this central government to take the first steps along the line of at least supplying them with all available information on this question. We have some technical education in Toronto, but it is of the higher order, being in connection with the University of Toronto. But, the board of education in Toronto is dealing with this matter. It is considering a question of the establishment of technical schools as an adjunct to the common school education in that city, so that that vast body of people, the sons of the labouring classes and the toilers, can get some kind of a reasonable education in the various trades and crafts. Everything has been said, I think, that can be said upon this matter.

I would like to refer simply to this fact that we all know that unemployment is one of the pressing and most distressing matters that the governments, not only of this country, but of European countries, have to deal with. Happily the unemployment question is not a very prominent one in Canada at the present time, but the time has been when the question of unemployment was a serious matter and that time may come again. In the city of Berlin they have a clearing house for labour, known as the Berlin Labour Exchange, to which go those who are out of employment on the one hand and employers who want men on the other. It is an immense place where thousands of men assemble every day and where hundreds are placed in employment. At this clearing house it has been ascertained that very much the largest number of people who are seeking employment are unskilled labourers, that there is more unskilled labour seeking employment every day than there is labour in all the other trades combined. What does this prove? It proves that if men can get an education in some trade, business, or calling, they are not apt to be out of employment. The man who cannot get employment is the unskilled mechanic, while, if a man skilled in any line of business or in any trade does get out of employment, it is only as a rule temporary. The great body of men who are, practically, permanently out of employment are those belonging to the unskilled labour class. Surely that is a sufficient argument to prove to any government that it is the duty of the government to, as far as possible, educate the labouring classes in some trade or calling so that they may at all times have a trade upon which to rely and to fall back upon. If this commission were to issue I have no doubt whatever but that almost immediately upon its being returned to this House and the report distributed throughout the country it would be made use of and be available in all parts of Canada. It would have a double use. It could be used for the purpose of giving information to the trades in different communities and provinces and it could be made the basis of further action by this government if the government sees fit to take this up, as it has taken up other matters of a kindred nature. As to the provincial aspect of this case, kindred subjects have already been dealt with by the government and therefore I do not anticipate any difficulty in dealing with it in such a way as not to violate the principle of provincial autonomy in regard to matters of education. It would not form a precedent for interference at any future time by this government with the matter of education. I think the resolution has been ably presented to this House. The difficulty of dealing with a question of education, which is entirely of provincial character, has been fully met by the arguments which have been presented and a few of which I have endeavoured to elucidate in the remarks which I have addressed to the House.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Mr. Speaker, the question which is now before the House interests me to a large degree, and it is especially interesting to those whom I represent. I strongly favour the resolution that has been presented by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). As has been truly said a change has taken place in the apprenticeship system. Now, it appears that they are anxious to produce a mechanic in three, four or five months instead of making him serve three or four years as they did in the past. I am not at this moment disposed to discuss the reasons which have brought about this change of affairs in the apprenticeship system, but I may state that this is one question and probably the only one in regard to which organized labour and the Manufacturers' Association agree. It is a very important question. My hon. friend who presented this resolution, as well as my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), spoke about manual training. It was stated that organized labour is against manual training. In the real sense of the word organized labour is not against manual training, but it is against the taking of a clerk in a store, for instance, or anybody else, putting him into a training school for three months and trying to make a mechanic out of him. We claim, and I think justly, that it is impossible to teach a man how to do the work of a mechanic in three months. That has been the case in many trades. In the United States there are schools which advertise that if an employer wants a man of a certain trade they will produce him in three or four months. I might mention the Coyne

school in the plumbing trade which is carried on in New York and which follows this practice to a large extent. I am not disposed to say in the House why this is done. The labour people are not against manual training. We have that ourselves in the city of Montreal. In my own trade, for instance, regular training is provided. We have two nights every week when young men can come and receive instruction in addition to the practical training which they get while working during the day. We want men in the trade, but we do not want to spoil our trade any more than a lawyer wants to spoil his profession. A trade is a profession after all. As far as I am concerned I see very little difference between a trade and a profession. Just as long as we have no law to protect ourselves, as long as we cannot come before this House or the provincial legislature and have our rules and regulations sanctioned, we have, to a large extent, to protect our profession. I want to go on record as saying right here, that labour is not against manual training provided it is done in the proper way. I am strongly in favour of and I hope the government will see its way clear to furnish sufficient money to train the labouring classes of this country in the higher walks of artisanship. It is a great pity that to-day Canada has to send to different countries in the world for men to occupy the highest positions, and that Canadians should have to be satisfied to work under them. We Canadians have as much intelligence and as much energy as the people of any country in the world, and if facilities were afforded to the labouring classes to develop their natural ability I have not the slightest doubt that you would see the very best men springing from the ranks of the people who labour.

Mr. F. L. FOWKE (South Ontario). Mr. Speaker; it is refreshing to know that occasionally a question may be brought before this House which can be considered from the national standpoint of what is best for Canada, and regardless altogether of party bias. I am glad that such a one is the question we have for consideration this evening. Any question that deals with the education of the masses of the people is important, and that the question now before us is important we are all agreed, as we also agree that it has been presented in a most able manner by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who moved the resolution. That hon. gentleman has submitted to us a very practical question and he has asked that it be dealt with in a particular way. I venture to express the hope that the government may be willing to accede to the proposition set forth in the resolution, since, under the British North America Act, the provinces have had relegated to them the work of providing systems of education. I am glad that learned gentlemen of the legal profession in this House are able to assure us that no strain will be placed upon the constitution should the resolution before us be adopted. For my own part I have always felt, and as the years go by I feel it more and more, that we have not in the truest sense of the term a national system of education in Canada. Since we cannot have that I am rejoiced to know that we will not be held to be trenching on the prerogative of the provinces should we adopt the scheme outlined in the resolution of my hon. friend. I trust, Sir, that the day may yet come when we will have a technical or trade school in every town of the land, and that the system will reach its apex in a national university established in the capital city of the Dominion. The resolution before us simply asks that an inquiry be instituted as to the merits of the proposition therein set forth. We ought not be unwilling to investigate; we ought not be unwilling to obtain from any and every quarter information which may tend towards the advancement of our people. I have no doubt that the commission which under this resolution would be appointed will view the question from a Canadian point of view, that they will see with Canadian eyes, hear with Canadian ears, and report back to us what is best in the older countries to suit our conditions and environment. It is something to have it recognized that there is such a thing as a Canadian point of view. To-day, I see that idea very fittingly given effect to by the Toronto 'Globe which is sending one of the best known newspaper men of Canada, Mr. Stewart Lyon, to report back to the Canadian people the conditions under which the political battle is being waged in England so that Canadians will not have the news filtered through American or even British sources, but through a Canadian channel and from the viewpoint of the Canadian people. Now, these centres of the old world. Germany, England, Belgium, and other continental countries in which for a long time they have had trade schools in operation will be visited by Canadian representatives and we shall have described from the Canadian point of view the adaptability of these various systems of education to the Dominion of Canada. That ought to be of considerable value to us. I was glad indeed to hear the mover of the resolution express himself as willing that the scope of this inquiry should be enlarged. The resolution speaks of an inquiry only into the matter of technical education, and my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) has stated his willingness to include an inquiry into manual training and trade schools; a fact which I hope the government will note in connection with the proposed appointment of the commission. In Blisses' encyclopedia of social reform pub-

lished in 1908 there is given a modern definition of technical education and manual training, and if you bear with me I will read that definition because it appears to me that it may be helpful to a clarifying of views held on this question outside this House even though those within its precincts may be already thoroughly informed on the subject I read:

Technical education and manual training: We include under this general heading three subjects which are distinct, although continually confounded in the public mind—trade education, technical education, and manual training. We consider them under one head, in order that, by placing the subjects side by side, the important differences between them may be clearly brought out. We commence with definitions. Trade education is the preparing of craftsmen for practical work in a particular trade. Technical education is the teaching of the sciences in their particular application to the material interests of man. A good trade-school may be a very poor technical school, while a good technical school is not of necessity a good trade-school. Manual training is different from either; it is instruction in the use of tools as a part of a complete educational discipline. Trade-schools seek to turn out craftsmen; technical schools seek to turn out scientific specialists and professional men, such as civil engineers, architects, &c.; manual training seeks to develop complete manhood and womanhood by developing dexterity of hand as well as head.

I trust that definition will be borne in mind should the government conclude to accede to the wishes of the mover of the resolution. A very charming and interesting contribution has been made to the debate by those gentlemen who may in the proper sense be held to be representatives of labour in this House. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) express their acquiescence in the suggestion that labour has no objection whatever to manual training in the proper acceptation of the term, being introduced into our schools. The knowledge that men have is of course only of value as it expresses itself in action, and the proposition is that the industrial classes of Canada may be as well equipped for their particular callings in life, for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, by reason of the schooling placed at their disposal, as are those who are able to participate in the higher branches of learning and in the higher walks of life; and surely one of the duties of a representative institution in a democratic country like this should be to provide to the utmost facilities for the advancement and betterment of all sections of society which together make up the commonwealth of this great Dominion. I am well aware that outside of this House there are those who are altogether opposed to the proposition contained in the resolution before the House. There are those who think that the educational system should continue as it is, devoting itself entirely to the classics, and that no man should be held to be educated unless he takes a classical course at one of our universities. The time was when two or three learned professions were very much looked up to and admired and were thought to be the sine qua non of everything proper in human society. I do not say that that day is past or will ever be past. I am bound to say, however, that useful as the physician may be in society, we prefer the prophylactics of common sense; we prefer to keep well rather than to apply ourselves to any system of therapeutics whose only purpose is to make us well after we become sick. With regard to the lawyer, I suppose we may be asked to acquiesce in the suggestion that without him truth would perish from off the face of the earth. I do not deny the proposition. The lawyer has his place in society, but we are glad to give him as wide a berth as possible. The clergyman, another member of the learned professions, has an important place. I see that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) is not present this evening to pay his compliments to the clergy. We are perhaps all in the frame of mind to believe that a little teaching of the doctrine of total depravity would not be amiss—like the old lady who wanted to join a certain church and was told that she would have to pass an examination by a board of elders and answer certain questions. 'What questions?' she asked. 'For instance, do you believe in total depravity?' 'That's easy,' said she; 'I not only believe in it, but hope to practise it too.' So we do not hope to get along without the learned professions. I am glad that gentlemen of the learned professions this afternoon have emphasized the fact that the classical is not the only method by which men may be educated in order that they may make the best of themselves in life, and may attain to positions of importance in the industrial life of Canada and of the world.

The fact has been adverted to that we are already doing a good deal in aid of technical education. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) a few moments ago pointed out that the great agricultural industry in Canada has been marvellously helped by what is really a course of technical education given on the experimental farms of this Dominion and in the laboratories of those farms. This is an age of the chemist in agriculture as well as in other departments of life, and I have no doubt that millions of dollars have been added to the wealth of this Dominion by reason of the technical education which the farmers have been able to avail themselves of through the reports issued by the Dominion government in relation to their par-

ticular calling, and I hope that this work will go on and increase. But I am also glad to reflect that this country long ago came to believe that it could never attain to greatness as a nation by remaining a pastoral people. So we have entered the field of industrialism, and this has grown in all the provinces of the Dominion until it is estimated that we have to-day invested in industrial pursuits $850,000,000, having an output of $750,000,000 per annum, with perhaps one fourth of our total population dependent upon those pursuits. Yet we are only in our infancy as an industrial community, and we could not do a wiser thing than avail ourselves of the knowledge, the wisdom, the experience, of the countries of the old world which have brought industrialism to a high state of perfection, and with whom we have to compete if we send our products into the marts of the world. Another reason for the appointment of a commission arises from the fact that this is a country of untold wealth in natural products. Some of these have been referred to this afternoon, and speakers have dwelt upon the importance of our training men to be experts in particular departments of industrialism, so that we may, with Canadian capital and Canadian labour, avail ourselves to the full of those natural advantages which Providence has placed at our disposal. Some natural products of great importance I could mention that have not been named this afternoon. This is a country of fur-bearing animals. Canada exports millions of dollars' worth of furs every year, and why? Simply because in the old world, by reason of technical education, men have learned to treat those furs in such a way as to make them the desire of all who may be able to purchase them. Why may we not hope to teach and train men on our own soil so that they will be able to treat those furs which are now sent to Leipsic and London to be returned here in a finished state? In the same way the long lustre wools of Canada are being sent to the United States under a tariff of ten cents a pound, netting to our farmers only about ten cents a pound, whereas if we had skill and machinery to apply to the raw product, we could have the same market and the same profits as now go to the manufacturers of the eastern states. To stop the export of these raw materials and to enable our people to work them up into finished articles by the use of Canadian capital and Canadian labour on Canadian soil is surely worthy the attention of Canadian legislators. In this new era upon which we are entering, this business era, this era of trade and commerce and manufacture, it ought to come as an inspiring thought to us that the opportunity is presented now to place ourselves on record as true to the belief within us and to take such action that the men of this generation, the youth coming on the stage of activity, the boys and girls in our schools who are destined to enter upon the industrial life, may have every opportunity and priyilege to make the best of themselves, each in his particular calling, that, any boy or girl anywhere under the sun is known to possess at this hour.

At the risk of wearying the House, I would like to tell you of some concrete instances myself, which prove the advantage of having our own experts in the manufacturing interests. I come from a town which has had a varied experience in industrial life. We have had corporations formed to carry on industries in that community, without the advantage of technical knowledge in relation to their undertaking. They had plenty of capital, the world was all before them, and yet they came to naught. To-day, however, we have a number of flourishing industries in that town—the town of Oshawa—which may be called the Manchester of Canada. One of these industries is the largest of its kind within the boundaries of the British empire; another is the largest of its kind in the Dominion. Both are what they really are to-day—one employing nearly a thousand men, and its capacity circumscribed only by its ability to get men, and it could enlarge its plant at any time if labour were at hand—both these industries owe their success, not to their abundance of capital, but to the expert knowledge and training of the men in charge. One of these establishments started as a blacksmith shop on the side of the road, but the owner was a skilled mechanic, and under his management that has grown to be the largest institution of the kind in the empire to-day Why? Simply because the man at its head has skill and knowledge and is an expert in his particular line. The other industry I refer to owes its growth to the very same reason. One of its proprietors, and one of the finest inventors in the Dominion, is the manager of that business, and the president of the company told me only a few days ago that because of the skill of that particular man, of whom he is very proud, he is able to-day to start three new industries of a kind not now being operated anywhere in Canada, and will do so as soon as the right sort of men to manage them are available. So that there is any amount of scope for an educational institution such as we have in our mind to-night.

It has been shown by the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution (Mr. Guthrie) that there is a current of public opin-

ion all over the country behind this movement. It is endorsed by the trade and labour councils and by the boards of trade and chambers of commerce, and the public sentiment in every manufacturing town and mercantile community is entirely favourable to the proposition. I therefore sincerely hope, in view of all the circumstances, that the government will not be frightened away from the adoption of the idea by any regard for the small cost which the appointment of a commission would entail, and I hope they will not be alarmed by the bogey that it would place a strain on the constitution greater than it could bear. I trust that the House and government will give their favourable consideration to this most important resolution, so ably presented by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this afternoon.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). I do not rise for the purpose of making any extensive remarks upon the resolution before the House, but for the purpose of tendering my sincere thanks to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) for having introduced this resolution. I am sure that any hon. gentleman who heard him present this matter before the House must have come to the conclusion that there is nothing to prevent the government coming to the assistance of industrial training. Coming from the province of Nova Scotia, where we have already a splendid technical school, established lately in the city of Halifax by the local government, and also a manual training school, second to none in the Dominion, of which we are very proud, I might be content with that condition and give no heed to the rest of Canada. But that is not the way we are built down there. We are always glad to help the rest of Canada, even though sometimes, when we seek a little consideration for our province, the rest of Canada looks at us with rather a forbidding eye. However, should this government come to the conclusion to assist technical education throughout Canada—while I am not in the position to speak for the government of Nova Scotia—yet I am sure I can say that the government of that province will be very glad indeed to accept any assistance for the carrying on of that school, without feeling that such a grant would interfere with their provincial rights in any way.

Ship building has been referred to by the mover of this resolution. One of the good reasons for instituting a technical school in Nova Scotia is that we expect to have a ship building plant there very shortly and we hope—because our people are very apt and quick to learn—to have men competent to take charge of the principal positions in connection with that industry. Navigation has also been referred to. I am sorry to say that in the maritime provinces we have no navigation school, and if there be any school this government should establish, it ought to be a school of navigation. Trade and navigation go hand in hand, and this government would be doing a great deal for trade and commerce and navigation by giving its assistance to the establishment of a school of navigation. It is a great disadvantage to the maritime provinces not to have a school. Several men competent to teach that branch have taken it up but could not carry it on because, although at times they had sufficient pupils, at other times they had not. Therefore it would be a good thing for this government to take that question into consideration. While I think that the government should contribute to all branches of industrial training, certainly I think it should contribute to the teaching of navigation, some contribution should be made towards the teaching of that subject in our technical school in Nova Scotia. We have been accustomed, particularly in the eastern mining sections of Canada, to go across the border for our mining engineers, but the government of Nova Scotia have now established mining schools which have done a great deal for us in providing and preparing men to act as mining engineers. Some of the industries which have been established fn Nova Scotia almost went to destruction shortly after their inception. When the sugar refinery was established in Halifax technical men were brought from the United States to conduct it. The result was that it looks suspiciously as if these men did not attempt to carry on the industry properly and in a very few years the industry had gone altogether and the capital invested in it was practically sunk. After getting a fresh start and depending more on the men who had gained a little information in regard to the manufacture of sugar in our own province, that industry has become a great success. If we had had technical education it would have been of great assistance to us in the establishment of that industry as well as in connection with our cotton factory and many other industries.

While I should be glad to see this resolution passed, I do not think that the appointment of a commission is necessary. I do not believe that a commission could obtain any more information, any better collection of facts and could place them before this House in better order than has been done by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this afternoon. The commission is not necessary. This matter should be taken up by the government at once, and they could easily see the advantage from every standpoint of taking action in this direction. As has

been well stated here, there are many industries in the Dominion of Canada that have barely been touched upon yet. Take, for instance, the pulp wood industry. Great quantities of pulp as well as many other products of Canada are shipped to the United States in the raw state. If we had technical education, if our people were prepared to take hold of the different industries, such as the pulp wood industry and in place of sending abroad partly manufactured products to be returned to us in the finished state, should send out finished products, it would be greatly to the benefit of Canadian manufactures and of Canada generally. I believe that if the government would take action on the statement of facts as presented by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the country would endorse them in providing at least 25 to 30 per cent of the cost of taking care of any technical school that may be started in any province. The hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) stated that in the German empire they pay 28 per cent, and I think that this government would be perfectly justified in arranging to contribute to the extent of 25 to 30 per cent of the cost of running any technical school in any province in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am only voicing the opinion of every member of this House when I say that our thanks are due to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) for having brought this important subject to the attention of parliament and for the exceptionally able, forceful and comprehensive manner in which he introduced his resolution. I think, too, Sir, the House is to be congratulated on the very full discussion which has taken place on this resolution, to be congratulated because the subject is one which, no matter what view we may take as to the jurisdiction of this government or a provincial government to deal with it, cannot be viewed other than as one of great national concern. I should like to add a few words to what has already been said from that point of view, but before doing so I would like to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) in reference to industrial accidents in the coal mines of Nova Scotia and the coal mines of British Columbia.

The hon. member has drawn the attention of the House to the great difference in the number of accidents which have taken place in the mines of those two provinces, and I do not know that a more fortunate example could have been brought forth to illustrate the important part which technical education may play in the industrial development of a nation than the example the hon. gentleman has cited. During recess I took advantage of the oportunity to look up a table showing the number of fatal and serious accidents in the coal mines of Nova Scotia and British Columbia, and I find that in the last ten years in Nova Scotia 264 miners have been killed outright in the course of their employment, while in the province of British Columbia, 624 miners have been killed outright in the course of their employment. Reducing the figures to averages, the difference is still more striking. Taking the rate per thousand men employed in Nova Scotia and comparing it with the ratio per thousand men employed in the mines of British Columbia, we find that the fatal accidents in Nova Scotia have been 2·64 per thousand men employed and in British Columbia, 9·21. That, Sir, is to be accounted for, it seems to me, mostly by the different advantages given to the miners of those two provinces in the way of technical education. My hon. friend knows, as every member of this House knows, that factory legislation and legislation in regard to mines is enacted by the provincial legislatures. He knows that the mining inspectors, as the factory inspectors, are appointed by the governments of the respective provinces, and I believe that from the point of view of laws and numbers of inspectors, the conditions in British Columbia will compare favourably with those in Nova Scotia. But there is this difference between the two provinces: In the province of Nova Scotia you have to-day a Department of Technical Education and since the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, you have had technical schools in connection with the mines of that province so that when the miners who are spending their day time in the mine have an evening or have leisure, they may get the advantages of a technical training which will help to acquaint them with the difficulties and the hazardous conditions of their calling, with the scientific side of the work in which they are engaged. The result of that is shown in the figures that have been placed before the House. It seems to me the hon. gentleman has rendered to this country a great service in drawing attention to the fact that technical education may be the means of saving to the nation a large part of its working population.

Let me supplement these figures in regard to mining by some figures which the Department of Labour has been gathering during the last few years in regard to the subject of industrial accidents generally. Although the figures are imperfect, although they do not begin to include the total number of accidents which have taken place, they are, I think, sufficiently large to show how important this particular phase of industrial life is. Taking the figures as reported in the annual report of the Depart-

ment of Labour, for the year ending March 31, 1909, I find that the number of persons engaged in industrial occupations who were killed outright from accidents occurring in the course of their work, was 1,271 and during the preceding year, the total number was 1,353. Take that average for a period of ten years, and what does it amount to? Between 13,000 and 14,000 of the wage earners, of the wealth producers of this country, killed outright in the course of their employment. What a tremendous national loss this is, to say nothing of the great loss to industry, to say nothing of what it means to the friends and families of those who are victims of these disasters. We see here the necessity for an extension of governmental action which may help to acquaint workingmen with the difficulties and dangers attendant on their callings, and which may tend in some way to reduce the number of fatal accidents which are likely to occur.

Now, I would like to say a word or two on another phase of the importance of technical education. And first of all, let me draw attention to the important part which technical education must necessarily play in the industrial development of this or of any other nation at the present time—must play because of the change which has taken place in the methods under which industry is carried on to-day in comparison with the methods under which it was carried on in the past. Under the old system as it prevailed before the mechanical inventions that have taken place during the last century, under the old domestic system, it was the custom of the employer to work with his men in his own home or in the shop. There were not then the large factories, there were not the large organizations of capital and of labour as we find them to-day. Under the old system of industry the training of the artisan was a comparatively simple matter, but under the system as it has developed to-day through the introduction of different powers the harnessing of the forces of nature, be they water, steam or electricity, we have entered into an entirely different industrial era, we have an industrial condition in which technical education must play a tremendous part. No man, for instance, can deal with electricity unless he is something more than an ordinary workingman, something more than an ordinary mechanic; he must have scientific training if he is to take any part in the application of electrical power to industry. Our whole industrial system being carried on to-day by factory organization and organization of capital and labour on a large scale, renders it absolutely essential that a nation which is going to progress and keep abreast of the times must equip its workers along the most modern lines, provide its workers with a practical technical training to enable them to deal with the new conditions under which they are obliged to work.

But not only has the industrial system vastly changed from what it was some years ago, the nature of the competition in industry has become vastly different from what it was not so long ago. It is no longer in any line of manufacture a question of competition as between municipality and municipality, as between province and province, but it is a world wide competition, competition between one nation and another, between different countries forming a part of the same empire, and between different empires, a struggle for industrial supremacy so vast that it is difficult for the imagination to grasp its significance. Now, in a struggle such as that carried on under our industrial system, the slightest difference in processes, in technical devices, the slightest advantage in scientific knowledge, in the adaptability of machinery for different purposes, may have a far reaching effect. It may affect the whole of one industry, or the industries of one country, as compared with those of another country, and we in Canada, who at this time are endeavouring, as we all are, to become one of the foremost peoples in the industrial struggle of our time, should be prepared to consider carefully this question of technical education, since upon technical education will largely depend the success of our manufacturers in obtaining the advantage of the latest scientific processes. Not only the men who are directing an industry, but also those who are taking part in it, must be well educated to enable our country to hold its own and make headway against all competitors.

Sir, while speaking on this question of foreign competition, I would like to touch for a moment on the question of foreign trade. No nation that is worthy the name can hope to accomplish much unless it develops a large foreign trade, and this country, while it has already made considerable strides in the direction of gaining a foothold in the markets of Europe and elsewhere, will, we hope, go much further, and not only maintain a foothold in the markets of Europe, but also gain an entrance in the markets of the Orient, for which we are so well fitted by our geographical position. Perhaps the House will pardon me if I make a reference to one or two facts which came under my observation during the time I was privileged to be in the Orient last year. What impressed me almost more than anything else was the extent to which the manufacturers of England, the manufacturers of Germany and the manufacturers of the United States were finding a sale for their goods in those distant parts. In the cities of China, in the towns and cities of Japan, one saw

everywhere articles of manufacture, products of one kind or another, coming from Great Britain, from Germany and other countries of Europe, and also from the United States; and I could not but wonder as a Canadian that we had not found our way into those distant parts, possessing, as I have mentioned, a great natural geographical advantage in the matter of trade with the far east. Going down from China to Japan, one travels through Manchuria on a road over rails that are made in Europe, and on cars that are made in the United States. The table service is made up of cutlery and china that comes from Great Britain. Much of the food has been prepared in European countries or in the United States. Surely we can hope that before long the manufacturers and producers of this country will be finding a market for their goods in those distant regions, and this market, I believe, once it is obtained, will be one of the largest and most profitable in the world. But if we are to find an entrance to that market, and if we are to hold our own when we get there, it will be only in virtue of the fact that our industries are equipped in a manner second to none as compared with those of other countries, and that we are doing a business as up-to-date as that which any other nation can do.

But, if there was one thing that impressed me more than another it was the extraordinary industrial development which has taken place in those countries themselves, and that is one of the main reasons why we should spare neither time nor money in an endeavour to equip our industrial communities in the most efficient manner if we are going, not only to obtain a foothold in those foreign countries, but if at the same time we are to retain our own markets in face of the competition which is sure to come from the far east. Let me mention only one case. I had the privilege of visiting the city of Hankow, which is three days' journey up the Yangtsze river, just opposite on the other side of the river, is located a large iron and steel industry. At the time I was there, this concern, established by Chinese capital, employed in the vicinity of 20,000 Chinese workmen, and they were shipping pig iron and steel ingots not only to other cities of China but to the United States as well, paying the duty on the steel ingots all that distance from the interior of China, across the Pacific, paying the duty and landing that steel at a profit in the very districts in which steel is being manufactured in the United States. I asked myself how it was possible that the Chinese nation that we had supposed to be asleep was carrying on so successfully such an industry in the far east, and the answer I found in connection with the very subject we are considering to-night. The men who were directing those industries were highly trained specialists, some of these young Chinese who had gone to Germany, who had gone to the United States, who had gone to Great Britain to receive a technical education in the schools and colleges there, and with that fine intellectuality characteristic of Chinamen, were able to return to their own country and to take part in an industrial development which will be second to none in the near future.

Now, if we are going to hold our own against that kind of competition it will only be by bringing our workmen up to the highest degree of efficiency, and by seeing that our industries are managed by men who are second to none in technical knowledge and training. They talk of the Yellow peril. Sir, I find no danger in the Yellow peril if you consider it under the aspect of immigration. I believe that can be dealt with by diplomacy; I believe it will be possible to keep the oriental to his own side of the Pacific, as it is in every way desirable he should be kept. The real Yellow peril, a peril that is surely coming, is that of industrial competition with the Orient, and when it does come in all its power, it will present to us the greatest problem with which this continent has yet been faced. Let me show wherein it is at our doors at this very moment. I have in my pocket a letter I received from a gentleman in San Francisco, who says that the company with which he is concerned is to-day in a position to control the imports of steel billets, from the company in China to which I have referred, and his company is arranging with that company in Hankow to secure their products, the steel billets and pig iron they are manufacturing there, and he writes to know what are the possibilities of his developing with this material a large iron and steel industry and rolling mills on our Pacific coast. His company is proposing to establish a manufacturing concern somewhere on the western slope of the United States and Canada to carry on the manufacture of steel with their products coming from this old country of China. Now what is true there is going to be true in one industry after another, and how are we to meet it? It will not be met by our shorter hours of labour. We work eight to ten hours a day in our factories, whereas the orientals are working twenty-four hours in the concern to which I have referred, they never stop even for Sundays, the Chinese New Year being the only day in which that industry closes down. Our regard for women in industry is not going to save us, our laws exempting little children from working in these industries is not going to

save us. Our higher wages will not the better enable us to meet this competition. What then is going to save us? Two things, and two things alone will enable this country to face the competition with which it is destined to be brought into conflict in the far east. One of these is the extent which the future witnesses the spreading of the light of the new world over the old, spreading of the light from the lamp of knowledge, and the still brighter radiance of Christian truth and Christian influence. Where that goes will come with it a greater regard and respect for women, a greater reverence for the little child, a greater and truer insight into the nature and dignity of manhood itself. With these things will come a shortening in the hours of labour, a lessening of the employment of women and children, and a respect for the Sunday which we observe as a day of rest, and a hundred and one other considerations which makes this our standard of living what it is among our own people. The other thing that may help us to meet this competition is the greatness of our natural resources, combined with the industrial efficiency of our own working people, and this industrial efficiency can only be brought about by the development on a general scale throughout the whole Dominion of sound technical education, carried on by the authorities whose duty it is to do it. Only by the development of this system of technical education so far as we can possibly carry it, will we be in a position to face the future with a confidence of success.

Now, Sir, perhaps I have spoken on this point at greater length than the circumstances would warrant. But I have thought that perhaps another opportunity may not occur very soon to enable me to express my views on a question which seems to me of paramount importance. It seems to me there is great need for the development of a system of technical education in Canada. This need has been demonstrated in half a dozen different ways. First of all, it has been demonstrated by comparison of conditions in this country with conditions as they are in Germany, in France, in England, in Switzerland and in the United States. It has been shown by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution and by others who have spoken on it, how much has been done by each of these countries in the matter of promoting technical education. The hon. leader of the opposition asked, I think, in speaking of Germany, whether the work that has been carried on there had been done for the most part by the states. I think the work has been carried on by the states in Germany, for the most part. The work was started in Germany, as the member for South Wellington said this afternoon, away back early in the last century, and it has been taken up by one state after another. But the federal government in Germany has also done something to further this work. They have done nothing in the way of teaching, but they have established an institute for physical and technical research, they have an industrial museum, and they are giving financial assistance to ship-building and navigation schools. In the United States while most of the work has been carried on by the individual states, the federal government contributed land away back in 1862 for the purpose of aiding in the development of the agricultural and mechanical arts. They have had one or two commissions which have made inquiries into these questions, and a department of education which conducts researches along these lines. The federal government has also granted financial aid to the several states. In Great Britain there have been a large number of polytechnic schools, continuation classes, and technical schools and commercial and technical universities. All these countries are competitors of Canada, and are doing a great deal to equip their army of workers and enable them to take their part in this world wide competition. And were there no other reason why the authorities of this country should do their part in promoting the work of technical education than that our competitors are doing so that of itself would be a strong reason why much should be done. But there is another reason that was mentioned by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) and the hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair), and that is that the employers of labour in this country are crying out for skilled workmen. We all know that this demand comes from every part of the Dominion, one industry after another complaining that they have not enough skilled workmen. They allege that they have to send to other countries to get foremen, and import men skilled in certain industries. Why is this? It is not because we have not in Canada men who are capable of becoming skilled in scientific knowledge, and of carrying on any industry after the most modern scientific methods, but it is because we have not in Canada a sufficient number of institutes to enable our artisans and workingmen to qualify for these high positions the number of which is daily increasing. Not only is there a desire on the part of the employers for a greater number of skilled workmen but there is also, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve, the mover of the resolution and the hon. member for Nanaimo have said, a desire on the part of the workingmen themselves to avail themselves of greater opportunities of education in this direction. I think it was the hon. member for South Wellington who pointed out that not less than three-quarters of a million of dollars was spent by the work-

men of this country in payments to the correspondence schools in the United States in the furthering of this work of self-education along technical lines. Where there is a desire to that extent, manifesting itself in that particular way, surely we have before us the strongest reason why the authorities, whose duty it may be to undertake this work, should undertake it to the greatest degree possible.

And, Sir, there is another reason, much akin to the one which I have already mentioned, and that is the need at this time for a better system of apprenticeship. Our industries are suffering in every direction because workingmen do not go through the form of apprenticeship now that they went through in the olden days. It is inevitable that it should be so. In the olden days the apprentice worked with his employer in his master's shop, but to-day the employer is a large corporation and this personal relationship which formerly existed is now impossible. There is the greatest diversity of industry, and the greatest division of labour, so that the work of the ordinary mechanic comes often to be that of simply performing one particular kind of action, doing that in a monotonous, routine fashion and knowing nothing of the whole process of which his labour forms a part. That being so it seems to me there is a greater need for some system of education which will make intelligible to the man who has the work to do the part which he is performing in industrial development and that service might be performed by an extension of the system of technical education throughout the country.

There is a further feature which I think should be considered in this connection and it is the obligation which society owes to workingmen to enable them to realize the best of the capacity which they have within them. This is something which we, in this day, are too apt to forget. We have all the comforts in our homes, we think of the enjoyments that we possess of one kind and another, but we fail to realize to what a considerable extent, I was going to say, the almost illimitable extent, the whole enjoyment and routine of our daily life rests upon the manner in which the great mass of men who are day labourers or ordinary mechanics discharge the duties which they are called upon to perform. Let me read an extract from the report of the Industrial Committee of the American Federation of Labour which recently held its session in the city of Toronto. It was a report brought in by a committee of the workingmen composing that body in regard to this question of industrial education and the sentence or two which I shall read is deserving of the consideration not only of this House but of every man in this country:

We must never lose sight of the fact that a large majority of the working people are poor, and because of this they are forced to begin the battle of life at an early age. The need of the day is that something be done for the children of this great wage-working class.

Formerly the apprentice system offered the boy an opportunity to learn a trade and become a thoroughly trained mechanic, but of late years the scheme of specialization has supplanted the old apprenticeship system, even to extreme specialization. It ought to be recognized as a scientific truth that the higher the skill possessed by the mechanic the more valuable his labour, both to himself, his employer and the community.

The one trouble in America to-day is that too many of our youths who have graduated from the grammar or high schools are misfits industrially. If we are to secure industrial supremacy, or even maintain our present standards in the industrial world, we must in some way in our educational system acquire an equivalent to our old apprenticeship system.

It is to the first paragraph of that extract that I would like to direct special attention.

A large majority of the working people are poor, and because of this they are forced to begin the battle of life at an early age. The need of the day is that something be done for the children of this great wage-working class.

We leave these halls of parliament, we go to our homes in the evening, we take a street car, we go to our rooms and sit down by our firesides and unless there is a strike on the street railway, or a strike of plumbers so that our houses are cold when we go into them, unless there is a strike of miners so that we cannot get coal for our fires, or unless there is some other kind of industrial disturbance to direct our attention to the fact that there is a great industrial community working ceaselessly day and night, we are all too apt to forget that this great body of workers exists at all. For that reason we cannot too often remind ourselves of the fact that society does owe something to the great body of working people who are obliged to begin life early, to begin to toil before their education is completed, that we owe something to them in the way of conferring an opportunity at least to each to realize the capacities of which his nature may be capable. Carlyle says, in one of his famous works, that for a man to die ignorant who has capacity for knowledge, is a tragedy. Well, Sir, if this be true, the crime must somewhere rest upon the heads of those who have it within their power to confer the opportunity and who yet withhold it. It seems to me therefore that if we recognize the imperative ethical obligation which is upon us we will find it our duty to do something to put in the way of the miner who daily risks his life in underground toil the opportunty for education which will better enable him to rise in the calling

which he has been forced to take up in his youth and which may enable him to move up from the position of a hewer of ore to that of overseer or manager of the mine in which he is employed, and similarly a like opportunity to all engaged in the other classes of employment.

Further, take it in our large industrial cities looked at from the point of view of national strength as this may be gauged by the efficiency and calibre of our workingmen. In our large cities what do we see at night?—groups and groups of our young men aimlessly walking in one direction along the streets meeting groups of other young men aimlessly walking in another direction. Each and every one of these young men might be educating himself in some branch of technical education if the opportunity were there for them. I was much impressed by what can be done in that direction in a talk I had, last summer, with the headmaster of the Berlin Collegiate and Technical Institute, Mr. Forsyth. He has been one of the pioneers in technical education in the province of Ontario, and he has helped to place the Collegiate Institute of my native town in the very front rank of the collegiate and technical institutes of Canada. It is Mr. Forsyth's desire that the work which is carried on there in the day time may be so arranged that in the evenings it will be open to classes of students composed of young mechanics who are pursuing their trades during the daytime and who will be given a chance of training and equipping themselves to take higher positions in the work in which they are engaged. Something might be done by the different provinces that have already commenced a system of technical education in extending the work so as to bring it more within the reach of every mechanic in the community. In this way the nation will be substituting for possible determination a guarantee of increased efficiency. If I had not already taken up the time of the House at such length I would speak a little of the work that has been done in Canada along these lines.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. KING. While I have endeavoured to lay emphasis on the need for the extension of the work I would have failed to have properly presented to the House what I had in my mind had I conveyed the impression that Canada is not at the present time doing a great deal considering the number of other things that we have been called upon to do and the comparatively early stage of our industrial development. Just running over in a very rapid way what has been accomplished, let me direct the atttention of the House to the province of Nova Scotia. They have in that province a department of technical education. In that respect the province of Nova Scotia, as in some other respects, has gone far and away ahead of any of the other provinces of the Dominion. They have recognized the great importance of this work to the extent of having a department of the government under an able and efficient officer, Dr. Sexton, devoting its time exclusively to the work of technical education.

They have, I understand, 21 technical schools established in different districts throughout the province and these schools are attended by miners, by stationary engineers, by fishermen, and by craftsmen generally. It is, I believe, the intention of the provincial government to still further extend that work which was initiated by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, when he was premier of Nova Scotia. In Prince Edward Island something is being done in the way of manual training and in New Brunswick there is a department of forestry connected with the university, but little has been undertaken in the way of technical education in either of these provinces. In the province of Quebec a good deal has already been done and more is promised. Recently, Sir Lomer Gouin, the premier, in connection with the laying of the foundation stone of a new technical institute in Montreal promised that the government recognizing the needs of the mechanics and working classes, would make for still further progress in this line. There are at present 11 schools of arts and manufactures in the province of Quebec; there have been liberal grants to existing institutions and the premier has promised to the city of Quebec a technical institute similar to that in course of construction in Montreal. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, experiencing the need for skilled mechanics, has started in connection with the Angus shops, classes for the technical education of its employees, and the classes, I am informed, are well attended. The universities of McGill and Laval have done good work in their technical branches, so that the province of Quebec has set to the other provinces of the Dominion an example which is only paralleled by Nova Scotia and Ontario. In Ontario, the development of technical education and manual training through the high schools and collegiate institutes has gone a long way, and there are also well equipped technical high schools at Hamilton and Toronto. The university has its school of Practical Science and department of forestry, there is the agricultural school at Guelph, and the department of mines at Kingston. Within the last few months the technical high schools at Toronto sent a commissioner to the United States to inquire into the conditions there, and the pro-

vincial government has sent another commissioner to Europe to inquire into technical education, so that it may be said that Ontario is doing good work in this direction. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) has spoken of what is being done in his own province and in his own city, and I would like to mention the commendable example set by the late David A. Mitchell, of Winnipeg, who, in his will, provided a large sum to be devoted to the erection of technical schools in which workingmen and artisans may receive free of charge technical training at evening classes in their particular callings. This probably sums up all that has been done throughout the Dominion in the way of technical education. It is only a few years since the start was made, but what has been done thus far gives us reason to hope that these provinces will advance in the work and that their example will be followed by the other provinces.

The resolution before the House expresses the opinion that it is advisable that a committee of inquiry should be forthwith appointed to investigate the needs of Canada in this respect to technical education and to report the ways and means by which these needs may best be met. There can be no doubt that such a commission would render great service to the Dominion, and to all the provinces of the Dominion. The reports of the British consular agents afford very interesting information as to what is being done by other countries in the way of gathering information on the subject of technical education. I have here a list of British consular reports on technical education in Germany which I find in the library of the Department of Labour, and I will read it to show what information may be acquired by gentlemen who make researches into existing conditions in other countries. There is one report of 83 pages which deals with special schools and courses for mechanical engineering in Germany. There is another report of 91 pages dealing with what Germany has done for the development of the textile interests, another report on navigation schools, another report on the special technical schools for the ceramic industry, another report on agricultural instruction in Germany, another report on engineering schools, another report on the technical schools for the branches of the metal industry, another on technical instruction in naval construction and architecture, another on special schools for ship engineers, and another on special schools for the woodworking industry.

Now, if the great nation of Britain finds it to her commercial and industrial advantage to have her consular agents prepare reports on what a rival nation is doing to develop industries along technical lines, that should be evidence enough to show wherein a similar course adopted by the governments that have charge of this particular work could be found advantageous to them, and that the work of any commission properly performed would be of great service to this country. I may say that the Department of Labour has already commenced to gather a large amount of information on this subject of technical education in other countries, and any work which a commission would undertake would be in part of that nature. So far as it has been possible to do it by means of correspondence we have endeavoured in the Department of Labour to gather in the library reports on what is being done for technical education in the different countries of the world. We shall be only too glad in the department to have any persons who are interested in this subject take advantage of the information which is gathered there. Mr. Acland, the deputy minister, who has made a very full and careful study of this whole question would be pleased, I am sure, to lend his assistance towards facilitating the work of representatives of the provincial governments or others who may desire to consult any of the documents in the department.

There does not seem to be any difference of opinion as to the desire in many quarters for a commission of this kind. That has been made plain to us by the manufacturers as well as the workingmen through their representatives in the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress and the Canadian Federation of Labour, each of which bodies have made requests that something should be done in this direction. It goes without saying that the recommendations on this subject from boards of trade, universities and other public bodies, are also entitled to the greatest respect and consideration. But that leads to a further point which has been mentioned this evening. All that I have said thus far has had relation to the importance of technical education; and I think every member of the House will agree that there is little room for difference of opinion as to the importance of this matter to Canada as a young nation seeking industrial supremacy be it ever so far removed. We cannot, I think, overestimate the importance of this work, no matter by whom it may be carried on. Much has been said of Germany. I think the commercial and industrial history of Germany is most enlightening to this country. It was after the downfall of Napoleon that Prussia saw her opportunity to become a great nation. She started in the work of nation-building by laying the foundations sure and strong, by endeavouring to establish without delay systems of technical training which would make her working-

men and artisans second to no others on earth. Then, after the Franco-German war, the large indemnity paid by France left the provinces free to expend on technical education what they would otherwise not have been able to devote to that object. From the fact that the provinces themselves made the beginning at the time they did, and from this other exceptional advantage, Germany has been able, since the time of the birth of the empire, to take the strides that have brought her to the position of industrial importance she holds in the world at the present time; and I think Canada is a young country, looking forward to the part she shall play, as the largest and most important part of the British empire, can afford to take lessons out of the books of any other nation in the world and profit by them.

But there is left the doubt on the question of jurisdiction, and that is a matter which cannot be too carefully considered. I do not believe that too much importance can be attached to the work of technical education to be done by the authorities whose duty it is to perform that work. But it is another question whether or not this parliament has the power to go into this question to the extent to which some speakers this evening have indicated they would like to see it do. The resolution asks only for a commission to inquire into the needs of this country. It suggests, however, that the commission should also report on ways and means. Other speakers have suggested that the government should do more than that—that it should assist in a financial way; and other speakers, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) in particular, went so far as to express the wish that the word 'commission' had been left out of the resolution altogether—though if it had been, I fail to see how there would have been any resolution left—and would prefer that the government should do something in a practical way, in the direction of instruction along technical lines. All of this raises a question which has been debated many times in this House, and one which we cannot consider too carefully—whether or not the good which might be done by the appointment of a body by this government to further the work of technical education might not be in part undone by the mischief which the appointment of such a body might create were the motives and purposes of this government in establishing such a commission not fully comprehended and understood. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said that communications have already been received to the effect that there would be no objection on the part of the provinces to such a course. Well, Sir, it seems to me that before the Dominion government should take the step suggested in the resolution, there should be something more than this negative attitude on the part of the provinces. It should not be a case of no objection, but a case of an earnestly expressed desire which the government should be asked to listen to. I think, the risk should not be run of raising a great constitutional question in a matter of such great national importance until at least the exact position of this government with regard to this question is fully and rightly understood by the different provinces and by the people in the country. To my mind the section of the British North America Act which says that 'the legislatures may exclusively make laws in relation to education, undoubtedly gives to the provinces the right of legislation in all matters respecting education; and if this parliament were to attempt to legislate on matters affecting education, as set forth in this section. I think this parliament would be going beyond the powers which are given to it in the British North America Act. But I am not so sure that the exclusive right to make laws with regard to education means the right to exclude the Dominion from gathering information on any subject which may be deemed a subject of national importance. However, that may be a debatable constitutional question, and in view of the importance of the subject of this discussinon, I think it would be well if the mover of this resolution would allow the government a further opportunity to consider the question from this point of view, and not press it to a division to-night. Assuming that we got over the question of jurisdiction all right, there is still the question of the advisability and the expediency of taking this step so long as there is any likelihood of that step being misunderstood; and I hope that one of the results of this debate will be that the true relationship of the provinces to the Dominion on this question of great national concern will be brought out in bolder and clearer relief than ever before, and if the subject be brought up again, as I hope it will be, there will be no doubt in the mind of any member of this House, or in any group of responsible persons outside, as to whether or not the Dominion would be trespassing in endeavouring to co-operate with the provinces—for it is co-operation alone that would be expected—to the extent the mover of this resolution would desire. I would beg to move therefore the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the debate is adjourned, I desire to congratulate the mover of this resolution, (Mr. Guthrie) and the various other gentlemen who have spoken and who have shown such a wide range of information, upon having brought this matter so forcibly and clearly to the attention of the country. In a comparatively new and almost undeveloped country such as Canada, it would be seen to be eminently

wise, in the first place, to take stock, as it were, of the resources which the country possesses, and in the next place endeavour to come to a conclusion as to the most effective way by which those resources can be developed. The industrial development of Germany has been alluded to by more than one speaker to-day. When we consider the thoroughness with which the German empire has laid the foundations of its great industrial development, and when we realize how comparatively nothing has been done in this country along the same lines, we cannot but wonder that Canada has made so great an industral advance as she has attained to. Her progress in that respect speaks volumes for the ability, energy and aptitude of our people. I do not desire to labour the question of how important it is that there should be industrial training and technical education in this country. We are all pretty much agreed with regard to that. Take the professional man, the lawyer, the clergyman, you find that each of them has the advantage of a special training after he has finished his academic course. To a certain extent a farmer also has the advantage of such a technical training or education. But, as has been well said by the mover of this resolution (Mr. Guthrie) and my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and others, when we come to look at the great majority of the labouring population, we find that they remain, in this respect, under enormous disabilities, which ought to be removed at the earliest possible moment.

My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) has made a very comprehensive speech. He has spoken very warmly on this point. He has spoken of the Yellow peril in the shape of industrial competition from the oriental countries, and this peril, he says, is not remote but it is at our door to-day. He has spoken of the disabilities of the working classes and the inability of our labouring population to utilize their time to the best advantage. He discussed many matters, and one would have thought that even so mild a resolution as that of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) would have seemed to the hon. minister but a lame and impotent conclusion. The Minister of Labour, however, is not prepared to go even that far, and he conjures up some imaginary constitutional objection. I listened to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) with a great deal of interest, and I think that as regards the constitutional question, he need not have laboured it to one-tenth the extent he did. He made an absolutely convincing case so far as that is concerned. If the position of the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) be correct, the government has been violating the constitution of Canada for 35 or 40 years in the establishment of the military school in Kingston. But I have not heard of any province raising any objection. But the hon. minister need not stop at the Kingston military school, let him look at the estimates of this year or any year, and he will find over and over again, where the government has spent money by the million on matters absolutely within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. Does not my hon. friend know that his own estimates which he has just brought down, contain dozens of items for aid to undertakings purely local and absolutely within the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. Local works and undertakings, except in so far as they connect one province with another or some province with a country outside Canada, are purely and absolutely within provincial control, yet you can take the estimates and on page after page you will find money given by the $5,000, $10,000 and $100,000 to undertakings of that kind. The parliament of Canada has the right to vote money for any purpose that it may deem proper. It has voted money for purposes absolutely outside Canada. For example to aid the sufferers at San Francisco, to industrial exhibitions within our own country, subsidies to provincial railways which are purely works of a local character and under provincial jurisdiction, aid to arts schools, special lectures upon the advantages of the metric system, a grant to McGill university in aid of work of this kind, schools for the examinations of masters and mates, to keep up the school at Kingston and for the establishment of experimental farms. When we have had illustrations of the sort every year for the last 15 or 25 years in every set of estimates brought down, is it not absolutely perfect folly to talk about there being any constitutional objection whatever to granting aid immediately to technical education in this country. We can do it and no one can say us nay. If the Minister of Labour has no better answer to his own impressive speech than the one he gave at the end of it, I venture to think, he would do better to adhere to the first part of his speech, and not the last, and that the government should act in this matter at once. I would have thought that, after the information vouchsafed this afternoon, he would have said to my hon. friend from South Wellington: Your motion is well intended, you desire that a commission shall be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the needs of Canada in respect of technical education, but we know the needs of Canada now, we know that this country is behind almost every country in the world in that respect, we have the example of Germany, we have the reports of the commissions in Germany, we have the example of the United States and the reports of the technical commissions in that country, we have the example of the British Islands and the reports of the technical commissions there, and consequently we have at least enough to know that some-

thing ought to be done and done quickly in this regard. Therefore, inasmuch as the last part of the motion simply desires a report on ways and means, and inasmuch as we know where the ways and means are to come from so far as the Dominion of Canada is to furnish them, namely out of the public treasury of this country, there seems to be no need for a resolution in this form. For this reason, I would have expected the Minister of Labour to say: I will propose to amend this motion by a more definite motion setting forth the absolute need of urgent and immediate action by the Dominion of Canada in order that Canada may no longer labour in this respect under the disadvantages from which she has suffered so long. Instead of that the Minister of Labour was constrained to suggest that the debate should be adjourned, that the motion should be, in effect, withdrawn, and that this session should pass without a single step being taken in this matter. I have thought it desirable to place this aspect of the question before the House. I say to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that I am entirely in sympathy with the object he has in view, that I trust action will be taken along the line he has suggested, if no other action can be taken, but so far as I am concerned I would greatly and infinitely prefer that a more definite and practical and speedy action should be taken than that which has been suggested in this resolution itself.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Speaker, I must say I was greatly surprised at the stand taken by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) upon this question. I would have supposed that we would have taken this matter into consideration and would have placed an amount in the estimates to at least make a commencement on the line suggested by the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Therefore, I was surprised that the minister should move to sidetrack this issue. The action of the minister shows that the government have decided to take no further interest in the subject this session, and I hope that the House will divide and let us see whether the Minister of Labour is to be supported in his effort to sidetrack this important issue.

Mr. MORLEY CURRIE (Prince Edward County). Mr. Speaker, the question raised by the resolution of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has been shown by the discussion this afternoon to be perhaps of as much importance to the industry and commerce of this country as that of the tariff. Resolutions and memorials have been mentioned which have been presented to this House to show the importance of the subject. I believe there are other indications which are perhaps of as great importance as these in showing the tendency of public opinion on this question. In the first place, I wish to refer to the schools already established in the United States. We have there many schools for special industries, and a point which I believe is of importance is that there are in all parts of this country to-day young men who have learned their trades here and who are emigrating to the United States to take these courses in technical education in these schools. We have now stopped almost every other class of emigration to the United States, but with this one class we have not interfered, and I think it is high time that we took some steps to furnish our young men with the facilities which they are at present obliged to seek for in a foreign country. In the second place, it has been well said that the correspondence schools are attempting to carry out this work of technical education. That is very true, an immense amount of money is going to these schools. I do not believe that most people are aware of the number of men taking the courses in these correspondence schools. Some years ago I looked into this subject for a short time and I was surprised to find that one of these schools had enrolled as students at least 200,000 in the United States and Canada. That this large number of young men are attempting to obtain practical education in such an imperfect way shows the great need for education of this kind to-day.

I shall not discuss the importance of technical education; I believe we are fully seized of that. What we have to discuss to-night is the question: Has the parliament of Canada a jurisdiction in this matter of technical education which it can take up and should take up and define? If it has such jurisdiction, I believe we should take advantage of the present occasion to take some steps in the direction of acting under that jurisdiction.

If the contention is raised, as I believe it was by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this parliament has jurisdiction in the actual work of instruction in technical education, I cannot agree with it for several reasons. From the simple reading of the British North America Act it is seen that by article 91 the federal government is given jurisdiction over those subjects not assigned exclusively to the provinces, and by article 93 education is assigned exclusively to the provinces. Some say that education should be subdivided, that we have in technical education something different from ordinary education. But I believe that the result of the thought of the best men to-day on this subject is that there is actually no dividing line be-

tween cultural education and technical education, that the one merges insensibly into the other and that this attempt to differentiate technical and cultural education has been a great obstacle in the advancement of all systems of the former. Again, it has been said that we have examples already, such as the Royal Military College at Kingston. I draw attention to the fact that the latter part of article 91 of the British North America Act says that subjects coming within the classes of subjects assigned to the legislative authority of Canada shall not be deemed to come within the classes of subjects of a private character assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces, and it is only fair to consider the subject of military training as one which comes naturally within the jurisdiction of the Department of Militia and Defence. This being the case, in establishing the Royal Military College we have simply acted in accordance with the latter part of article 91 of the British North America Act. Again, in the case of agriculture, we see that by article 95 the Dominion parliament and the provincial legislatures are given concurrent jurisdiction, so that these two cases are exceptions and the rule, I think, judging by the simple reading of the British North America Act, is that in the matter of actual instruction in technical education this parliament has no jurisdiction. However, I believe there is another and a more important reason why we should not interfere with the actual work of instruction in technical education. We have an example to go by in Germany. Thirty years ago they had the same discussion on the jurisdiction of the federal and state legislatures on technical education. At that time good reasons were given why technical education in Germany should be left to the states. In the first place, it grafted itself naturally on the system of common education; in the second place giving the states jurisdiction would give elasticity to the system, and in the third place, competition would be introduced. For these three reasons, the opinion of those who held that technical education should be placed under the jurisdiction of the states instead of the federal government in Germany had precedence. That action was taken in Germany on purely theoretical grounds. We have to-day the practical experience of Germany extending over a period of twenty or thirty years. The system has worked out splendidly and for that reason I believe we should not consider the advisability of this parliament undertaking any part of the actual instruction in the work of technical education. There is a third reason why I think we should not undertake that work and that is that we should be interfering with the excellent system of technical education which we already have in embryo in the various provinces. The province of Nova Scotia and some of the other provinces have been referred to by preceding speakers and I wish for one moment to refer to the system in the province of Ontario. About a year ago there was a petition from the city of Brantford for the formation of industrial continuation classes in that city. This system of industrial continuation classes is a most important part of the system of technical education, and while I do not know what the result of the petition was, I know that it aroused discussion and every one feels to-day, in so far as industrial continuation classes go, that they are something that graft themselves naturally upon the public school system because these industrial continuation classes would utilize the public school buildings as well as many of the teachers and they would be simply for the most part classes continued in the public schools as they exist to-day. There is also a transformation going on in the province of Ontario in our high school system. We have a manual training department, a commercial department, an agricultural department, and it will probably be but a short time before we will have the remaining courses composed of the industrial, scientific and classical parts. When we have this one further change made in the high school system of Ontario, we will have the prototype of the gymnasia and the pro-gymnasia of the German system. In addition we have in Ontario the school of practical science in Toronto which corresponds with the third class of technical education in Germany represented by the great technical high schools. We have the fourth class represented in Germany by schools for particular industries and in Ontario this class is represented by the dairy school, the school of mines at Kingston and the agricultural college at Guelph. So, we have in Ontario already the skeleton of a system of technical education such as exists in the German states. For these reasons, for the reason that we have a good example in Germany of what can be accomplished by leaving the matter of technical instruction to the individual states, because of the reading of the British North America Act and from the fact that already we have in the provinces a system under way, I believe that this parliament will be very unwise in discussing seriously the question as to whether they have jurisdiction in this matter which would justify them in undertaking actual instruction in technical education. That being the case, the question arises: Is there any function left which this parliament can assume in the matter of technical education which would advance it? I want to refer to two or three things that I think are of some importance and which would result in some action be-

ing taken on the part of the parliament of Canada.

In the first place I want to say that if we took some action now we would define our exact position on this subject. It is evident to any one to-night that there is not a consensus of opinion as to what our exact position is, but if we took some action at the present time we would define that position and we would not have, as we had a year ago, the Minister of Education of the province of Ontario going about the country, making speeches, as reported in the press, to the effect that the province of Ontario were waiting to see what action the Dominion parliament would be prepared to take, before they took any action upon this matter of technical education. The mere fact that we have not already acted and defined our position has, for the time being, put off the discussion of the matter of technical education in Ontario, and I think that if this commission were appointed, or if some other action were taken by the government resulting in the definition of our position it would be an important thing for technical education in Ontario at least.

Reference has been made in some of the speeches to the fact that this parliament would have it within its powers to grant money. While it is possible, I do not believe that it is an important subject. I just wish to refer in that connection for a moment to the cost of a system of technical education. The fact that we lay so much stress upon the granting of money for this purpose is owing to our belief that a system of technical education is a very expensive thing. Looking over a system such as that which exists in Germany we find that in some of the states the cost of the complicated system which they have there is between $200,000 and $300,000 a year. So that, I believe it fair to assume that a system of technical education could be established and put in a fair way of operation in any of the provinces for an annual expenditure of $100,000. That would not by any means be a very serious obstacle.

There is another reason and one which I think will appeal strongly to the Minister of Labour. In any consideration of the development of a system of technical education, as it exists in Germany, one is strongly impressed by the fact that unless you have the interest of the manufacturers and others interested in technical education aroused, the establishment of any system is bound to result in failure. You have to have the interest aroused first. You have to have a demand for a system before it can be a success. That being the case, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will be pardoned if I refer for a moment or two to some personal experiences. I have been interested in this subject for some time and often in travelling over the country I take occasion to talk with manufacturers on the train and in other places in regard to this subject. I usually find that there is amongst manufacturers an idea that this subject is important, but they usually think that it is of importance to some other manufacture than their own. They have no personal interest in it from the standpoint of their own manufacture. I want to illustrate that by a concrete example. In the part of the country that I have the honour to represent the manufacturing industry is represented chiefly by the canning factories where fruits and vegetables are canned. The first man to undertake that work was Mr. W. Boutter, in Prince Edward county, over twenty years ago, and since I was a boy I have had a chance of seeing these factories in actual operation. I have seen valleys converted into level ground by being filled with spoiled fruit that went bad in the process of manufacture. I have seen the site for a factory made out of a marsh by being filled with spoiled goods. If we had a system of technical education for the instruction of those interested in canning factories it would be a great advantage to that industry. With that object in view, about seven years ago, I wrote out as complete a plan as I could for the establishment of an institution of that kind in connection with the Agricultural college at Guelph, where, in their chemical and bacteriological laboratories, they have facilities for such a course. At the same time I explained to the Hon. John Dryden that it would, of course, be necessary to get the interest of the manufacturers in this subject. It may be that at that time we did not have such intelligent manufacturers as the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), but at any rate, after talking the matter over with them for six or seven years, I could never find any of them who would bring the subject to the attention of the Canners' convention. I only mention that to show that many of the manufacturers have not the active interest in the subject that they should have. It has been mentioned that steps have been taken in the United States to accomplish something in this matter of technical education. This brings me up to the point as to how it has been accomplished. The best work that has come into my hands on the question of technical education is the report of the commissioner of labour of the United States. That was distributed broadcast through the United States and has done more than any other one thing to give the people generally information on this subject and to stimulate the interest of all classes of people in it. There is a work that we can do, and I was very glad to hear that the Minister of Labour was about to collect material along this line. If the steps taken by the government re-

sulted only in one thing and that was the Department of Labour being instructed to arouse the interest of manufacturers and others in this subject the establishment of that department would be a thing that we might be thankful for in the future. Therefore, I say that one of the great functions of this government is the stimulation of interest on the part of all classes in this great subject.

In the third place, there is something of a suggestion in a remark made by one of the speakers in regard to the Imperial Technical Institute of Berlin. This is a country of great resources; I think I am safe in saying that our undeveloped resoures are far and away greater than any we have yet developed. Our efforts should be directed towards developing our unknown resources and towards the utilization of the by-products of our different manufacturers which now go to waste. I believe it would be well within the jurisdiction of this parliament to establish a technical institute of the highest class, and manned by men of the highest technical ability who would have as their duty the investigation of our unknown resources. For instance, just to mention only one out of the number, we have in Canada unlimited supplies of clay, felspar, and quartz which are the raw products of the china and porcelain industry, and I doubt if we have a single manufacturer of these articles in the Dominion. Again, if we look out of the windows of this building we can see at the mills on the other side of the river the great waste of sawdust which is going on, and it would be well within the duty of such an institute to devise means for its commercial utilization. I have been told that bearings could be made from this by-product which would be more useful than babbit metal or brass for the shafting of machinery. I will speak of only two examples of the utilization of by-products. Not many years ago a gentleman interested in the fish packing industry in Maine hired a young man named Lepage to look into some of the problems in connection with the curing fish, and within a year Mr. Lepage had discovered that a certain variety of glue could be made from the fish refuse, a simple discovery which resulted in his becoming a multi-millionaire. Take again the dye industry which has so enormously developed in Germany as a by-product of coal tar. As late as 1892, London had practically the monopoly of the indigo trade of the world, and Germany then imported about 4,000 tons of indigo yearly; but then came the discovery of Professor Hoffman, and to-day Germany produces three-fourths of the indigo product of the world, and instead of importing 4,000 tons a year, as formerly, she now exports 8,000 tons. The experiments in connection with coal tar and other by-products have resulted in chemical discoveries which a year or two ago accounted for an export trade of about $200,000,000 a year in Germany. In view of these results it is well that this parliament should consider the establishment of a Dominion institute of technology which would look to the development of our unknown resources and the utilization of the by-products of our existing manufactures.

Now, I believe that the general system of education in Canada is not excelled by that of any country in the world. The graduate in mathematics from one of our Canadian universities can go to one of the best schools in the United States and he will find that his Canadian mathematical training has resulted in putting him at least one year in advance of the graduate of Harvard, Yale or Princeton. If you look at the curricula of the engineering schools of the United States you will find that mathematics are superficial and elementary compared with what is taught to the Canadian student. In the department of science you find the same condition. But when we want a man with high technical knowledge we have to take one of these American graduates who has been able to avail himself of the facilities afforded by technical education in the United States, although the ground work of his general education may be greatly inferior to that of the Canadian. It would be a grand thing for Canada if we were able to furnish our young men with the technical knowledge which would enable them to become great engineers and to erect, for example, such works as the Quebec bridge, without having to send for our experts to the United States. One Quebec bridge on top of the water instead of under the water would pay for a system of technical education in Canada for a long time.

Now, the function of the government of the German empire in connection with education is not, I fear, thoroughly understood in other countries. The pre-eminent function lies in the encouragement it gives to the associations of teachers and the associations of manufacturers and others interested in technical education, and under this system technical education in Germany has been unified and brought to its high standard. In most of the published works on technical education in Germany, in the English works at any rate, the assistance given by the German federal government to these associations is passed over as unimportant, while the Germans themselves look upon it from an entirely different view point. I notice that in the report of the Commissioner of Labour of the United States there are only a few lines dealing with this branch of the subject, and in consequence of this lack of information, until

three years ago the people of the United States were not seized of the importance of the relation of the federal government to the promotion of technical education. In the year 1906 there was formed the American association for the advancement of technical education in the United States, which at its second meeting in Chicago provided for an expenditure of $25,000 during the coming year for the advancement of technical education. At the second meeting of that association 18 states were represented, and at the third meeting every state in the Union had a representative present, so that our cousins across the line are now fully aware of the great importance of these federal associations for the advance of technical education. There again is a function which this parliament could assume. One of the recommendations of the American association at its second annual meeting was that the United States government should appoint a commissioner who would devote his entire time to a propaganda for the development and upbuilding of technical education throughout the states of the Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe that the federal government has jurisdiction with regard to the actual instructional part of technical education, I do say that we can do something towards stimulating the interest of our Canadian people in this subject. I believe we could establish a chemical institution of the very highest order for the Dominion, and I believe we could give assistance to these large Dominion associations for the advancement of the cause. Perhaps in the future we might appoint a commission.

I was glad to hear from the Minister of Labour that the government was likely to give the matter serious consideration and I trust that the best men in the country will come to their aid. When this question became a very live one in Germany twenty years ago, Prince Bismarck did not consider it beneath him to give a great deal of his time and consideration to the question, and I shall quote a prediction made by Prince Bismarck at that time, After looking thoroughly into the subject, he said in substance that the nation which has technical schools has secured itself for commercial and industrial supremacy. That was said by Bismarck not twenty years ago, and at the present time we see that it has almost come true in Germany. I believe that will go down to history as one of the greatest predictions of one of the greatest statesmen. To-day we are giving a great deal of attention and thought to the matter of the Germany navy; but to-night we may well reflect that under the protecting influence of a system of technical education, Germany has already constructed a fleet of ironclads of commerce before which the old wooden frigates of her commercial competitors have faded away like a toy flotilla. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty sympathy with any effiorts which this parliament make make in forwarding a system of technical education in any way that lies within its jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and those of other hon. gentlemen in favour of technical education. Indeed the textile trade of Canada owes a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for South Wellington for introducing to this House this most important question. Speaking from practical experience, I can assure this House that it would be a great benefit to the textile trade of Canada if we had technical schools established in the various provinces where textile manufacturing is carried on. While I say that on behalf of the textile manufacturers, I fully agree that technical schools should be established for every other industry that is carried on in this great Dominion. One of the things the workmen of Canada lack is technical education, and there is very limited means of getting such an education in Canada at the present time.

The hon. member for South Wellington has referred to the fact that the coarse wools of Canada are exported to the United States. These wools are manipulated there in a manner in which they cannot be in Canada, because there are in the United States a better educated class of mechanics, men who have had a thorough technical training, to manipulate that kind of wool. I know of no class of manufacturers in Canada who suffer more for the want of technically educated men than the textile manufacturers. In England and Germany this class of people get a thorough technical education, and consequently they are able to manipulate cheap raw material in such a way as to make it into a good-looking article which is sent to this country to the detriment of the Canadian manufacturers. Nobody knows better than the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs the difficultes which Canadian manufacturers have to contend with along that line. Deputation after deputation have waited on these hon. gentlemen in the effort to get this state of affairs remedied. The hon. Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that we might expect the budget speech before the holidays. Well, I can assure him that the textile manufacturers, especially those engaged in the woollen industry, are looking forward to that speech with a great deal of interest, in the hope that some measure of relief may be given to them. However, the question we are dealing with to-night has nothing to do with

the tariff. This is a question on which we may be thankful to find both sides of the House heartily agreed. Consider the great beneficial results that have come from the agricultural colleges established in the different provinces of this Dominion. Young men attend those colleges and get a technical education, and then go back to their farms and produce more grain to the acre and a better quality of grain, and breed better classes of cattle and horses. There are young men from these colleges attending farmers institutes and giving lectures, thus educating the young men who attend these institutes, but who cannot afford to attend the agricultural colleges. If we get such beneficial results from agricultural colleges, military colleges, medical colleges and business colleges, why not have established in this country technical schools in order that the manufacturers of this country may receive from those colleges similar benefits to those received from colleges I have referred to. I do not wish to prolong this debate, because it is getting late, but I do want to take the opportunty, from a manufacturer's standpoint, of expressing my conviction that no institutions of learning could be established in Canada that would impart more useful knowledge than technical schools. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the government will see its way clear to appoint a commission asked for by the hon. member for South Wellington.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I had not the pleasure of being present in the earlier stages of the debate and consequently have missed a part of this very interesting discussion. I shall have to content myself with reading the earlier part of the debate in 'Hansard.' But what I have heard has enabled me to appreciate thoroughly the great importance of the subject under discussion. I must take exception entirely to the observation of an hon. gentleman opposite that the motion to adjourn is a motion to sidetrack this resolution; and while I propose to vote for the motion to adjourn, I do so on altogether a different ground. After the discussion we have had, after the abundance of information brought before the House, showing the great need of this movement in Canada, it would indeed be strange if nothing further should be done. We are all of the opinion that something should be done, and the only question is what is the better way of doing it. I have no doubt that we have the power to spend our own money in the way we please. If, as a layman, I should venture to express an opinion on a constitutional question, I would on that point agree heartily with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition; but there may be room for doubt as to whether we should organize the machinery for an elaborate educational system, even though we had the right to grant the money. It is not, however, necessary to enter on that branch of the question. If we agree that it is an important matter and something should be done, then it is for us to look about and see what is the best way to do it. An hon. member of the opposition side said there should be no inquiry but that the Dominion should go right ahead and do something. Well, while appreciating the spirit that prompted the hon. gentleman to take that view, I do not agree in it at all. I think it is the duty of the provincial authorities in the first place to institute the work, but should they not do it efficiently, I do not say that the Dominion parliament should not step in and assist them. I am going to vote for the adjournment of the debate, not for the purpose of sidetracking the matter, but that we may have further opportunity of considering, not the wisdom of doing something, but the best way in which to do it. Take the province of Nova Scotia: that province has done a great deal of work and spent much money in the establishment of a system of technical education, and it would be eminently wise, before we proceed to deal with the question, to put ourselves in communication with its educational authorities and see how the Dominion and provincial authorities can work together. What is true of that province is equally true of the others. There is every desire on the part of the government to show our appreciation of this work, and I join most heartily in all I have heard this afternoon with regard to its necessity and importance, and in voting for the motion to adjourn, I do so in order that we may have the opportunity of considering further what is the best way to aid a movement which seems to have received the favour of the whole House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Last year I asked the government some questions regarding its intention to establish some such institution in Ottawa or some other suitable part of Canada for the consideration of similar questions to those brought to our notice by the hon. member for South Wellington. There are three classes of technical education. One is such as might be granted by cities and municipalities for the development of artisans and mechanics along certain lines. The other would be such as come under the influence of the provincial authorities, for the development of matters purely connected with their own province; but there are many matters which evidently affect the Dominion as a commercial nation, a part of the great British empire, to be still closer connected with it in a very short time, I trust. These matters I think should be treated by the Dom-

inion at large. Let me name some of these, concerning which people from every part of the country are reaching for information. Take the question of the manufacture of steel. Patents are being held on the advanced processes of producing steel such as may drive every other industry, not using these advanced patents, out of the markets. Why should there not, in connection with this development, be some institution at Ottawa where encouragement would be given and experiments carried on in order that the highest perfection might be attained in this very important industry? Only last year two patents were brought out, each of which, in its own sphere, practically revolutionized the trade and put every industry not using it at the mercy of those who do. The same may be said regarding copper. Then there is the question of sewage disposal. It is estimated by competent authorities that in a very few years our farms will be depleted of fertilizing elements and there will be nothing at the disposal of our farmers with which to replace them. I understand that the Americans are making gigantic strides in this regard. They are producing bacteria which, when mixed with the grain when sown, will draw the nitrogen from the atmosphere, and thus encourage the plant's life. There are various other processes of uniting carbon and phosphate with nitrogen. Why should not this government take up this matter, which is of vital interest to this country as a farming community, and have the experiments carried on in a government institution. I might also point to the question of producer gas being made from peat and all the various industries in that connection, which have been referred to by the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman). All our great northern country is rich in peat. Why should not the government pay the cost of carrying on these experiments in their establishments in the city of Ottawa, and thus save the cost to the individual. If this peat could be utilized profitably, it would place Canada in the front rank of manufacturing communities by giving us power cheaper even than the electricity from water-power. Moreover our supply of coal in central Canada depends on the United States. If peat could be profitably utilized for fuel, we would be absolutely independent of the United States in that regard. The experiment of utilizing peat should be conducted by the government. I know three or four gentlemen who have carried on experiments to develop that industry, and they lost their money. It ought to be the duty of the government to carry out these things in the experimental stages.

Every one knows that the dyeing and the dyes used in the trades and manufactures are also of very great importance to the development of the nation. There should be a scientific branch in connection with the government to take up all this class of work. Progress in mining knowledge is being made all over the world, but I believe that if the government established an institution with highly skilled officers, advancement would be made very much more efficiently than by mere hap-hazard work on the part of individuals in mines here and there over the country. A very interesting matter was brought to my notice yesterday by Mr. Murray of Toronto. He had given an address in Montreal a few days before on the chemistry of the wool trade, a subject of which I had never heard before, but an explanation showed me that in this line there was a very important interest for the whole Dominion of Canada and an absolute need of a scientific investigation into the whole business. Then there is the development of nickel. One could mention a score of other branches of commercial industry all of which could be improved by having a bureau or a school of technology, an institute of some kind in Ottawa or elsewhere, where the best men in the country could be kept, even at high salaries. I am certain the country would endorse such an expenditure and it would be justified by the results.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) expressed a strong desire to do something. He said the Dominion government recognized the importance of the subject and had all the information necessary to deal with it. It seems strange to me if the government are so anxious to do something, the Minister of Labour, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) are also anxious to do something, they should forget that we had a long discussion on this two years ago. At that time most of the members were anxious to see something done, but it was shelved in much the same way as it is being shelved to-night and we heard nothing more of it until to-night. The motion was placed on the Order Paper last year on January 28, it remained there until May 19, when we prorogued, but nothing was done. Now we have had the motion discussed at great length for the third time, and the Minister of Labour admits it is so very important he drew arguments from China and Japan and told us of the danger we were confronted with to-day from the industrial life of China. What was the remedy? To Christianize the Chinese so they would work less and keep more Sabbaths and I presume let the Canadians fall into the Chinese habits, work longer hours, and keep fewer Sabbaths, and then we would be able to compete with them. If it is so important that we should do so much to help the labouring class in this country why is it that the minister who is at the head of a department brought into being for that especial purpose, has allowed the whole summer to go

by and has permitted one of the most unfortunate disputes between capital and labour that this country has experienced to continue, apparently without making any effort to bring it to a close. I thought that he might have been of value to the country in this matter but he did not seem desirous to make any effort to be valuable. He will elaborate great theories and present strong arguments to the House on lines on which he is making no effort whatever to help the people. I think that if he had more of the practical in him and less of the theory it would be to better purpose. This is the third year we are going to sidetrack this question. How long will it be before it will be taken up in a practical way by the present government. The ministers admit that they have all the information that is required, but beyond collecting that information there is no effort on the part of the government to doing anything.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have pleasure in adding my voice to those raised in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that this matter of the appointment of a commission on technical education be decided forthwith as opposed to the suggestion in amendment of the Minister of Labour that the matter should be indefinitely postponed. The Minister of Labour at least has the excuse that he was not personally cognizant of, and was not a party personally to the promises made by this government to the representatives of organized labour in Canada when early in this year they interviewed Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Lemieux, as representing the government and laid before them a series of requests for legislation which the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada desired to have passed. Replying to that delegation on the subject of technical education, Mr. Lemieux, on the 12th of January, 1909, nearly a year ago, stated, according to the published official report of the Trades and Labour Congress, that the appointment of a commission on technical education was under consideration. To my mind it is surprising that other members of the government who must be cognizant of the promise made by the Prime Minister and the then Minister of Labour, have not corrected the present Minister of Labour in the extraordinary position he takes on this occasion, and that when for the third year in succession the promoters of the idea of a commission on technical education come to this parliament they are told that they must wait indefinitely until the government gives consideration to this matter. As one of those interested in promoting the cause of technical education, interested particularly in seeing that effect is given in this parliament to the desires of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, I must say that I can only regard the suggestion made to-night to adjourn the debate as evidence of the intention of the government to resist the suggestion to participate in the movement for technical education and to shelve the matter indefinitely. If there is any intention on the part of the government to appoint a commission later in the session I think it would well become some minister to tell us of that fact, to take us into his confidence and give us some reason for supporting the suggestion that instead of pressing the motion on the Order Paper we shall wait until it suits the pleasure of the government to tell us when the appointment is to be made. While I rose mainly to call attention to the definite statement made on the 12th of January last that the government had then under consideration the appointment of just such a commission. I wish to refer to one or two incidents brought out in the same report of the Trades and Labour Congress. The present Minister of Labour honoured that congress with his presence and he obtained, as might be expected, because the report of his eloquence had reached the congress before him, a most hearty reception. We read that the Minister of Labour received a tremendous ovation on entering the chamber. He made reference to many of the points the congress had under discussion and he also referred particularly to a matter which he has brought before us to-night. We heard with great interest that there was no other way under Heaven by which we could be saved from the menace of oriental competition except the adoption of some active measures in connection with technical education. We find that when the Minister of Labour addressed the congress he had a different idea as to what we should do to save ourselves from Chinese competition. We find it expressed in this extraordinary way:

> He also referred to investigations conducted by the home and Canadian governments in China, and gave a brief synopsis of his observations while assisting in conducting these investigations in China, and stated that it might be well for the representatives of labour to study the effect the poll tax of $500 Canada had placed upon the Chinese was having upon the trade which the manufacturers of Canada were endeavouring to develop in China and the Orient.

Now when we contrast that as a chief menace to our trade with the orient in September last, with the statement to-night that the one thing we must do to save ourselves from oriental competition is to adopt a scheme of technical education, I think we must come to the conclusion that the Minister of Labour, at least, is not serious. We find that the Trades and Labour Congress have a very different idea as to what this government means when it postpones from time to time the action which

their representatives have urged upon this House. We have a report in this book on the Bill introduced by the congress respecting an eight-hour law on government contracts; and on that occasion, as well as on this, the bug-a-boo of provincial rights was introduced as a reason why we should not deal with it. We find the parliamentary committee thus reporting:

His argument (speaking of the Hon. Mr. Lemieux) as to interference with provincial rights was answered by himself when he said that we could only pass such legislation as regards public works. That is all Mr. Verville's Bill dealt with. But in any event there would be no conflict with provincial jurisdiction. The government did not think of provincial rights when it enacted the fair-wage clause nor when it made provision to prevent sweat-shop labour being employed on government work. There is no more conflict in the one case than in the other, and as for 'respect for the usages and customs' of different localities, the very reason given, during the discussion of the fair-wage clause, by the then Minister of Labour, was, that the government should be a model employer and an example to other employers. It is all very well to refer to the dignity of labour, but it would be a greater compliment to assume that labour is intelligent enough to see through such arguments as those used by the Hon. Minister of Labour in the discussion of this Bill. The debate served a useful purpose at all events in showing what we have to meet when the Bill is next introduced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to members of this House to remove from it the reproach levelled at it by the Trades and Labour Congress when they say in this official report that when the labour representatives introduced this Bill it was trifled with, and subterfuges instead of solid facts were advanced why it should not be dealt with. I say let us be men. If we are in favour of a grant for technical education, let us say so, to-night. If we are not in favour of it, let us be manly enough to say that we will not take up this matter, that the provinces must bear the sole burden, and that we will pay no heed to the resolution of the Trades and Labour Congress. Let us say so openly, and not put them off with the suggestion that this matter shall be postponed till some indefinite time. In conclusion I will read the request which is now before the government from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada with respect to technical education.

Resolved, that this congress emphatically reaffirm its declaration in favour of the immediate appointment by the Dominion government of a commission on technical education, and that copies of this resolution be immediately sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour.

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE (Drummond and Arthabaska). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to that question. Though I sympathize with the idea which has inspired the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I confess that I cannot agree with the motion as it is framed. Therefore, if the wording of that motion were put to the vote on its own merit, I would be obliged to vote against it, whereas I am in favour of the proposed adjournment. We know that everything relating to education is under the jurisdiction of the local governments, and for my part I would like the authority to remain vested with those governments. I do not want the federal government to interfere later on with our education affairs.

Just now we are secure from all danger with regard to education. I am anxious to keep for my province its self-government in its integrity, and I believe that all the other provinces are anxious also to preserve their autonomy. I would not therefore let anybody infringe upon it.

We have heard so much talk about the question of separate schools that we should not desire that matter to be brought up again. Our system is perfectly good, and I confess that I am against that motion if it is intended to deprive us of our rights with regard to education. If, on the contrary, the question is for the federal government to interfere only in order to give moneys with a view to assist provinces in the establishment of technical schools, I shall approve the motion, provided the moneys be given to the provincial governments and they have the right to control the appropriation of the funds and to manage them as they think proper, but not otherwise.

I think this motion is actually dangerous, because if it were adopted we in favour of separate schools would find ourselves, later on, in a very bad position.

As I have already said, if I were obliged to vote on the merits of this proposition, I would vote against it. But as the question is on the adjournment of the debate, I am in favour of this latter motion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. As mover of the resolution I may say a word on the motion to adjourn. After dealing with the question somewhat fully this afternoon, and endeavouring to impress upon the government the propriety of the motion, and also the expediency of appointing a commission forthwith, I hardly think it would be consistent for me now to vote for the postponement of my own motion. However, I accept in absolute good faith the statement made by the Minister of Labour in asking for an adjournment of this debate in order to give the government further time to consider the question. If I thought there was the slightest foundation for the statement of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr.

Reid) I would be the more inclined to press the matter with all the resources at my command. But I accept the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, and the positive assurance given to this House by the Minister of Finance that the government does feel in sympathy with the main purpose of this resolution, but requires further time for consideration. I was somewhat amused by the statement of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who seemed to complain that on this occasion there was a possibility of adjourning the debate, and that the question had been similarly adjourned indefinitely on a former occasion; and if the few members who were present on the former occasion were here now, they will perhaps also be surprised when they are told that the hon. member who moved the adjournment of the debate and postponed the question on that occasion, was my hon. friend from East Grey.

I might just state that while I myself am reasonably clear as to the constitutional rights of this parliament to go as far as this motion asks—and I am glad to know that I am supported in this view by the hon. leader of the opposition—I can tell the leader of the opposition that the gentleman who sits immediately to his right is not so clear. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was good enough. at the six o'clock adjournment, to compliment me on the general tenor of my remarks but he saw fit to say that on the constitutional question I talked utter nonsense. So that, there is some difference of opinion on that subject also. However, as I feel satisfied that the government has evidently the intention of going ahead on this matter and desires only time for consideration, I do not ask any one to support what may be my vote if a division is taken. I would, for the sake of consistency, if there is a decision, have to vote for my motion, but I do not do so with the idea of antagonizing the government or of placing myself in a false position with regard to it. I realize that antagonizing the government cannot help the matter at all. I desire the support of the government, I desire the government to act, as I desire my motion to be carried out, whether amended or not, after consideration.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. King.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,	McCraney,
Bickerdike,	McIntyre,
Borden (Sir F.),	McKenzie,
Brodeur,	McLean (Huron),
Brown,	McLean (Sunbury),
Bureau,	McMillan,
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Mayrand,
Clark (Red Deer),	Meigs,
Clarke (Essex),	Miller,
Congdon,	Murphy,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Oliver,
Demers,	Papineau,
Douglas,	Parent,
Dubeau,	Paterson,
Ecrément,	Pickup,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Rankin,
Gauvreau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Geoffrion,	Richards,
Gervais,	Robb,
Girard,	Roy (Dorchester),
Graham,	Rutan,
King,	Savoie,
Knowles,	Schell,
Kyte,	Sealey,
Lafortune,	Seguin,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Smith (Stormont),
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Talbot,
Lapointe,	Templeman,
Lavergne,	Tobin,
Law,	Todd,
LeBlanc,	Tolmie,
Loggie,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Lovell,	Turgeon,
Low,	Warburton,
Macdonald,	White (Victoria, Alta.),
McColl,	Wilson (Laval).—78.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Middlebro,
Barnard,	Monk,
Blain,	Nantel,
Borden (Halifax),	Osler,
Boyce,	Owen,
Broder,	Price,
Burrell,	Reid (Grenville),
Campbell,	Rhodes,
Clare,	Roche,
Cowan,	Schaffner,
Crosby,	Sexsmith,
Crocket,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Crothers,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Daniel,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Sproule,
Fowke,	Staples,
Fraser,	Stewart,
Goodeve,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Guthrie,	Thoburn,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thornton,
Herron,	Verville,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Lake,	Wilcox (Essex),
Lortie,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Macdonell,	Worthington,
McCarthy,	Wright.—56.
Maddin,	
Meighen,	

Amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize. I had forgotten that I was paired with my hon. friend (Mr. Lloyd Harris) and I ask that my vote be stricken off.

Mr. SMYTH. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has not voted.

Mr. BRADBURY. I was paired with the hon. member for Assiniboia. Had I voted I would have voted against the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The railways branch Bill, the Bill respecting the government employees provident fund, the Bill of the Minister of Marine respecting water carriage of goods, and if we have time we will go into supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. If the Minister of Public Works can be here we will take his estimates; if not we will take Inland Revenue and Customs.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 7, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Saint Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Mayrand.

NEWMARKET CANAL—HOLLAND RIVER CHANNEL.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM. I wish to make a slight correction in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) about a week ago. The question was as follows:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals had a survey or investigation made into the feasibility and cost of constructing a channel from the Devil's Elbow on the Holland river to a point in the neighbourhood of the Bradford Railway station, in South Simcoe?

2. If not, will the department have this done at an early date, and if done, is the report favourable, and what is the estimated cost?

The answer is:

1. Yes.

2. The Bradford survey was begun on the west branch of the Holland river at the junction of the Newmarket canal, which point is 4·9 miles from the mouth of the river, Cook's bay, and carried up the west branch of the river to a point about 3 miles above the Bradford and Holland Landing road.

The canal or channel leading to the proposed basin in front of the Grand Trunk station, Bradford, would leave the west branch at the Devil's Elbow, 7 miles from Cook's bay, and the Bradford basin would be at 8·2 miles, or in other words the canal would be 1·2 miles long with a bottom width of 50 feet. The proposed Bradford basin is estimated for 200 feet width, inclosed with concrete dock walls. No work is required in the 2·1 miles of river between the junction of the Newmarket canal and the Devil's Elbow. The estimated cost of the work is $52,947.

QUESTION.

IMPERIAL EXPORT COMPANY.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Has an application been made to the government by the Imperial Export Company for assistance in establishing a regular freight steamship service between Atlantic ports in Canada and Australia and New Zealand?

2. Has the government received any communications from the trade agents in Australia and New Zealand favouring the establishment of such service?

3. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce received any communications from Canadian shippers or others requesting the establishment of such a service? If so, what communications and from whom?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes, but it is not thought advisable until the matter has been adjusted to bring down the information sought for.

NAVAL DEFENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the Navy Bill? We were promised some information on that point a week ago yesterday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we will be able to take up the Navy Bill immediately after the disposal of the Budget or about that time.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the government to lay on the table of the House the correspondence, despatches, cables and communications between the imperial government and the government of Canada concerning naval defence, since the Imperial Defence Conference last July and up to the present date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection.

CANADIANS ENTERING THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister and of the government to a matter of considerable importance, and one which we discussed last session. It is a question which is causing considerable feeling in southwestern Manitoba. I read from this morning's Ottawa 'Citizen'.

Stopped Pastor returning to Ireland from Winnipeg via U.S.A.

(Special to the 'Citizen.')

Winnipeg, Dec. 6.—Rev. T. Davidson, famous pastor of Belfast, Ireland, who has been preaching special services here for several weeks left on Friday last for home via the United States. He was stopped at the boundary by immigration agents and compelled to return to Winnipeg to have papers filled out showing he was not an undesirable.

Such occurences are becoming so frequent that it is creating a strong feeling here. No one regrets it more than United States Consul General Jones, who is doing everything possible to create good feeling. He ascribes it all to ignorant and over zealous officials.

I did not suppose that I would be in order in discussing the question at this stage but it is certainly one which needs the serious consideration of the government. I refer to the manner in which the United States officials are dealing with people of almost all classes who are crossing over the boundary into the United States.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER. We have no jurisdiction over the immigration officials of the United States. They exercise jurisdiction on their side of the line and we exercise jurisdiction on our side. I cannot give any answer to my hon. friend on this matter at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the Minister of the Interior and the government cannot afford to treat such a matter in this fashion. The Prime Minister will remember that last year we had a discussion over some rather outrageous cases and I think the Prime Minister himself promised that the matter would be looked into. Perhaps he can tell us if anything has been done, and if so what? Such things as these referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Schaffner) are indignities and we have no spirit unless we resent them. We ought at least try to make fair inquiry and see whether the conditions cannot be ameliorated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not trust my memory about what occurred last session and I thought the Minister of the Interior would know. My impression is that representations have been made on this subject, but I will look into the matter and give further information to my hon. friend. I thought we had some arrangement about it.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the House of Commons.—Mr. Campbell.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire by lease lines of railways connected with the government railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. I explained this Bill on its introduction, and as the question of acquiring branch lines has been so thoroughly discussed in this House time and again, I think it hardly necessary to go into details. The Bill provides that the government shall have power to lease such line or lines as connect with the government railways and on the report of the board of management that such lines will be of benefit to the government railways. The Bill also provides that no line shall be taken over unless the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals reports that it is in good order and in safe condition for operating. That provision is to obviate the necessity for expending a large amount of money on the line after it has been taken over. If it should be thought desirable to take over any line of railway under this Act, the government will not take it over unless the owners put it in such condition that we can operate it without having to undertake an expenditure on capital account to put that line into proper condition. In other words, we do not propose to lease any lines that are not workable and not in good operating order. The third clause is a safeguard to parliament that no line shall be leased and no contract of lease entered into without first submitting it to parliament for approval.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the tendency of this proposal along the lines of increasing government ownership? Is the government fully committed to that principle now and do they intend to work it out to its full extent?

Mr. GRAHAM. That question covers a very vast territory, and I could hardly be expected to give an answer to it. If advantage be taken of this Act to lease any line or lines that now connect with the railway, on the face of it it certainly widens the field of government ownership.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And therefore it shows that the stories as to the government giving up the control and administration of the Intercolonial, are pure fiction?

Hon. J. HAGGART. I do not clearly understand the necessity for this Bill. The minister has not stated what lines he has at present in view that might be taken over, but I assume it is his intention to follow out the proposal made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who has advocated from year to year the acquisition of these different lines by the government. I do not clearly understand the necessity of it. Why do you want authority from parliament to make a lease of these lines and afterwards come to parliament to ratify it? Why cannot you make a lease without the authority of parliament at all, and then come to parliament to get the lease ratified? I think that would have been the best plan. An acquisition of a property would be more fully considered if the whole of the reasons were to be given by the minister for the acquisition of a particular line. The pros and cons might be fully discussed, instead of the government coming to parliament with a cut and dried lease entered into by the government with the approval of the commission. That, I think, would be the more parliamentary course, and the better course to pursue if the government had not authority to enter into a lease, because once having entered into a lease, we would have no power of altering or amending it; the lease would come to us holus bolus, take it or leave it. According to the other plan, if the lease was entered into conditionally without the government being bound until parliament had given its approval, I think that would be a far better plan than the one proposed by the Minister of Railways. But the Minister of Railways surely has some object in view, he has surely considered the question whether there are any railways in the maritime provinces which would, if acquired by the government, benefit the operation of the Intercolonial. If that be his object, he should take the House into his confidence and state what line he has in view, what railways he thinks would be for the benefit of the Intercolonial if they were acquired by the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is in error in thinking that I have some particular line or lines in view. The introduction of this Bill is the result of consideration by the government after repeated discussions in this House, and after considering, not only a report made by commissioners appointed by the New Brunswick government, but a report made by a commission appointed by this government over a year ago. They reported on some twenty railways in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I am free to admit that I have not entered into the merits of any of these lines to ascertain which one or ones it would be proper for us to acquire. Until this year we have not had the machinery for that purpose which we have now, a body thoroughly well qualified, as I think the present board is, to judge of the merits of any of these lines, and to judge whether they might be of benefit and of how much benefit to the government line. That is the point of view from which the question would be approached. The other point of view, of course, would be the benefit of transportation to the people. But the first object, from my standpoint, would be the benefit that the leasing of these lines would be to the government system itself. As I say, I have not gone into the merits of any of these roads to see which ones if any we should lease. My hon. friend will see that any lease we might make, or any negotiations we might enter upon for making a lease, would always be made on the distinct understanding that they would not be binding until parliament gave its approval.

Mr. CROCKET. Would that mean that the government railway would not operate the lines until parliament approved?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. CROCKET. I can hardly see the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will understand that the government could have gone ahead without a Bill. We could have entered into negotiations without parliament having first said: We are agreeable, and if you find a line that will be of benefit to the government road, you may enter upon negotiations. By the passage of this Bill parliament approves of the principle of leasing any line or lines if they are found to be of benefit to the government system, although the details of such lease must be approved by parliament before they can become effective. One of the safeguards we will have in considering questions of that kind is the fact that the government line will not consider any proposition unless the board of management first approves or recommends it; and secondly, the chief engineer of the department must approve the standard of the road before the government will enter into negotiations for its acquisition, it being understood that an arrangement would not come into force until parliament had given its approval.

Mr. SPROULE. I would expect that the government would not propose a Bill like this unless they were prepared to inform the House whether it is the fixed policy of the government to extend the principle of government ownership of railways. If that is not their policy, it does not seem to be the part of wisdom to proceed along this line without some definite object in

view. I would naturally expect that the Minister of Railways had gone into an inquiry, through this board or through his chief engineer, with regard to the situation of the Intercolonial railway and the conditions which make it a non-paying concern, and that the object of these leases was to make it a paying concern in the future. I think also he ought to be able to tell the House whether it is the determination of the government to go on and extend government ownership, because there is a great deal of controversy going on over that matter, some being in favour of it and some against it. I think there is a motion on the Order Paper for passing the Intercolonial over to some other railway to run it. Now, that indicates that there are some persons, at least from the maritime provinces, who are opposed to this principle. I think the Minister of Railways ought to be able to furnish such data to the House as will justify us in saying now that we are giving you a free hand, you have something in view, you have looked carefully over the ground, there are many feeders to this railway that would be valuable if put in good condition, providing we can lease them at a reasonable figure. But I agree with the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that the government have such power already. Did they not do it with the Gibson railway, and with the Drummond County railway? Have they not done it several times during the last 14 or 15 years with reference to railways in the maritime provinces? Now, what different relation will the government be in with regard to this work after the Bill has been passed from what they were in before? They could already make a lease subject to ratification by parliament if they thought proper to do so. They will be able to do the same thing in future, so I cannot see what great benefit is going to be accomplished by this Bill. At any rate, if we pass the Bill it is assenting to the principle, and if that principle means the extension of government ownership of railways we ought to be given some better information than we possess at present. I am not opposing the Bill, but I think the Minister of Railways ought to be able to furnish the House with better data than he has, and a more elaborate scheme, and show us that he has carefully considered this subject, and that he thinks it will be wise for us to extend the principle.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would be glad to give my hon. friend an outline of an elaborate scheme if I had one; but I frankly stated to the House what my view is, that it is proposed to obtain from parliament authority to have the Board of Management investigate any line that they think would be beneficial to the government line of railways, and authority to lease any such line. As to the enlargement of government ownership, I am not prepared to announce any particular policy. The present policy of the government is public ownership of the Intercolonial railway; and so long as we own that line, which will probably be quite a while, I propose to make the best of it. But my hon. friend says there is a question on the Order Paper suggesting that the Intercolonial be leased. If the government were proposing to lease the government road, such a movement as this would neither help nor hinder the leasing of the government road. My own opinion is that if a company owned the Intercolonial, it would have had possession of some at least of these branch lines long before this. If it be true, as has been argued time and again in this House, that the leasing of certain lines would not only improve the transportation facilities for the people, but also increase the usefulness of the government line, then parliament ought to be prepared to give us the power asked for in this Bill—to investigate and see if this be true in any case, and, if so, to act accordingly.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister say that the government has not already the power to investigate a railway and enter into negotiations to lease without the passing of this Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I explained a few moments ago, the government can investigate this or any other question. But there is this difference, that with this measure on the statute book, parliament has approved of the principle of leasing any branch line which it may be found, after investigation, to be in the interest of the government railway to lease. We are starting on that investigation with the approval of parliament to the policy of leasing these lines if proper conditions do exist, the details to be submitted to parliament.

Mr. CROCKET. But the lease is not to become effective, I understood the minister to say, until it is submitted to parliament and is approved by parliament. If so, I cannot see the purpose of this Bill at all, unless as a meaningless sop offered to the member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Railways has perhaps properly described the effect of this Bill when he says that it gives the government a general authority to negotiate. He says, as I understand him, that general authority to negotiate ought to be granted by parliament, but in that case he should make it clear to us that there are some lines of railway in Quebec and in the maritime provinces which may usefully be acquired by the Intercolonial railway, having regard to

the interests of the people in respect to transportation, and having regard to the interests of the Intercolonial railway as a going concern. I may say in passing that I rather object to the expression of government ownership. I would like the government to understand that they do not own the Intercolonial railway. They are for the time being, unfortunately for the people of this country, entrusted with its management and control; but the railway is owned by the people of Canada, and not by the government at all. I must confess that I would have expected the Minister of Railways and Canals, according to his own definition, to have given us a little more information than he has given us so far. He has not made it clear that, in his own opinion, there are any railways of that character. He has referred us to certain reports of certain gentlemen appointed by this government and certain other gentlemen appointed by the government of New Brunswick, who have arrived at certain conclusions. I am not very familiar with these reports, and the minister appears to be no more familiar. However, he has not stated to what extent he has acepted their conclusions, nor has he given us the name of any railway which he thinks it advisable for the government to acquire. More than that, he has not intimated to us the principle upon which the government or the Government Railway Management Board will proceed in dealing with this question. Although the minister very cleverly introduced into his speech words that are not in the Bill, I do not observe in the Bill itself any statement of policy upon which the Government Railway Management Board will proceed. I understand that they have full discretionary powers of management and control so far as the operation of the Intercolonial railway is concerned; but I do not understand what discretionary powers they are to have in regard to leasing branch lines. I do not understand what considerations they are to have regard to in coming to a conclusion. The Bill leaves us entirely ignorant on this point, and the minister also leaves us ignorant of that. If the minister asks us for this Bill as a general authority to negotiate, and that is all it can amount to, ought he not to give to the House some explanation of the principles upon which they will proceed to negotiate—what considerations they will have regard to and upon what lines they will proceed, in coming to a conclusion as to whether they shall recommend or not? I can understand that the Intercolonial railway might embark upon a policy of acquiring ultimately every one of these branch lines. That is perfectly intelligible whether we approve of it or not. I can understand that the policy might be very much more restricted than that—that it might relate only to such of these lines as would in the immediate future become financially profitable to the Intercolonial railway as a going concern. I can understand that lines would be acquired because they would give increased transportation facilities to the people, and although not immediately profitable, would become profitable within a reasonable period. There are other lines of policy that might be suggested. The minister does not commit himself to anything, and only asks for general power to negotiate. He does not give us the slightest idea of the lines on which the action of the government or the Railway Management Board is to be conducted. I am bound to say that I am in favour, so far as I am personally concerned, of coming to parliament first and stating what the government proposes to do and getting this general authority to negotiate. I think that, perhaps, on the whole—although there may be a difference of opinion—that is the wiser and fairer course to pursue. But I do not think it a very advantageous course to pursue unless we get from the minister some intimation of the lines upon which the general power to negotiate will be exercised and the policy which will influence the government in coming to a conclusion, one way or the other, with regard to any of these lines.

Mr. BLACK. I would like very much to have a little more light on this question. When it comes to a vote, I propose to vote on this Bill. At the present juncture, I do not know whether I shall vote for it or against it. Unless I get a little more light on the subject, a little more information than I have now, I shall be strongly inclined to vote against it. I think that the minister must surely have had in mind, when he prepared that Bill, some branch railways or some number of branch railways that he was going to acquire. For myself, I would like to have some definite information what branches are to be taken in. Is it for a few branches in New Brunswick that are not paying a dividend and never will pay a dividend, under present management? Is it for some branches in the province of Quebec that are in trouble? Is it for certain branches in Nova Scotia that are not paying dividends? I remember that, last autumn, a commission was appointed to examine and report on the subject of branch railways. And I was astonished to learn afterwards that the most prosperous branch, the branch that runs through the best part of the maritime provinces, the Dominion Atlantic railway, had not been examined or reported on at all. This road, as many hon. members know, runs through the richest part of the maritime provinces——

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLACK. Perhaps the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) does not know,

but I know that this road runs through the richest part of the maritime provinces; that we send over that road between half a million and a million barrels of apples alone every year; that the country through which it runs is handicapped by that railway, a country that would be alive with manufactures if we had a railway that was assisting manufacturing development, in stead of taking out of the manufacturers all they can. This is a railway which is managed from London, and anything in Canada managed from London has hardly ever been prosperous so far as Canadians are concerned. I say I was astounded to learn that this road had never been examined or reported on by the commissioners. And when I inquired the reason, I found that there had been a difference between the management of that road and the commission in regard to the cost of running over the road. I believe—of course, I am not speaking positively, but the information came to me from a very good source—the management wanted $30 a day for taking the commissioners over the road, and the commissioners, in an economical frame of mind, refused to give it, and made no report on the road. I should like to know, before I vote, if it is contemplated to take over the Dominion Atlantic as one of the branches of the Intercolonial. It can be bought, and it is not in bankruptcy. All that any one has to do is to look at the report sent to the government every year, and he will find it to be a good paying road. A part of it is leased from the Intercolonial railway. This private company actually leases part of its road from the Intercolonial. And it is one of the best paying pieces of road in Canada. I would like to know if the government intend to withdraw that lease. It was a foolish lease in the beginning, it has been a foolish lease so far as as the people of Nova Scotia are concerned ever since, and it will continue to be a foolish lease until the end. I repeat that I should like very much to have a little more information before deciding whether I shall oppose this Bill or support it.

Mr. SPROULE. How would it do to use this power as a means to extend the Intercolonial westward to Georgian bay?

Mr. TALBOT. I have opposed any further purchase, lease or administration of any railway in addition to what the government possesses. And I oppose it now. And I am prepared to say that, unless things happen that should change my mind—and they will have to be very real and important things, I shall oppose it for many years to come.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Bill before us is, to my mind, an extraordinary one; it is something new, I think, in the way of railway legislation. The powers asked for by the government are very unusual, and they are asked upon a basis of very little information as to how the Bill will actually be carried into effect. I understand that the Bill will authorize the government to lease certain railways—we do not know what railways, nor do we know whether they are rich corporations or poor ones. They may be corporations whose bonds are not worth ten cents on the dollar; but the moment the government gets this power to lease these roads, no doubt the bonds will go up very quickly. To my mind, there is an open door there for a good speculation on the part of some one down in New Brunswick or Quebec. I should like more information before we are called upon to vote on the question. I do not wish to oppose anything that is in the interests of the Intercolonial railway or will promote the interests of the maritime provinces or Quebec in relation to their railway systems. But it does seem to me that there is something about this Bill that is rather dark. Under it, the Minister of Railways is to be authorized to lease certain roads in whole or in part, in fact, any line or lines connected with the government railway. And he is authorized to do this upon the recommendation of the Government Railways Managing Board. In effect, the Minister of Railways is authorized to do this on his own recommendation, because, practically, the Minister of Railways and the Managing Board of the Intercolonial are one and the same power—I do not think they are very far apart yet. I confess that the legislation is of a character new to me; it seems to me to give the Minister of Railways extraordinary powers. Now, if the recommendations of the government Railways Managing Board would go so far as to tell before the purchase is gone into who the owners of the railway are, and what is the value of the road, whether it is a bankrupt road or one paying dividends, and so on, I could see my way more clearly to giving the minister this power. But, if the Bill passes, he is to get this power without our having any information as to the value of the road or roads to be leased. That, to my mind, is a very strong objection, and I think the minister ought to see his way to remedying that defect. I assume that the minister will not press this to a conclusion at once, but that he will give members a further opportunity of looking into the matter and by all means that he will be able to place before the House, before the Bill passes its second reading, definite information with regard to the names of the railways he proposes to purchase, their value, the value of their securities and the holders of these securities, practically a statement of the persons who are to be benefited by this leasing or

purchase. It looks to me like a dark horse. I think we are taking a great deal for granted if we confer on the minister a power like this on the limited information he has given.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I am afraid the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is unduly suspicious. It never occurred to me that there was anything very dark or dangerous about the Bill; it seemed one of the most moderate and reasonable Bills ever submitted to parliament and I should be surprised if, after a fair consideration of the Bill, there is any serious opposition to it. The adoption of this Bill simply asserts a principle which has frequently found expression in the debates of this House and which every man in any way acquainted with railway matters will readily approve. That principle is that where there are branch lines connected with a large and important system it would undoubtedly be in the interest of economy and efficiency that these branch lines should be consolidated with the general system if such a consolidation can be brought about on fair and reasonable terms. It needs no argument to say that a short branch line of railway may be economically a failure, its expensive management may be so great that it cannot pay even its working expenses. Take that same branch line and consolidate it with a large system and instead of a burden it might become a useful feeder to the larger system. Any hon. gentleman who has the slightest knowledge of railways will at once agree to this general principle. It is well known that along the line of the Intercolonial railway there are a number of branches worked more or less inefficiently—I will not say more or less efficiently, some of them are not worked efficiently, and it is believed that if these branches were consolidated with the Intercolonial railway better results could be obtained. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen opposite that it is essential to specify what branches are in contemplation. For myself I have no idea of a single branch which will be leased under this Bill, while I have no doubt that some branches will be acquired by way of lease. The criticism of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) rather goes to the fact that the minister will have to come back to parliament for approval. That goes to show that the Minister of Railways has not been taking to himself some unwarranted power but has been unduly modest. He does not ask authority to enter into any binding arrangement with anybody but he does ask the House to accept the principle involved in this Bill that the consolidation of branch lines with the Intercolonial railway is a desirable thing if it can be brought about on fair and reasonable terms. Any branch of the Intercolonial railway may properly be brought within the operation of this Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My criticism was confined to the absence of any statement by the minister as to the principle upon which the government intended to proceed. What will be the government's policy after getting this power to negotiate? I approve of their coming here to get the power to negotiate as I have said, but I think we are entitled to some statement of what the policy of the government will be.

Mr. FIELDING. It is certainly desirable that there should be as clear an understanding as possible, but my hon. friend will agree that inasmuch as we must come back to parliament for approval, even although the government should be unwise enough not to negotiate in the right direction, the rights of parliament are fully protected. The Bill sets forth, in the first place, that the road must be in good and safe condition. There is a very important assertion of principle. If you take a dilapidated road and acquire it by lease, although on the surface it may seem to be a good arrangement, you may have to spend a large amount in putting it in order. Therefore the Minister of Railways has wisely determined that he will not consider the acquisition of any branch line unless it is in a safe condition.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Railway managers often take over a road just because it is in a poor condition and put it in good order.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt there might be cases where the Minister of Railways would say to the parties: Your road is not in a condition to enable me to negotiate for it; put it in a substantial position so that we will not have to spend a large amount of money on it and we will deal with you. There are a number of railways that might be acquired, notably in New Brunswick. There are very few in Nova Scotia that would be willing to be called branch lines. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) has spoken of the Dominion Atlantic. I am afraid the Dominion Atlantic would be offended if it were called a branch line.

Mr. BLACK. I do not mind offending them, they have offended us often enough.

Mr. FIELDING. People are often very glad to get railway accommodation and when they get it are sometimes too ready to find fault with the railway company. However that may be, I think the House ought to adopt the principle of this Bill. It is a principle of what might be called the economy of railway management.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Dominion Atlantic could come under this.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not confined to branch lines, it is any line connecting. It might be a railway 1,000 miles in length.

Mr. FIELDING. It might be, but we have not any railways of that length down there.

Mr. LENNOX. It might be anywhere, it might be the Canadian Northern.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think there is any danger of a branch of 1,000 miles in length being brought under this Bill and anyhow, as we must come back to parliament for ratification of any agreement made, my hon. friend will see that the public interests are adequately protected. This Bill simply authorizes the Minister of Railways to enter upon the consideration of a policy that has again and again found advocates on both sides of this House. True the minister could have gone ahead made his negotiations and then come back to parliament, but he has thought it best to pursue the policy, which I am glad to say has won the approval of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), of coming here and asking a general declaration in favour of the principle. I would take it for granted that the managing board would have to satisfy the Minister of Railways that the road will either from the beginning or at a very early stage pay its own working expenses and a sufficient sum to protect the government against loss. That leads me to repeat the observation I ventured to make that it is quite possible a branch railway which is losing money as a branch line might even make a little when consolidated with the general system. I think the Bill is reasonable, I think the criticism of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) that we do not need to come to parliament as we have the power to negotiate without coming to parliament, while true is not important; in fact I think it is much wiser that the minister should come here and ask parliament to give general approval to the principle laid down and then I think it is not too much to ask the House to believe that the Minister of Railways and the managing board will not recommend the acquisition, even by way of lease, of any railway which would not be a helper to the Intercolonial railway. But if the Minister of Railways should be so unwise as to do that and if his colleagues in the government should be so unwise as to encourage him to do it, you still have the safeguard of this House of Commons and this parliament, because no lease that the minister might propose could be of any binding effect until it had been submitted to this House and had received the approval of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) was asking for light a little while ago. I watched him quite closely while the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was diffusing such light as he has diffused on this Bill; I did not see much of an answering gleam on the face of my hon. friend, and when the Minister of Finance got up I noticed that my hon. friend fixed both eyes on him. I do not believe I am far astray when I venture the guess that no very great light has gone into the cranium of the hon. member for Hants as a result of the explanation or the diffusing of light by the hon. Finance Minister.

Mr. BLACK. I am still waiting for light.

Mr. FOSTER. Still waiting! Then, I want to give the hon. member for Hants some of the light he was asking for. If he will just remove the little blur before his eyes and look back and down he will see a certain figure, not long ago upon the ministerial benches. He will see that that figure is no longer on the ministerial benches, but is removed a little farther to the right, and he will remember that that gentleman has had for some years a very decided liking for the absorption of maritime province railways by the Intercolonial railway, that he has advocated it in the country before his constituents, advocated it in the House, that he has pestered and bothered the present Minister of Railways and Canals considerably by the persistent advocacy and criticism which accompanied that advocacy, and that as a result the Minister of Railways, bothered with the fellow, gave a commission and had some of his wise men sail around about the maritime provinces. They had a good time, looked over all these roads, drew their money, got their expenses and then prepared a report for him which, strange to say, the Minister of Railways has not yet read. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong to this extent, that it was laid on the table last year and he should have read it if he has not.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not talking about myself. The hon. member for Hants has not been asking me for light.

Mr. GRAHAM. But you are attempting to give it to him.

Mr. FOSTER. And I thought that it was a fair assumption from what the minister said that he had not looked within the pages of the report. Has he?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have read it through twice.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, if my hon. friend has read it through twice, it is a very poor report or he would be able to give his opinions in reference to it. Now, he certainly says that he has not bestowed any thought upon it at all. Meanwhile the hon. member for Westmorland, still somewhat critical, a little on the offside, bothers the minister again, and the minister says: I

will have another whack at him; I will put some enabling measure on the law-book; I will have a statute that will enable me to take in these railways. Of course, I am not going to bestow any bother upon looking into the question whether there are or are not any roads. This is sufficient for my purpose at the present time. My purpose is to get another stepping stone away from that bothersome man from Westmorland. That is about all the light there is in it except that a little more may be shed upon it in this way. I see a splendid arrangement for future good work about the time of the coming elections. The minister comes down and says: Here is a matter of sufficient gravity to be called to the attention of two hundred and odd gentlemen whose time is precious and who are here to consider serious, honest and earnest legislation. He first calls the attention of his colleagues to it and says: This is the measure that I propose to bring down, and then he calls the attention of the House to it. When he calls the attention of the House to it, asks them to pass it, and they ask him for his policy he has no more policy than the man in the moon. He cannot tell us whether he believes there are any roads that would come under this category. He does not say whether he will find the branches in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Quebec, or whether he will use this power as a possible negotiating instrument to obtain a road and join it on to the Intercolonial railway at the city of Montreal running to the Great Lakes, or a road running across the prairies, or a road running all the way across to the Pacific ocean, because, under the enabling power of this Act, he can enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific railway to-morrow or any day and can acquire these roads by lease, provided they are willing.

Mr. FIELDING. But he could do that without the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. He could do that without the Act, but let me tell you what I say is the difference between doing it with and without the Act. You have done it without an Act. The government have done things equal to this and like it, as the government are doing time after time. Instance after instance is given. But, there is this difference which is two-fold. The moment you pass this Act everybody knows that the minister will have every branch and small railway which joins with or is in close proximity to the Intercolonial railway on his back and he will no longer have the advantage of being able to say to them: The government has not made up its mind in reference to this; I have no authority for this sort of thing. The best I can do would be to make a sort of arrangement with you and to take it to parliament. But the moment the Act is passed he is in a very different position. They come to him and say: You have no excuse for not entering into negotiations for this road. Here is a branch road, we want you to take it over; what is your excuse for not doing it? You have the approval of the House to do the very thing that we are asking you to do. Does not the minister see that his powers of resistance are absolutely taken away from him and he cannot help but enter into negotiations with them and yield to their pressure? Then, when it comes down to the House, the House itself is restricted and restrained when the minister rises and says: Here is the report of my board of managers, here is the report of my engineer, I am doing exactly what parliament has sanctioned and ordered to be done under certain conditions and why are you opposing it? So, the power is made all the greater as against any opposing force because the government would say: We have the authority of parliament; we have simply entered into a contract with the authority of parliament and it must be passed. It is difficult for the opposition, even though part of it is composed of men on the government side, to make headway against a government measure when it is brought down for the first time, but it is infinitely more difficult when it is brought down in sequence of a measure that approves of the principle involved in the transaction. The House will have committed itself to the principle once it passes this Act, and that is the reason why I rather agree with my hon. friend the late Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to this matter. But there has not been a single assertion made by the government or the minister who is bringing down this measure as to how extensive or how limited this power may be. Does the minister think this proper to ask us to confirm a power which might be applied to all the great railways of the country because they all merge into either the city of Montreal, or the city of Quebec, as well as the points along the Intercolonial railway. It is of continental application and the ministers, in bringing in their Bill, do not even say that they do not contemplate going beyond branch lines. It is giving them a tremendous omnibus power and this parliament is binding itself that if certain conditions are fulfilled they may carry out the operation. Then, there is another point in connection with the matter and it was hinted at by my hon. friend from Halton. What a splendid avenue this opens up to the ingenious and skilful schemer. Here is an omnibus proposition. Here are some people who to-day own the bonds of a crippled railway. They say: The government has the power to take this railway over and operate it. Once it is taken over and operated and the blood of the Intercolonial railway system runs in its deadened veins,

it will suddenly come to the point of not only sustaining itself but of giving profits, and what a splendid avenue it opens up to companies of every kind to bring influence upon the minister and the government to negotiate with reference to the absorption of a certain road and possibly to carry it out. We will wake up after the negotiations have carried through probably to the fact that somebody has got the worthless bonds, worthless up to that time and that these people will then have made a fortunate speculation for themselves. As to the recommendation upon which the minister acts, what does it amount to as it is outlined in this section? Nothing at all. They need not give a single reason to the minister. If the minister communes with himself or with his creatures for he is the creator of these creatures; if he communes with himself and satisfies himself he takes that part of himself which is outside himself, to wit his board of managers and he says: Write me a recommendation. They write him a recommendation which may be in five lines or less and he comes down to the House with that recommendation and it is not worth a hill of beans simply because it is not a reasoned recommendation. He does not provide for a reasoned recommendation in this Bill and he ought to provide for it. The grounds upon which the recommendation is based should be set out and should become the property of the House when they are asked to consider the matter. It does seem to me that the minister and the government have not thought about this thing sufficiently to give us light on it. I join in the pitiful cry of the member for Hants: Light, more light upon this subject before we can consider it.

Mr. MACDONALD. This little preliminary discussion has swung in a rather wide circle ranging from the position of my hon. friend from York that this Bill had absolutely no meaning whatever, to the wild flights of imagination indulged in by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). Now that we have had these preliminary fireworks it might be well for us to consider just what this proposition really means. We do not need to soar to imagination nor descend to misrepresentation to arrive at the proper conclusion which is quite apparent to any one who looks at the measure with calmness and deliberation. It is nothing more nor less than that the government has asked this House to affirm the principle that it would be desirable for them to go into the question of obtaining a lease of certain branch lines along the Intercolonial railway to be utilized as feeders thereof and in connection therewith. My hon. friend from Toronto has no doubt overlooked the preamble of this measure which expressly limits the railways to be leased under this Act to such railways as are feeders of and are in connection with the Intercolonial railway. I do think that this proposition is sufficiently important to engage the attention of hon. members in a somewhat more serious discussion. Is it wise that this parliament should say to the government that they should look into the question of what branch lines lying along the Intercolonial railway would be advantageous to the people of the country generally as well as to the people of the country living along the lines of the railways in question. We have had the matter discussed at various sessions in the abstract, but parliament has never declared one way or the other on the proposition, and now this Bill asks for a declaration in favour of it. Of course hon. gentlemen know that it is impossible for the minister to say that he proposes to lease this, that or the other railway, but it is well within the knowledge of every member of this House that last year a return was brought down showing that after investigation it was found that there were 15 branch railways lying along the Intercolonial. Some of which it might be advisable to incorporate with that trunk line of railway. Let me premise by saying that so far as the operation of the Intercolonial is concerned, after you leave the city of Quebec and until you come to Campbellton it can hardly be said that the Intercolonial strikes any point that is accessible to the ocean. From Campbellton you run through a country that does not connect with any ocean port until you come to St. John; thence you run along to Halifax and the railway touches at one or two points only in Nova Scotia which are available for ocean transportation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Could you not connect at Metapedia and get an ocean port along the Bay Chaleur to Gaspé?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That railway is only constructed to Paspebiac.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is an ocean port.

Mr. MACDONALD. The railway is not yet constructed to Gaspé, and we have the Intercolonial railway in the anomalous position that with the exception of some points in Nova Scotia and at St. John, the whole of that vast range of coast along the maritime provinces is not reached directly by the Intercolonial but is reached by some 15 or 16 branch lines. That is a condition of affairs that invites attention. Some of us dream of the time when this country will be sufficiently self-contained that at least in the winter season we will be able to control Canadian exports through Canadian ports, and make our own ports the avenue through which will come our imports. That seems to me to be a laudable idea and one which we should aim to attain. And, in order that we may control the traffic to the sea the proposition now before us be-

comes a very important one. What this Bill does is that it asks parliament to say whether or not parliament approves of the idea of incorporating these branch line feeders with the trunk line. Upon the wisdom of that proposition a gentleman of such wide experience as Mr. Tiffin, the traffic manager of the Intercolonial, and formerly of the Canadian Pacific railway, and Mr. Story, say:

> The want of proper facilities for the conduct of even the existing traffic is detrimentally affecting the business interests of the districts interested in these branches, and preventing that development of industries, enhancement of property values, and general betterment that would undoubtedly follow on an improved service.
>
> The present branches are hampered by lack of capital and insufficient equipment, and are not in a financial position to increase their inadequate traffic facilities, and the absorption of these lines into the Intercolonial system would beyond question result in a greatly improved condition of affairs.
>
> It is a well established fact that in nearly every case where branch lines have been absorbed by trunk lines, and extended markets have thus been opened up for business along the main lines, such a policy has not only proved to be of great value to the branch lines, but has provided additional revenue for the main line, they becoming valuable feeders, increasing the traffic and the earning powers of the trunk lines.

One need not argue that proposition further. The magnificent success which has attended the Canadian Pacific railway throughout this country and which has made it the pride of every Canadian, has been very largely due to the wise policy of its directors in reaching out here and there and absorbing the feeders of the Canadian Pacific railway which has developed the territory through which they ran. The position of the Minister of Railways simply is: that the government should be permitted to look into the advisability of acquiring the branch lines and feeders of the peoples' railway as the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk and other railway systems in Canada have done with regard to their connecting lines. To that proposition the House cannot fail to give assent. The interests concerned are not merely local or provincial but they are great national issues in that the object sought is to obtain an outlet for the Intercolonial railway to the various ocean ports of the maritime provinces and a connection with the mineral resources of these provinces. As to whether or not any one is to be injured by the minister entering into negotiations for the purpose of obtaining a lease of a railway which is in proper condition for operation, I think the Bill throws around that the very proper safeguard that nothing can be eventually done without the sanction of parliament.

I venture to say that my hon. friend from North Toronto, who conjured up some difficulties that might result from the adoption of this Bill, would not be deterred from the most energetic opposition to any proposal which the Minister of Railways might bring down if he chose to think that the proper thing to do was to oppose it. It is perfectly understood that the House does not commit itself to the adoption of any particular proposal under this Act until it is submitted; but by this Bill, if it is adopted, parliament will commit itself to the proposal that it is wise that the Intecolonial railway should enter upon the policy of incorporating branch lines.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member tell me what difference there is between the power the Minister of Railways and the government possess now and the power they will possess after this Bill passes?

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend had listened to the argument of his hon. leader who sits beside him, he would not have found it necessary to ask me that question. The hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto both made it clear that this Bill does do a very important and serious thing, in that it declares that the policy of this country shall be to incorporate with the Intercolonial railway such branch lines as it may be advantageous to the country to incorporate with it, and the minister is authorized to go on and negotiate subject to the ratification of this House. It affirms an important principle that has never before been affirmed by parliament, and for that reason this is an important measure. The question of the acquisition of branch lines is one in which not only the people of the maritime provinces, but the people of the whole of Canada, are interested. I would like as a sequence to this proposition that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways would look into one or two other matters relating to the extension of the Intercolonial railway. The construction of a line of railway from Moncton to Pugwash, along the north shore of Nova Scotia, and the construction of a comparatively small addition from New Glasgow to Country Harbour in Guysboro would give the people of this country a line of railway exactly the same in length as that part of the Intercolonial now running from Moncton to Halifax, and would place the ocean-going trade 100 miles nearer to the other side it is at present by the line to Halifax.

Mr. BLACK. And by a good port too.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is a matter beyond doubt. I have frequently pressed this proposal on the minister privately. It is to be hoped that

the people of Canada generally will appreciate the ambition of this little province down by the sea, that as we go on developing Canada it may more and more become the entry and the exit for the trade of this country. We look to measures such as the one before the House as hastening the time when our ideas and ambitions in that respect may be realized.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can point to any Act on the statutes of this country that enacts a theory. I have always thought that parliament enacted something, and not merely a theory or a principle without anything being done.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend will find that this proposal is no mere theory, but a very practical piece of legislation which I hope will be for the good of Canada.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) appears to think that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Geo. E. Foster) has been indulging in a little imagination. On the contrary, I think that what the hon. member for North Toronto said is very hard business, and it is just the kind of business that I would expect from him. Before I heard a word that he uttered, I had prepared and intended to introduce an amendment on the very point he raised, and I do not think I am much given to imagination. The hon. member for Pictou tells us that everything is made right by the preamble—that satisfies the general idea. But the point is that the preamble does not say how much of the preamble is to be looked to by the minister, how much by the board of management and how much by the chief engineer. When we come to clause 3, however, we find how very little the board of management have to do. The minister will go to his board of management and will say: Do you think we ought to lease such a railway or such half dozen railways? And they will say: Perhaps we ought to, the line would be more or less valuable to the government railway; yes, we recommend that. Then the minister enters into negotiation and ascertains what the terms are likely to be; but there is not a word in that clause that requires him to obtain from the board of management their approval of the terms. It is very little use to ask, as protection to the people of this country, the approval of the board of management unless that approval covers the terms of the lease, and that is the very question raised by the hon. member for North Toronto. Now, I propose to ask the House to amend that clause to that effect. Then we shall have a recommendation that will be worth something to us. I might very easily recommend the minister to take a lease of a piece of property; but when I saw the terms of the lease. I might advise him not to have anything to do with it on those terms. I hope the minister will not object to making that point clear. So far as I am concerned, if it is made perfectly clear, I approve his getting the recommendation from his board of management, which consists of practical railway men and experts in railway management. In committee I propose to move an amendment to that effect.

Mr. CONGDON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken with respect to the purport of this section 3. The recommendation of the Government Railways Managing Board must cover the whole terms of the lease, and it is only the report of the chief engineer that relates to the good and safe condition of the road. So that objection appears to me to be removed by the terms of section 3 of the Bill itself. I think it is a matter of common knowledge to this House that the Intercolonial needs some extension in order that it may become efficient and effective, and serve the country through which it runs. It is also a matter of common knowledge to this House that there are many branch roads connecting with the Intercolonial which it would be in the interest of that system to acquire. It appears to me, therefore that there is some soundness in the contention that this Bill does not give any additional power to the Minister of Railways, but is merely an intimation that this parliament supports him in the endeavour he contemplates making to add to the effectiveness of the service of the Intercolonial. Ample protection is thrown around the whole operation under this section, by providing at the end that any lease made under it is of no effect until ratified by the parliament of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it is necessary to add much to what has been said. I assure the House that this Bill was not introduced, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) thinks, to placate a certain gentleman lest by his continual coming he might weary me. It is a sincere desire to make the best possible out of the government railway; that is the only desire I have, not to try to serve any friends, or disconcert any enemies. I want to make it clear to the House that my Bill is introduced with the object in view of taking parliament into the entire confidence of the government, and having a decision on this question before we enter upon negotiations; and then, after negotiations have been entered upon, to submit the details to parliament for ratification. We want everything to be done openly and above board, after the fullest investigation and scrutiny are made. I can assure my

hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who discussed this question from a practical point of view, that I certainly thought I had covered the point he has mentioned. The minister does not propose to enter upon negotiations to lease any line unless upon the recommendation of the board, which recommendation shall include the terms of the lease also. Certainly that is my intention, and if it is not clear we will make it clear in committee. I assure the House again that this Bill is for the sole purpose of rendering, if possible, the government railways more efficient. We take the step in the interest of the public and of the government line, and if it is found after investigation by practical men, that they are lines, the leasing of which would bring about this object, then we will proceed to negotiate for a lease.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Might I ask if any applications have been made to the government, or any negotiations have been entered into with any branch line company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The only discussion I have had as to branch lines, hon. gentlemen have heard it all in the House. There has been no application for leasing any line from any company that has come to my knowledge.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Allow me briefly to draw the distinction between the position of the government before this Bill is passed and their position after it is passed. The House and the minister must remember that by the passage of this Bill we affirm the principle that branch lines may be a necessity of government railways, and we empower the government to enter into arrangements for acquiring them. When we affirm the principle and give power to the government, it is the duty of the government to acquire them. Look at the different position you are in after the passage of this Bill from the position you are in before. Before, the option was left entirely with the government to enter into an arrangement of this kind or not; but after the passage of this Bill, if my reasoning is correct, it is compulsory upon the government to do so, you have no longer an option. If a branch line, or any railway that connects with the Intercolonial, is considered to be necessary for the Intercolonial, and will increase the earnings of the Intercolonial, we affirm the principle that under certain circumstances the government must acquire that branch line. My contention is that you are not merely passing an empowering Act, but you are laying down a principle which the government must enforce. Now I differ from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who thought perhaps it was best to come to parliament and get the power. He qualified that statement, however, by saying that the principle should be laid down before exercising the power, and that a principle could be laid down in an Act of parliament which would guide the commission in making the inquiry, and the government in exercising the option. The better plan I think the government may act upon at the present time. If they think, in the interests of this road, that it is desirable to enter into an agreement with branch line companies to acquire their property, then let the government come to parliament and get the necessary power, after they have obtained the opinion of the board of management that the road is likely to be useful to the Intercolonial, and the opinion of the chief engineer that the road is in a proper condition. Then parliament would authorize the government to go on and acquire the road.

Mr. NESBITT. I am sorry to disagree with my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who is much older and more experienced than myself in these matters. But I cannot see that if we adopt the principle of authorizing the Minister of Railways and his board of management to inquire whether it would be well to acquire a branch line or lines, that we thereby force the government to do so. I do not believe there is anything in the whole Bill that would suggest such a thing. If the Bill is not clear enough on the question that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) raised, let it be made clear, but I think it is perfectly clear. When I read the Bill I thought that was the intention of the Minister of Railways, but if that intention is not clear let it be made clear. Now as I am not of a suspicious turn of mind like my hon. friends of the opposition, who think that this Bill hides some sinister purpose, I must say that for my part I commend the Minister of Railways for coming to this House and asking us to lay down a principle before he proceeds with the investigation of any particular road with a view of taking it over. I understand it is the intention that the board shall investigate any particular road which in their judgment they think would be serviceable in increasing the earning power of the Intercolonial. If this board are not capable of doing that, they are not capable of managing the Intercolonial, they are not capable of doing what they are supposed to be doing now.

Therefore, as I think, personally, that they are capable, and as I think the minister is wholly capable. I believe this House runs no risk in trusting to this board the further addition to their duties of examining into whether branch railways will be a benefit to this railway or not. The principle of branch railways has been adopted not only by the great roads of this country but by the great roads of the United States as well. Feeders are absolutely necessary in order to get re-

turns, and it is returns we want, after all, from the Intercolonial. I believe that when we have the statement of the Intercolonial before us, it will show that we were justified in appointing this board of management. As I have stated before, that I believe we do not run any risk. The minister has to come back to this House with all the terms and particulars; he has to get sanction for every piece of road he proposes to take over. It seems to me there is no reason for the suspicion which seems to exist in the minds of some hon. members, judging by the expressions we have heard this afternoon. We must trust to a very large extent to the management. The minister has to report to the governor in council and get their sanction and he has to get also the sanction of parliament. How can it be necessary to hedge him around more than with these precautions? Again I say that, for my part, I commend the minister for asking the authority of this House to the principle before taking action.

Mr. RHODES. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that the passage of this Bill will mean the affirmation by this House of the principle of the acquirement of branch roads. Upon that ground alone I am prepared to support the measure now before the House. It was not my intention to speak on this subject, because it seemed to me obvious that the Bill ought to pass. Privately-owned railways, whether in Canada or elsewhere, make their business successful in proportion as they acquire or build feeders for their lines, and, if the Intercolonial is to be run as a business proposition, to my mind it is obvious that it must acquire feeders along its route. So much from that standpoint; but there is another phase of the question which has not been discussed at all, and one to my mind that is of vital importance to the people of the constituency in which I live in common with many others in the maritime provinces and in Quebec. That point is that where there is a multiplicity of small railways, a shipper of freight who lives on a branch line has to pay two, and sometimes three, freights. In my own county, for instance, to send freight for a distance of only twelve miles in a certain direction three railways must be used. I speak of freight shipped from River Hebert via Maccan to Springhill. The freight must be sent over the Maritime Coal, Railway and Power Company's line to Maccan, then over the Intercolonial to Springhill Junction, and then over the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company's line to Springhill. Consequently, to cover this distance of nineteen miles a shipper is called upon to pay a larger sum for freight than he would have to pay for perhaps 100 miles over a line of railway owned by a single company or by the government, as the case may be. Without discussing the question further, I wish to say that I am in hearty accord with the principle of the Bill, and if it comes to a vote it is my intention to vote for it.

Mr. BLACK. I desire——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has spoken.

Mr. BLACK. Others have spoken twice——

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not call attention to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) speaking in answer to a question.

Mr. BLACK. But the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) spoke twice, and he is not a minister of the Crown.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BLACK. Have I the right, Mr. Speaker, to ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would warn the House that if the right to speak twice is given to one member, it can hardly be refused to another. The rule is against, but it is for the House to say whether the rule is to be lived up to.

Mr. FIELDING. Only a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose a question might be allowed.

Mr. BLACK. Before this vote is taken, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) if the refusal of his commission to examine and report on the Dominion Atlantic railway means that the minister does not consider that the Dominion Atlantic is a branch or connection of the Intercolonial and so is barred from the operation of this Bill? I feel very strongly on this subject, because we have been for years paying two freights on almost everything imported into that country. If we get a barrel of flour from Montreal, we pay two freights; if we get a parcel by express, two express charges must be paid. All our manufacturers who export have to pay double freight, and so have all the people who import goods into that country. I cannot help feeling warmly on this question, because the interests of the people I represent, the prosperity of the manufacturers and importers are vitally concerned. So far as the Act of the commissioners is concerned, I think they treated the country from Windsor to Annapolis not exactly very courteously. I would like to know in what position the Dominion Atlantic railway stands in regard to this scheme before I cast my vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a pretty long question; I am afraid it will take a long answer. As to the latter part of what the hon. member (Mr. Black) says, it rather proves what has been said before, that the Intercolonial so far as rates are concerned, is more beneficial to a community than an ordinary company road, else my hon. friend would not prefer that the Intercolonial should have the Dominion Atlantic. The second part of the hon. member's question is easily answered: There is nothing that would preclude the Dominion Atlantic from coming within the scope of this Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has already spoken.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have not spoken on the general subject; I only asked a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is an infraction of the rules——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I still say that I am within the rules, Mr. Speaker, as I only asked a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that a member may not speak twice on the same motion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I submit that asking a question is not interpreted as making a speech. I shall not occupy the attention of the House for more than a moment. I am an absolute believer in the public ownership of railways in Canada. Therefore, I believe in this country owning and maintaining in the highest efficiency the Intercolonial. I would like to see it extended and improved on the line indicated by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes). I take this measure to be a declaration in favour of the acquisition of local lines, and that it will mean an end to the talk and rumours and secret negotiations said to be under way concerning the handing over of the Intercolonial either to the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern. And with this new departure in favour of public ownership, I believe there will come an absence——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should confine himself to the question he wishes to ask.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think, Mr. Speaker, I can set myself right in your eyes by explaining that I said I had asked a question only, but had not spoken on the subject. I think I am quite within your previous ruling, having only asked a question, in speaking on the question now. There is a declaration to-day in favour of the extension of the principle of government ownership of railways to the wide extent of taking in all or most of the local lines in the provinces where the Intercolonial railway now runs. But if they are to be taken in, they must be taken in on business terms and on reasonable values, and the roads so acquired and the Intercolonial railway itself must be administered from the point of view of business and efficiency and must be absolutely separated from politics. I believe if public ownership is attempted in this country on those lines it will succeed, and I hope that not only will the Intercolonial railway be widened and broadened in the maritime provinces, but that at an early date this state-owned road, which to-day is Canada's greatest asset, will be extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I want to see the state-owned road extended into Ontario, I want to see it at the Niagara river and the Detroit river, and most of all I wish to see it extended where there is abundance of traffic and where the competition of such a road would discipline the great private-owned roads, that is in the west. We were told a while ago that it was very much in the air that the Intercolonial railway was to pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern. Instead of the disappearance of that road, I wish to see it extended, its administration made efficient, and its operations extended to the west. If there is room in this country for the extension of the Grand Trunk railway to the Canadian west, there should have been room and there is to-day room for the extension of the state-owned road to the Canadian west. My objection to the Transcontinental system is not so much that it was not required, it was required very much, but that I thought it should have been a part of the present state-owned road, the Intercolonial railway system. The government which is to-day taking the power to lease these roads could a short time ago have taken over the Parry Sound road which the Grand Trunk railway have now acquired. If they had acquired that road on reasonable terms, or on lease, the Intercolonial railway would to-day have been at the Georgian bay, which is now the source of the greatest amount of traffic for the roads going east. The Canadian Pacific railway are now double-tracking their system from the Georgian bay to Montreal and the ports of the St. Lawrence in order that they may handle the traffic of the west. In the same way, if the Intercolonial railway had taken a lease of the Canada Atlantic, the policy which is now begun in the east where there is very little traffic, would have produced such results that the Intercolonial railway, the state-owned road, would be in a much better position, would be able to pay all its expenses and even some interest on the cost of construction. So I agree

with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) that the principle is not a bad one, but that it ought to be lived up to in the best way. Speaking of state ownership and taking over leases, one way of bedevilling public ownership, and it has been practised a good deal in this country, is to apply the principle only where there is very little traffic or business, and then you have public ownership condemned. Take the instance of the government telegraph systems. The only government owned telegraph systems in Canada are those supplying the coast where there is very little or no business, and as a consequence, if you want to cite a horrible example of public ownership, you say: Oh, look at the government telegraph system! The only way to apply government ownership is to apply it where there is business and traffic, and the only way in which the Intercolonial railway will become the success it ought to become is to extend it into the province of Ontario, extend it to the Niagara boundary, to the Detroit river, put it in touch with the Georgian bay and extend it through the great Canadian west. That is the way to work government ownership in this country, and that is the way I hope we will yet see it.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the taking over of short branch lines connecting with the trunk line is, as a rule a very wise and proper policy. I understand from the Minister of Railways that in connection with the report which he proposed to get from his advisory board, the business aspect of these lines will be considered as well as their physical fitness. If they are taken over on a business basis, there is no doubt it should be a good thing for the branch lines, a good thing for the Intercolonial railway, and a good thing for the country. The danger is that very often branch lines are taken over as feeders and they turn out to be suckers. If that can be avoided I think the principle of the Bill is exceedingly good.

Mr. DANIEL. It has been stated this afternoon that this Bill, if passed, will not confer on the government any more power than it has already. That of course may be the case but the Bill is important because it will be, if passed, the adoption by this House of the principle of the Intercolonial railway taking over the branch lines in the maritime provinces. We listened a couple of years ago to a very interesting discourse on this subject by the present member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). He went into the matter very fully and I think gave very good reasons indeed why the branch lines in the maritime provinces should be taken over by the Intercolonial railway. I agreed with the remarks of that hon. gentleman when he made them in this House. I thought his reasoning was sound and I am prepared to vote for this Bill which gives the Minister of Railways power to go into the taking over of these branch lines under certain favourable conditions. Why, Sir, in the rest of Canada, leaving out the maritime provinces, the uniform policy of the great through lines has been the taking over of branch lines, the building of branch lines, the grid-ironing of the country with their own lines and feeders, and in that way they have succeeded in becoming prosperous and in serving the country to a far greater extent than they otherwise would have done. There can be no doubt that the policy which has succeeded so well in the western part of Canada would succeed equally well in regard to the eastern provinces. I cannot see any reason why this Bill should not pass, especially as, by its adoption, parliament will approve of the principle of taking over these branch lines. I do not support it because the Intercolonial is owned and operated by the government. I quite agree with those who think that perhaps the Intercolonial railway might have been much better operated and governed under a private owner than it has been under the government. At the same time the Intercolonial railway remains there one of the guarantees of confederation; and I am quite sure that the people of the maritime provinces are determined to keep that line in the ownership of the people of this country. I do not believe that the large majority of the people of the maritime provinces will consent to its passing out of the hands of the people of this country. For these reasons I shall be pleased to vote for the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. As intimated a few minutes ago there is no objection at all to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to make clear our intention, except that there is a correction of one clerical error which I have made. I have inserted the word 'chief' so as to make it read 'chief engineer.' I propose this amendment to section 3:

That clause 3 of the Bill be amended by inserting, in the 26th line thereof, after the word 'Canada' the words 'nor shall any such connecting railway be entered upon or operated on behalf of the government of Canada until the said managing board and the said chief engineer shall have approved the terms and conditions of such lease having regard to the beneficial results to the government railways and until the parliament of Canada has ratified such lease.

Mr. RHODES. I think the clause would be better drafted if the words 'line or' were inserted between the words 'such' and 'lines' in line 20. I therefore beg to move:

That in line 20 after the word 'such' the words 'line or' be inserted.

Amendment (Mr. Rhodes) agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the committee ready for the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals?

Mr. FOSTER. That meets the objection that I raised provided the meaning is clear. 'Having regard to the beneficial results to the government railways.' How broad is that? I had a thought like this—may be this carries it out—that the board of managers would write a full report showing that the line of railway in question, from its situation, condition and traffic resources, is one the acquisition of which, under the proposed terms of the lease, will result beneficially to the net revenue of the government railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. This covers the point.

Mr. FOSTER. If it covers it that is what I want. I want a reasoned report.

Mr. GRAHAM. A report will be required giving reasons.

Mr. FOSTER. And showing that good will result to the goverment road from a money point of view.

Amendment (Mr. Graham) agreed to.

Mr. CONGDON moved:

That the words 'be binding upon the government of Canada' in the 26th line be struck out and instead thereof there be inserted the words 'have any force or effect.'

He said: I suggest this for the reason that the lease is made in the first instance by the Minister of Railways, and I do not see why the proviso should substitute for the minister the government of Canada. I submit that it would be better to use general words and say that no such lease shall have any force or effect until the parliament of Canada has ratified the same.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CROCKET. In view of the amendment which has been added to the Bill I think it would be safe in striking out the words: If such lines are reported by the chief engineer of the Department of Railways to be in a good and safe condition for operation. I can conceive of a railway not being in a good and safe condition for operation, but which it might be advantageous to the country to take over and put in good condition, and operate as part of the system. There are perhaps some lines of railway in New Brunswick of which it might be said that they are not in first-class condition for operation, but which might be taken over and operated very advantageously from the standpoint of the country and of the Intercolonial railway itself. The words added to the Bill: 'Having regard to the beneficial results to the government railway,' make it possible for us to safely strike out the words I have referred to, and leave the question entirely in the hands of the board and of the engineer. I take it that any proposition of the kind must now be submitted to parliament for approval and that the facts will be stated in regard to the condition of any railway which it may be thought desirable to take over, and therefore it would be just as well to authorize the government to negotiate for the taking over of any branch railway which might be thought advantageous to the government railway system.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose the province of New Brunswick is more interested in this question than any other province because it has a greater number of branches of the Intercolonial than Nova Scotia or Quebec. But while that is so there would be very serious objection to changing the Bill in the way proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket). It is one of the essential features of this Bill that parliament shall not adopt the principle of entering upon a large capital expenditure in connection with any of these branch railways. One great objection which would be raised in other portions of Canada would be that such a proposition as that set forth by the hon. gentleman might involve the country in a large capital expenditure. The Bill provides that the managing board can only make a recommendation for the leasing of a road when it is certified by the chief engineer that that road is in good and efficient condition for operation as part of the government railway system. That is a safeguard which it seems to me will commend itself to prudent men all over Canada whether they live within the sphere of the influence of the Intercolonial railway or not. It would be very unwise to change the Bill in this respect. If there is a railway which is not at present in good condition and which the board of management may think it desirable to acquire it would not be a very difficult thing for the owners of that road to make the necessary financial arrangements to put it in proper condition, on the assurance that it might then be leased to the government. Of course the rental to be paid by the government upon the recommendation of the board of management would be to some extent based upon the expenditure incurred by the company in bringing the road up to the required standard. If any special case should arise which the board could not deal with under this Act that case could be brought before parliament and considered by itself. It seems to me that in adopting this general principle we ought to be very careful that we do not authorize the Minister of Railways or the managing board to enter into negotiations with respect to any road which

would involve any large capital expenditure, or indeed any capital expenditure at all on the part of the government.

Mr. CROCKET. I would agree with the Minister of Public Works if under the terms of this Bill parliament were not to be consulted before any such road was leased. But, when we provide that a Bill shall be submitted to parliament for the leasing of the road it does seem to me that no harm can be done if we authorized the Minister of Railways to negotiate so that even although a road may not at present be such as the engineering department would describe as in good and working condition, that road might advantageously be taken over by the government and put in good condition afterwards. My idea is that if it is intended to take over such a road it would be far better to have the government put it in good condition than to have the railway company do it simply for the purpose of leasing it to the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I agree with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket). We have this afternoon adopted this principle largely on the ground that it is the invariable practice of all the big roads to take in the smaller lines and to improve the service and give better facilities to the people. If a road happens to be in bad condition and it would be advantageous for the country to take it, and the owners could not get the money to put it in proper condition, the improved service will not be given to the people and our idea will not be realized. If the principle is sound it ought to be applied to any road which when put in good condition by the government would serve the general public and would be advantageous to the government system of railways.

Mr. RHODES. It seems to me that the principle upon which the government, on the advice of the Railway Board, is to take over any given branch line is the consideration whether that line would be a paying one for the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not that alone.

Mr. RHODES. If that be the principle then we need not object to capital expenditure on these lines if we can get a fair return for our money. I think there is much in the suggestion of my hon. friend from York.

Mr. GRAHAM. I quite appreciate that hon. gentlemen opposite are now willing to go much further than I contemplated. But, if it is found that this Bill works out in the interests of the people and in the interests of the government railways it would be possible to meet their views later on. However, we must be very careful that the power which we take under this Bill shall meet with the approval of the people of Canada. There is no use disguising the fact that there has been a good deal of criticism on both sides of the House on the large expenditure of capital on the Intercolonial. In submitting this Bill to parliament I wanted to guard against the criticism which would have at once been launched, that we were opening the door which perhaps might lead to an enormous addition to the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial. It is well to proceed gradually. If we find that the lines that we take over meet with acceptation we perhaps may come to parliament later and change the Act as is suggested. But for the present I want to tie up the Board of Railway Management so that they cannot recommend the acquisition of a line unless it is placed in such a condition that it would not require an immediate large outlay of capital. With that condition, the question of whether it would be profitable or beneficial would be largely problematical. Once started on the expenditure of capital for the improvement of a line, we do not know where that expenditure will end. We merely say to the company, we propose to lease your line if after full investigation we come to the conclusion that if it were put in proper condition it would at least support itself. There is no trouble about a company under such circumstances being able to finance such improvements as would put it into good condition. Thus we avoid opening the door to a large capital expenditure; but if such a door is opened it will not be closed if it turns out to be for the benefit of the country and of the government railway.

Mr. JAMESON. While on the subject of the possible cost of improvement to these railways and the expenditure likely to be incurred by the government in acquiring them, I would like to ask the minister if he has any plan as to the fixing of the basis of rental which would be paid for any roads that might be taken over; whether the amounts which have been paid, either by a provincial government or the Dominion government, in the way of subsidies to aid in the construction of any of these branch lines or connecting roads, will be taken into consideration by him when the rents are determined? I have in mind particularly the case of the Halifax and South Western railway, one of the connecting roads which may possibly receive some benefit under this Bill. The minister, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), has very frankly stated that, so far as he is aware at the present time, no application has been made by any branch or connecting road to participate in the benefits of this Act. At the same time, from the information which I have been able to obtain from time to time regarding the oper-

ation of the Halifax and South Western railway, and the results of its operations so far as revenue is concerned, I am very much inclined to think that it is not altogether unlikely that in the comparatively near future that railway will be one of those brought under this Act. According to Poor's Manual of Railways, 1908, the government of the Dominion of Canada paid toward the construction of that road, including the Middleton and Victoria Beach branches, the sum of $1,147,069, and the province of Nova Scotia contributed $2,213,173 in subsidy and by way of loan. It has been stated to me, though I am not prepared to say that the information is correct, that the company is not at the present time earning the operating expenses and fixed charges of the road. If that be the case, it is not unlikely that when the door is opened, this company will ask, or possibly the government of Nova Scotia, being the mortgagor, may ask, that the government of Canada enter into arrangements for the leasing of that line. Under these circumstances, I think it might very properly be asked of the minister that he should state to the committee whether he has arrived at any conclusion as to the basis upon which these rentals would be fixed, and as to whether he is in a position to say that the amount of such subsidies which have been paid would be taken into consideration and would in any way lessen the amount of rental which would ordinarily be paid in cases where large subsidies and loans had not obtained.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not thought much along that line, but my idea was riveted to this point, outlined in the Bill and the amendment, that the chief thing to be kept in mind is, can we lease this line so that it will be a benefit to the government railway and to the country. The details will all lead to that point. If what my hon. friend says be true, that the Halifax and South Western railway is losing money all the time in its operation, perhaps it would not be up to the standard which the board would require in any line proposed to be taken over. As a matter of fact, I think the Nova Scotia government has a mortgage on the Halifax and South Western railway, and if anything were done with regard to that line—I have no intimation that anything of the kind would be done—it would probably be that the Nova Scotia government would proceed against the railway or would become the interested party. I can assure my hon. friend that his statement is the first intimation that I have had that the Halifax and South Western Railway Company had any idea of leasing their line to the government. But all the questions brought up by my hon. friend will be considered from this point of view: will this road benefit the Intercolonial railway and assist the people in the transportation of their products?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And will the terms be reasonable?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course.

On the question, that the Bill be reported:

Mr. HENDERSON. After this lengthened discussion, I feel that I have a very slight knowledge of this Bill, and I think other members are in the same position. I think it a pity that a Bill of such far-reaching importance as this, and cut and slashed in the manner in which this has been, should be dealt with without having some expert draftsmen go over it and make all these clauses fit one into the other. I think the minister would be well advised if he would ask the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and in the meantime have this Bill submitted to the law officers of his department to see if its various clauses are well fitted together.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was drawn by the legal adviser of my department and was submitted to the law clerk of the House of Commons, and the amendment is that of the hon. member for Hamilton, who is himself a good lawyer and draftsman.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. minister had allowed the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton to remain as he suggested it, I would have much more faith in it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did exactly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was there not an amendment to the amendment? At any rate, the Bill has been amended and reamended so much that I think it should receive the mature consideration of some expert draftsman to see that the different parts properly fit into each other and in such a manner that the Bill will be workable.

Bill reported as amended, and amendments read the first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS PENSION FUND.

Mr. GRAHAM moved the second reading of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act. He said: As hon. gentlemen know, the Provident Fund Act is an Act under which the employees of the government railways contribute a certain amount, the government duplicates the amount, and on retirement of the employees they get a certain allowance. It is along the lines adopted by

the other great railways of Canada and the United States, and this amendment is designed to make the terms of the Provident Fund Act a trifle more liberal to employees. I will tell the House frankly my object in introducing this Bill. Owing to the large reduction in the staff of the government railways, quite a number of the older employees have been for the time being dropped from the service; I would not like to use the term 'dismissed,' because if opportunity offers these will be the first men to be re-employed.

Mr. HUGHES. What does the minister mean by employees? Does he mean merely workmen, or does that include railway officers?

Mr. GRAHAM. It includes some of the railway officers, but some of them are under the old Superannuation Act. The term 'employees' includes the workmen, who are by far the larger number. Not a few of the older men who have been working on the government railways for many years were dropped. The hardship to them came from the fact that some of them, perhaps from 75 to 100 in number, speaking roughly, were within a few years of the time at which they could have had some benefit from the provident fund, but dropping them at this time precluded them from receiving that benefit. The case was represented to me, not pushed at all; but a few months ago a gentleman pointed out that this was a hardship to some of the old employees, and after thinking the matter over I came to the conclusion that, looking at it from the human side, it was a hardship. Men who had worked for a number of years for the government, and contributed to the provident fund a certain amount, and were then dropped out, although in a few years they would have become entitled to the benefit of the fund, that seemed to be a hardship.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister define what he means by 'a few' years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the present statute, the number of years an employee has to work before he is entitled to be placed upon the provident fund is 15; my Bill proposes to reduce that time to 10 years, and to apply it to those who were in the employ of the government up to March 31 last. My sole object is to meet the situation that has arisen by dropping a lot of these men, and depriving them of the benefit they would have had if they had remained a little longer; in other words, those who were dropped since March 31 last, and have been in the employ of the government for 10 years, can be placed under the provident fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say whether there are not some men who, on March 31, were within a month or a few days of being entitled to the fund?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason we take that arbitrary position is that before that time there were very few men who were dropped except for cause, dismissed absolutely. But here are men who were dropped because the board of management thought the staff was too large, they were not dropped because of any fault of their own.

Mr. HUGHES. Are those men now in the service that have been retired?

Mr. GRAHAM. The men have been dropped. Advisedly I did not use the word 'dismissed,' because it is the intention of the board, if at any time the services of these men are again required, to re-engage them.

Mr. BARKER. This Act will apply to a few men who may hereafter be retired.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will apply to a few. It reduces the time, and makes that reduction to all men who were retired since March 31 last.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would ask the minister to consider a proposition to extend the advantages of that section to men who have been permanently disabled while in the employ of the government but who had not yet served long enough to obtain the advantages of the retirement fund, having served perhaps a couple of years short of the 15. I think there ought to be some reasonable limitations to cover that class of men.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister says in the second section of the Bill that this amendment should not apply to any person retired prior to the 1st day of April, 1909. What about the persons who were retired between the 1st day of April and the coming into force of this Act?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think these will be included.

Mr. HUGHES. It does not state that it should apply to persons retired between those dates.

Mr. GRAHAM. We must read into it the consequence that it does apply to any person retired since the 1st day of April of this year. All but those who are excepted will be included.

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

Mr. LENNOX. Are the men referred to by the minister a few minutes ago those who were under investigation recently by Judge Barron, Mr. O'Donaghue and

another? I understand there was an investigation quite recently into the cause of the dismissal of 350 men from the Intercolonial road. Are these the men referred to?

Mr. GRAHAM. That takes a little explanation. It does not apply to any particular class, but to all employees that come within the scope of the Act. In the case of certain employees, a conciliation board was asked for by the men themselves. A conciliation board was asked for by the men of Halifax, and that conciliation board was formed with Sir George Garneau as chairman. That board made a report a few days ago. This other board, to which the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) refers, was asked for by the men at Moncton who have their own brotherhoods. This board will make a report on the grievances complained of. It may be of interest to hon. members to know that, from the despatch I have just seen in the Toronto papers, the board suggested that this measure should be passed, as it will assist in meeting some of the difficulties that in the opinion of the board, seem to exist.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what I was referring to. These gentlemen recommend that some legislation should be passed that would enable the minister to deal with companies of this kind; and I presume that some of these men dealt with in that report would be covered by this legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they would.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the necessity of appointing this commission consisting of Judge Barron, Mr. O'Donoghue and another? Why did the minister feel called upon to appoint them?

Mr. GRAHAM. The minister did not feel called upon to appoint them and did not do so.

Mr. HUGHES. Who made the appointment?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were a board of conciliation appointed under the Act, asked for by the men themselves.

Mr. HUGHES. Who appointed them?

Mr. GRAHAM. A board of conciliation, under the Act, is constituted in this manner: When the workmen of the Intercolonial, or any other railway, let us say, think they have a grievance against the management, they ask the Department of Labour to appoint a board of conciliation.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, they were appointed by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. The men select one member, the management selects another, and if these two do not agree on the third, the appointment of the third is made by the Department of Labour.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. HUGHES. Whom did the Department of Labour appoint in this case to this commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not a commission, but a board of conciliation. And there were two such boards that have been spoken of here; to which does the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) refer?

Mr. HUGHES. The one of which Judge Barron and Mr. O'Donoghue were members.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Department of Labour appointed Judge Barron.

Mr. MACDONALD. I desire to express my entire disapproval of the minister appointing a board in the manner he has done. No provision is made for the appointment of such a board as sat for the consideration of these matters. The Industrial Disputes Act does not apply to the Crown, in the absence of any specific provision making it so applicable. It seems to me that for the Crown to resort to the provisions of an Act of that kind to settle disputes with its servants is a very unfortunate principle, one that ought not to be acted upon in the Railway Department or any other. Until we have a declaration on the statute-book and some method by which the Act is to be applied, it seems to me that no department of the government should be made a party to such a proceeding.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) to say that the Minister of Labour had no right to make the appointment?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) is a member of the legal profession and will appreciate what I said. I ventured the opinion that the Industrial Disputes Act did not apply to any department of the government. That is my position as a lawyer. The hon. member can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. CROCKET. Did this appointment purport to be made under the Industrial Disputes Act?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we ought to have that point understood. It is a very important one. We should have some explanation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose this raises the whole question of the Crown's prerogative.

Mr. FOSTER. It raises the question of King's prerogative.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a very large question, and I do not intend to discuss it. I may be all wrong, but I think that when the Crown goes into running a railway it might conform to all the conditions that govern other people in the same line of business. The employees on the government railway have the same brotherhoods,

the same rules and regulations as the employees of any other road. They would consider it rather arbitrary, if, having provided machinery by which the employees of company roads can ask for boards to settle a grievance, the very authority that created the machinery should refuse the use of that machinery to correct grievances on the government line. Speaking broadly, I suppose, the Crown is not subject to any of these laws. But I am told that when the Industrial Disputes Act was up for discussion in this House, it was generally understood that the employees of the Intercolonial railway should have the same privileges under the Act as the employees of any other railway. As to the legal part of it, I will leave that out of the question, because the road, during the whole of my time, and, I believe, ever since the introduction of the Industrial Disputes Act, has allowed the employees to apply for a board of conciliation and it has been granted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the minister has not touched the point raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). If it is the policy that boards of conciliation be created in respect of employees of the Intercolonial, the only means by which that can properly be done is by a statute. That is perfectly plain and straightforward. But when you undertake to apply to the employees of the Intercolonial a statute which is not legally applicable, though, of course, the Minister of Railways has not any regard for the legal side of the question —it seems to me a curious——

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seemed to amount to that. Of course, there is a great deal of force in what the minister says, that if the Crown carries on business it ought to carry it on under the usual methods. But it is absolutely true, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has said, that no statute is binding on the Crown unless the Crown is expressly made subject to the provisions of that statute, and no consensus of opinion of the House of Commons, no expression of that kind in the progress of debate, has any more effect on that statute than the deliberations of any debating society. The difficulty of the situation is that when you are proceeding under a statute which has no application whatever, the whole matter is without any legal foundation, the persons appointed are not properly appointed, they have no right to subpoena witnesses, the witnesses have no right to be paid and any witness can insult the commissioners, disregard their authority, treat them with contempt and nothing can be done about it. The result would be to bring the whole operation into public contempt of the community upon occasion. That is if my hon. friend from Pictou is correct in the statement that there is nothing in the statute which makes it binding upon the Crown, and my recollection is the same as his.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is some misapprehension, I believe, in the impression derived from the position taken by my hon. friend from Pictou. The Conciliation Act, as I understand it, does not apply to the Intercolonial railway men. The consequence is that the railway employees can refuse to be bound by that Act, they could go on strike with impunity. But in this matter the railway authorities thought it advisable voluntarily to apply to themselves the provisions of the Conciliation Act. They had certain disputes with the management, and it was thought advisable, very properly, to have a conciliation board, to bring themselves under the Act. It was not perhaps legal, but it was voluntary and was acted upon in a voluntary manner. They agreed to have a conciliation, they selected their own arbitrator, the management selected another and these two called upon the Minister of Labour to select a third. All this was done in a voluntary manner. I do not think it was done under the law, but it was done by consent, and the result was the same, a satisfactory conclusion of the dispute between the railway men and the board of management. If the men had refused to be bound by that Act, no authority would have been able to force them to act on it, but of their own motion they chose to come under the provisions of the statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then it is just the same as if some other body of men to whom the Act does not apply had done the same thing? The difficulty is that whenever anyone chooses to treat the court as having no legal position and, for instance, refuses to obey a subpoena or to acknowledge the authority of the court, all the proceedings fall into contempt. Therefore, I say if the Intercolonial railway employees are to have the benefit of this Act, their rights should be given to them by a statute of this country, they should not be dealt with in this way. If it is worth while putting such a provision on the statute-book, and if it is desirable to give it a more extended application, the way to do so is by passing a proper amending Act.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I think you will look in vain for any proceeding where the Crown has abrogated the right to deal with its own servants in whatever way it deems best, and the responsibility of the Crown on the advice of the different ministers to take a certain course in regard to its servants is a matter in regard to which it is responsible to parliament, and the minister's responsibility in such a case cannot be abrogated by saying that a conciliation

board has come to a certain conclusion and therefore the government is rid of the responsibility. Personally, I do not think that in the case of the Intercolonial railway it is wise that the provisions of this Act should apply. These men are servants of the Crown. I know of no case in which they have threatened to strike, or have struck, and I cannot conceive of a case in which they would strike. I think the minister is the proper person to remedy the grievances that exist and to deal with them, and he is responsible to parliament for his course in regard to them. I mention this matter because I not only think there was no legal authority for the appointment of the board, but I think that as a matter of policy the board should not have been appointed.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not change the reading of clause (f) to make it apply to those who were in the service on the 1st day of April, 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM. The law clerk of the House advises me that that clause refers to the original Act and this amendment is passed as if it were part of the original Act. Therefore, the form used is necessary.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that this fund is provided, one half by the government and one half by the monthly contributions of the employees of the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway. The fund is to be administered by a board consisting of five persons, of whom one is the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, who shall be the chairman and preside at meetings of the board; two members appointed by the minister from among the chief officers of the railway, one of whom shall always act as chairman in the absence of the general manager and the remaining two shall be elected annually by the employees contributing to the fund. I would like to know whether the proposed amendment has been submitted to the board or the representatives of the employees who contribute half the amount of the fund and, if not, whether the minister does not think it would be fair to give them an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have received a communication, not in reference to this, but in reference to some other things that the employees want to place before me. There is no doubt in the world about them being in harmony with this Bill, I think, but they are going to submit some other matters to me early in January. I thought that if we put this Bill through the committee stage I would let it stand for the third reading, and then, if there is anything that they desire by way of amendment, it can be dealt with before the Bill receives its third reading. There is a committee representing the men who were on the provident fund, or those who were interested, and I will ask them to present to me in writing the matters which they desire to bring to my attention so that I can submit their proposals to the board before we assemble again after recess. I expect that will be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I am quite prepared to accept the assurance of the minister that they are entirely in harmony with the proposals, but at the same time I do not see how they can be in harmony with them if they do not know anything about them; nor do I see how the minister can be sure that they are in harmony with them if he has not heard anything from them. That, however, is a matter for himself and the committee will be bound to accept his assurance. I am under the impression that the minister added to the rules of the fund a note to the following effect:

> No absolute right of retirement exists under this Act. It must be clearly understood that the fund is a provident fund for the purpose of caring for disabled, worn out and old employees and not a retiring fund for the purpose of allowing men to secure other employment and at the same time draw an allowance.

I understood that that was the memorandum of the minister and I am not sure that it met the approval of the board. The minister will know about that. Does the minister consider that the proposal contained in clause (f) is quite in harmony with this note, for which he, I understand, is responsible.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not responsible for that note, but the object of that was to prevent applications being made by men for retirement who really left the employment of the road to better themselves. We have had men who left their employment whom the board did not consider as being entitled to be put on the provident fund at all. No man may demand to go on the provident fund. He may make his application and that application is referred to the board, which is composed of the representatives of the men as well as of the government, each furnishing a portion of the money for the purpose. That board, after taking into consideration all the circumstances, pass upon the application before it comes to the minister. Then, it comes to the minister for his approval, and I think that no injustice can be done to any person. Some circumstances have arisen in which men have no right to the benefits of the retirement fund, because they took other employment and simply

wished to better their positions. They endeavoured to get their retirement allowance and to better their position at the same time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It will still be necessary to secure the recommendation of the board in order to be placed on the fund?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That provision is not interfered with in any way?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think the minister has mentioned how many people will probably come within the scope of this Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. About how many?

Mr. GRAHAM. The chairman of the board told me that he thought between 75 and 100. It is a little difficult to say because we have not the ages of the men, but from the information he received he thought the number would not be more than 100.

Mr. CROSBY. Some reference has been made to the conciliation boards. We have had two conciliation boards. The last conciliation board which was referred to this afternoon was a board called together for the purpose of ascertaining the rights of some men who had been dismissed from the Intercolonial railway within the last year. I think that is what they were called together for.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was one of the questions before the board.

Mr. CROSBY. Has it anything to do with this Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. CROSBY. Because if it has I would like to bring up some other matters in connection with it.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister said that it had to do with it, that a number of the men who had been dismissed and whose case was investigated would, with others, come within the scope of this Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. The board itself would not have anything to do with this Bill. Any person whose services were dispensed with would come under this arrangement, whether they were in that class or some other class. They would be affected by this Bill, but the conciliation board itself would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. CROSBY. Then, if I understand it, the Bill is intended only to apply to employees from April, 1909? It does not go any further back than that? These men who have had this conciliation board dealing with their affairs certainly were dismissed. They were all out of employment before that time and consequently this Bill would not cover them.

Mr. GRAHAM. One of the things for which the employees asked for the conciliation board was to ascertain if the management of the road had not violated some agreement with them in dispensing with the services of several of them since April 1 last, because that is when the board took charge. This Bill deals with the employees who were dismissed since April 1, 1909, and any man of them who had then served ten years would be entitled to superannuation if the board recommends it. Without this amendment he could not be superannuated unless he had served fifteen years.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is there any restriction as to the age of the employees who will be entitled to the advantages of this section?

Mr. GRAHAM. It only applies to men who are seventy years of age and have been ten years in the service, we substitute ten years for fifteen.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, but are you not making provision for another class of people who no matter what their age, were removed since April the 1st, 1899. Under the wording of this would they be entitled to superannuation?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have to fulfil all the other conditions.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, but there are different classes mentioned and in all these classes an age limit is specified and now you are adding an additional section in which there is no age limit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think that the point mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) is well taken. I am not discussing the question of policy but simply the construction of the statute, and if the clause is passed as it now reads there would be no age limit stipulated.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the point is well taken. Under the old Act men who withdrew from the service for any reason would not participate in the provident fund until they had reached 60 years, and I do not think we would be doing any injustice if we put the age limit here at 55 years, then they would have the benefit of five years in the two ways.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the object of restricting this Act to those who are retired since April the 1st 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM. Before that date there were practically few compulsory retirements except for cause, and a man who was dis-

missed for cause would not have any claim on the provident fund. But since April the 1st the board has dispensed with a large number of men whose only fault was that they were not required in the service. By this legislation I am trying to meet the well founded complaint that they were harshly dealt with.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister say that men were not dismissed before April, 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not say that, but as a rule the men retired before that time were retired for some cause.

Mr. TAYLOR. Political or otherwise.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. CROCKET. How many men have dropped from the service since April the 1st last?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave the number in 'Hansard' the other day; I think about 500.

Mr. CROSBY. I understand that there were quite a number of men dismissed and particularly in Halifax, between the 1st of December, 1908, and April, 1909, and some of these were men who had served 25 years but who not having reached the age limit of 60 years were not provided for out of the provident fund. They were dismissed simply because their services were not required.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not had any cases of that kind brought to my notice.

Mr. CROSBY. If there are cases of that kind would it not be very unjust to provide for those whose services were dispensed with since April, while you make no provision for those who were dropped between December and April.

Mr. GRAHAM. If there are such cases I imagine that the committee which is to wait on me will probably present them. We will not press the Bill to the third reading until we hear from that delegation.

Mr. CROSBY. I should think that would be satisfactory. One class of employees should be provided for as well as the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We are to understand then definitely that the Bill will not be read a third time until this delegation makes its views known to the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Would it not be better to leave the Bill in committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. We can refer it back to committee if there is any difficulty.

Mr. LENNOX. It is much better to leave it in committee. There is a great deal in what has been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby). Here we have men who have not been in the service for more than 10 years who are being dismissed, which is proof of what we have contended often from this side of the House that we have had a small army of men on that railroad who were not required at all. If it is fair and equitable—and I am not going to object to it, because I have a good deal of sympathy with the men—to make compensation to those men who have been in the service only 10 years, many of whom admittedly should not have been in the service at all, would it not be far more equitable to make provision for men who have been probably 25 years in the service, and yet have not reached the age of 60 years? I think it is pretty harsh that a man who is 59 years of age and has been say 25 years in the service, is to get no consideration at all. When we are reconsidering the Act, let us reconsider fully, and do justice all round. The question arises from the fact that we have had a large number of people employed on the railway who should never have been employed there at all. This is no fault of these men, though a great deal of fault to the government, and I am disposed to treat these men generously, or at all events justly. We shall not be doing even-handed justice if we do not consider the cases of the men who have almost reached the age limit. I do not think the minister should object to leave the Bill in the committee for fuller investigation.

Mr. BARKER. Let us understand clearly what we are talking about. In the first section the wording of the Bill is: 'Those who are in the service at the time of the coming into force of this Act'. As I understand the minister, those words do not mean at the time of the coming into force of this Bill as an Act, but they mean those who were in the service on the 22nd of March, 1907.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BARKER. I think perhaps the minister would have avoided some confusion if, instead of saying 'at the time of the coming into force of this Act', he had said, on the 22nd of March, 1907, which is the date he is referring to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I had not the Bill drafted in this way originally, but on being referred to the law clerk of the House of Commons, he redrafted it in this form in order to keep it within the four corners of the original Act.

Mr. BARKER. There was no objection to the words 'the 22nd of March, 1907', in the original Act, and if they were put into this Bill there would be no confusion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the first section is perfectly clear as it is. It is incorporated in the original Act and is to be construed as if it had been there when the

Act was originally passed. Therefore the date is when the Act was originally passed.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Act referred to is the original Act, and this section becomes part of that Act. I wish to move to add the following words at the end of the section 'and had at the time of such retirement reached the age of 55 years'.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the minister will explain a little more fully why he is adding those words. He mentions a specific age, which might cause a good deal of injustice.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that had the old Act remained, only those persons who had reached the age of 60 years could be retired. We are reducing the length of time they have to be in the service by five years, and we are also reducing the age limit by five years.

Mr. DANIEL. At the same time, this Act is intended to apply to only a few men—those who are relieved of duty after the first of April, 1909. That appears to me to be an extremely arbitrary arrangement. I think section 2 had better be allowed to stand until this whole matter can be considered again. I do not think the committee has sufficient information to be able to deal with this matter in a proper and judicial way.

Mr. LENNOX. This affords an additional reason why this Bill should remain in committee. I understand that a deputation of parties who are interested is going to wait on the minister. I understand from a newspaper report to-day that there has been forwarded to the Minister of Labour a report and recommendation from the recent conciliation board with reference to 350 men. We shall have this deputation waiting on the minister, and yet not have afforded, up to this moment, any of the men interested any notice whatever that we propose to put a time limit on this provision. The Act has been announced in the press, the men interested know something of it, they understand it to be an Act providing that any man who has been ten years in the service will be entitled to recovery. Now we propose to make an age limit of 55 years. The minister may be right in that or wrong, but the men interested have had no opportunity to present their case. Why amend these sections now when in all probability we shall have to refer the Bill back to the committee for reconsideration in a few days? Will it not be more sensible to leave the Act unamended, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and leave the Bill in committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not worth while arguing about it. What I want is to get the measure advanced a stage, and the interests concerned will be protected just the same as under my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. LENNOX. Except if we determine on 55 years, whether right or wrong, it will be more difficult to alter it afterwards.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will not make a whit of difference. I do not want to urge the Bill through, but merely as a matter of expedition to get it off the Order Paper, after giving the assurance that I would have it referred back to the committee if necessary. When my hon. friend starts to make out a case, he must see that no matter what limit we may fix, it would be open to question. There must be a line drawn somewhere. The Act is arbitrary, and I am just changing the terms a little to meet the condition of the people referred to and who may have some reason for complaining. When the Act was passed, the argument of my hon. friend could have been used just as well as to-day. Section (a) provides:

> Those who have attained the age of 70 years after being 15 years in the service.

Why, according to the hon. gentleman's argument, exclude those who were in the service fourteen years and six months? Why exclude people who were fourteen years in office and let in those who were fifteen? You have to draw the line somewhere and make an arbitrary ruling, and any Act to help a certain class of men will give reason for others to complain because they are not included. Take another class, class (b) which covers those, who, after being fifteen years in the service, become physically or mentally incapacitated. But here is a poor man who was fourteen years in the service when he became incapable. Why do injustice to him by excluding him? Take the other class:

> Those who have attained the age of 60 years after being 15 years in the service, and request to be retired from the service.

Why not include those who served 13 or 14 years? While there may be something in the contention of my hon. friend, draw the line where you like, it must be arbitrary, and some will come just short of meeting the conditions you impose, no matter how lenient.

Mr. BARKER. We may as well be quite frank in discussing these things. There is an impression, rightly or wrongly, among some people, that men have been dismissed otherwise than for lawful cause, and that possibly some of these clauses may affect the rights of such men. There would not be any difficulty about the first part of section (1). The difficulty seems to be about section (2); and I propose to discuss section (2) with relation only to these 55-year men, leaving the other to be discussed separately. Why not make paragraph (2) read:

> The paragraph added to section 12 of the said Act by section 1 of this Act shall not ap-

ply to anybody retired prior to the 1st April, 1909, otherwise than for lawful cause.

This cannot affect the hon. gentleman, as he knows he has not dismissed anybody except for lawful cause.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not trying to open the door for a great many years back, but to meet the complaint which has arisen among a large number of the men who have been dismissed by the board. There was no complaint along that line, so far as I have heard, previous to the establishment of the Railway Managing Board. Rightly or wrongly, they have dispensed with the services of many men, and both sides of politics have complained to me that they thought the action of the board was perhaps not wrong in dispensing with the services of these men, but there was quite a number whose services were dispensed with through no fault of their own. This is to meet the conditions which have arisen since the board took charge and dispensed with the services of a large number of men.

Mr. TALBOT. I believe this measure is particularly intended to relieve 75 or 100 people who have complied with the conditions of ten-year service. But what will happen the other 350 who have given good service during 4 to 9 years and have been put out in the cold without an hour's notice?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Provident Funds Act was passed to relieve those who had attained a certain age and men could not be employed, since that Act came into force, over 35 years of age. In the case of men who were employed fairly young and had not served the railway ten years, of course their claim on that fund is not so strong as that of those who have attained a certain age. No one regrets more than I that men should lose their positions. That part of the management of the road has worried my mind more than any other, but in all great industrial enterprises that occurs, and fewer have lost positions on the Intercolonial railway than on any other railway during the last five years.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) suggests that there is less reason for pensioning a man who has been improperly employed for ten years and who has been a charge upon the public funds than one so employed for lesser number of years. There is logic in that, as the minister must see. The whole thing comes back to this—that the difficulty arises through the fact that the government would not take any action until this Railway Managing Board was appointed. The Managing Board now has discharged men who ought never to have been employed. The fact that these men have been employed ten years rather than five is not a very logical reason why they should get a pension rather than the five-year men. At the same time, no doubt, it would be a hardship on the men, and I suppose we should have to let it go in the end. It arises from having too many men on the railway.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is section 1 amended as agreed to?

Mr. LENNOX. No, the minister said he would allow it to stand.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) does not wish to carry out the arrangement made between his leader and myself. I am quite willing that it should remain in committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not understand that any arrangement was made.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was satisfied that I should leave it until the third reading.

Mr. LENNOX. I would not have made objection had I understood that. But I hold to what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the committee ready for the amendment to section 1?

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to get the Bill into shape so that it can be reprinted, for I propose to send a copy to this committee for their consideration as well as to ask them to send me their suggestions.

Mr. BARKER. And the whole Bill will be open for consideration?

Mr. GRAHAM. And leave it to the third reading.

Mr. LENNOX. We have settled this matter. If we are going to argue further, let us argue it all. If the minister is not prepared to do what he suggested a few minutes ago, there are many things we can discuss. I understood that the minister was ready to move that the committee report progress.

Mr. GRAHAM. As far as I am concerned, it does not make any difference to me. I submitted the matter to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the gentlemen from the section particularly affected who will probably be waited on by those concerned. If I can get this through to the third reading, I will have it reprinted and a copy sent to the committee. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) does not want it that way, I am not particular.

Mr. LENNOX. That can be done without it going through Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will not be printed unless it passes the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister says he will, on request, send it back to the Committee of the Whole, I think that covers the point.

Mr. LENNOX. If my leader says that he is satisfied with the proposal, I will certainly submit. At the same time, I do not feel that that is the best way, and I will give my reason: There are a good many things in connection with this Bill that we shall want to discuss more at length, and it is advisable that we should have the fullest information before we discuss them. It is not advisable that we should discuss them piecemeal and from time to time. If this Bill remains in committee we should have an opportunity to bring them forward. I submit to the judgment of my leader that it would be better to leave the Bill in committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I do not wish to force my views on any hon. member. But I understand the minister to say that he desires to get the Bill out of committee that he may have it printed. And he undertakes, on the request of any hon. member, to send it back to the committee after it is reprinted.

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly—no trouble.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So, we have only to make the request and we should be where we are now.

Mr. LENNOX. As I plainly see that my leader thinks that the proper course, I certainly take his suggestion, and allow the matter to go.

On section 2:

The paragraph added to section 12 of the said Act by section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any person retired prior to the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Mr. DANIEL. What objection would there be to striking out this section altogether and allowing this measure to apply from the passage of the Bill of 1907?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would open up the whole Act very much more than is intended. It would be popular, I have no doubt, but I have no idea what it would cost the country or how much it would cost the men. On the basis of the present section, we have a pretty good idea of how many men would come under it. That matter will be discussed with the representatives of the men when they come.

Mr. DANIEL. The hon. minister stated that there had been no dismissals except for cause. So, I thought there could be no objection to striking out this section. I ask it for the sake of those cases, if there are any, that the minister does not call to mind and to whom injustice may have been done and who would be cut out by this paragraph.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) as head of the department knows the position of the employees prior to April, 1907. If there have been no dismissals prior to that, the elimination of this section will not enlarge the scope of the Act or increase the expenditure necessary to carry it into effect. The hon. minister knows who has been dismissed, and whether dismissed for cause or not. I think the point taken by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) is well taken.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. member (Mr. Samuel Sharpe) had the responsibility of carrying out such an Act and realized the scope of it he would not, I am inclined to think, make the remarks he has made. The men were under certain conditions up to the introduction of this amendment, that is up to April 1, 1909. A new system of management was introduced. The hon. gentleman must remember that there are, if I recall the number correctly, some 8,000 employees on the government railways. If we open the door for those back to 1907 some hon. member may say, 'Why 1907? Let us go back further.' There must be a line, and it must be, in a measure, arbitrary. This Act was passed in 1907. I was not here then, but no doubt many hon. members before me were here at that time. The line was drawn strongly and arbitrarily and an age limit fixed. All I pretend to be attempting to do is to make the Act a little more lenient owing to the new conditions having arisen by the change in management. My hon. friend suggests that I know just who were dismissed out of all these men. I suppose he is not serious in that.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The minister would know the number.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister stated there were none.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not state anything of the kind.

Mr. DANIEL. Except for cause.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said once or twice that I did not make that statement, but my hon. friend has put it in my mouth twice since. Generally speaking, before this A t men were dismissed for cause as they would be in any railway or any other line. But when the management was changed the conditions changed, the circumstances to which the old Act applied were altered and a general reduction of the staff all over the system was entered upon. New conditions arose which acquired a new Act. I am trying to meet the conditions

that have arisen owing to a large number of men having been dismissed at once by the board of management. It must be remembered that the men still in the employ of the road will have to pay their share to those men who retire, and this Act has met with their approval. I do not know why in attempting to meet new conditions we should drag in all the old conditions existing before the passage of the Act of 1907. My only attempt was to meet the new conditions that have arisen since the board was appointed.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How many men have been dismissed from October last to the 1st of April?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I gave that information in answer to a question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Information of that kind was given in answer to a question of mine, but it related only to the county of Halifax. When the Bill is again in committee perhaps the minister would be good enough to have all this information ready so that we can discuss it a little more intelligently.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—THE NAPANEE RIVER.

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

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter of considerable importance to many people in my riding. At a public meeting on November 30, of representative men in the town of Napanee, the state of the Napanee river was discussed. In justice to the Minister of Public Works I would say that last year, although there was no appropriation for the dredging of the river, he gave me a pledge across the floor of the House that he would see if he could get a dredge and have a certain amount of dredging done. He made an appropriation of $2,800. I talked the matter over with him and I supposed if he did some dredging in the shallow places it would greatly assist the navigation of the river. But it turns out that there was only a very narrow channel made about twenty-five feet wide. The captain of the dredge was at that public meeting and explained the condition of the river. Marine men stated that the river was worse than it had been before any dredging was done. The captain said that only a narrow cut was made and when the dipper of the dredge came up it would bring up an overflow and pile up logs and stones and mud, forming a ridge on one side of the cut. Thus, if the vessel happens to get out of the channel she is in much shallower water than before the dredging was done. Captain Christie, of the steamer 'Brockville', quite a considerable steamboat, says that it is very important to his company to know what is going to be done about the dredging of the river, because unless the navigation of the river is improved his company will have to withdraw their boats from that route. He is anxious to know because he says they always make their routes the year before, so they will know what they are going to do in the spring. A question of mine as to whether it was intended to make an appropriation this year for the dredging of the Napanee river has not been answered. My constituency is one of the counties that get very little public money in return for what we contribute to the revenues of the country. We do not wish to be unreasonable, but we think this is a very important matter, inasmuch as the town of Napanee and the entire surrounding country are deeply interested because we get our coal from the United States, it has to come in vessels, and the river is so low for want of dredging in certain places that only the smallest vessels can come in, and they are decreasing in number. Having to use the small vessels naturally increases our freight rates. The Minister of Public Works is, I think, disposed to deal fairly by us, and I hope that a reasonable appropriation will be made in the supplementary estimates for this work of prime necessity. I hope I will not be told, as the Minister of Finance often tells members on this side, that we are continually finding fault with the large expenditure that is made but are still asking for more. What we want is that the appropriations should be made for useful public works, not for works like the Newmarket canal. You could dredge twenty-five rivers like the Napanee for the money wasted on the Newmarket canal. I allude to this in order that the minister may not think I am unreasonable and want expenditures for purposes which are not necessary. I now leave this matter in the hands of the government, hoping the minister will reply and give us fair reason to believe he will do what I have asked.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend (Mr. U. Wilson) has mentioned the subject of the dredging of the Napanee river and has intimated that one of the captains has made the statement that navigation is more dangerous than before, I think perhaps I should call the attention of the House to what has actually been done during the past season. Before doing so I may say that before we began working upon that river during the past season the river, for seven miles, was full of obstructions, such as sunken logs and stumps. There was also a wreck right in the channel of the river and it was a serious menace to navigation. It was reported to me, not only by my hon. friend but also by prominent citizens of

Napanee, by captains of vessels as well, that the dredging of this river was necessary in order to give satisfactory navigation. Well, Sir, it is true, as I told my hon. friend and a number of other gentlemen in Napanee, who communicated with me upon this subject, that there was no special appropriation made at the last session of parliament for this work, but I stated that if possible I would endeavour to get a dredge and have the work done. We had no government dredge available for the purpose because our dredges were all busily engaged elsewhere, but we did succeed in making a very satisfactory arrangement with the Windsor Dredging Company, what I think every one who is familiar with the condition of affairs in that river will say was a satisfactory arrangement, the price being 14 cents per cubic yard with a special allowance of $150 for removing the wreck. The report which I have is that dredging has been performed to a depth of 12 feet below low water at various points in the river where most required, the cuts were widened from 25 to 30 feet and the remains of the old wreck were entirely removed. Altogether during the past season this company dredged some 20,000 cubic yards of material in addition to removing the wreck. The total expenditure has been in the vicinity of $2,800. I think from this report and from what I have heard outside of the report the work which has been done has been very satisfactory and excellent value has been got for the money which has been expended. I may say to my hon. friend that the question of continuing the dredging will receive careful consideration, but I do trust that my hon. friend recognizes, that, at his own request and at the urgent request of a number of prominent citizens of Napanee, I made arrangements under considerable difficulty to do this work, believing that it was a justifiable work, just as all other work which is done by my department is justifiable work and necessary in the public interest. I can assure my hon. friend that he would make a stronger case for the dredging of the Napanee river if he would simply rely upon the merits of the work which we have on hand and not seek to disparage the public work which is being done in other places. I think it is a great mistake, when one desires that some work should be done in his own locality, that he should feel it necessary to throw out the suggestion that every expenditure made in any other part of the country is a waste of money and that the only place in the whole Dominion of Canada where money can be expended to public advantage is in the particular locality in which he resides.

Mr. U. WILSON. I did not throw out any such insinuation, I did not intend to and I think, Mr. Speaker, you will bear me out when I say that I gave the minister full credit for his generosity last year. I acknowledge that under difficulties he made this appropriation. I have a letter from Captain Christie which bears out everything I have said in reference to the dredging. I will let the minister see it.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works—chargeable to income, harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Pinckney Point breakwater—extension of, $1,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is for the purpose of extending the breakwater at Pinckney Point. The difficulty which we are seeking to obviate there is that silt and gravel wash away through the action of the sea and obstruct the berth. We find it necessary to build an extension of the block 40 feet long, the whole cost of which will be $1,000.

Piper's Cove—breakwater—pier, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the construction of a breakwater pier at Piper's cove on the Bras D'Or lake. The proposed structure will extend to eight feet at low water, and it proposed to construct blocks and spans 224 feet in length. There is to be a road bridge 270 feet long as well. The total cost is $8,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Will this work be done by tender and contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I think this will be done by public tender and contract.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to urge upon the minister the advisability, wherever possible, of having these works done by contract. There is a variety of very good reasons why this course is preferable to the alternative of having the work done by day labour. In most of these communities there is a large number of people who are very anxious to secure employment upon these public works at certain times of the year when they have not very much to do and when it is a great boon to them to be able to make a few dollars. It very often happens that when a work is done by day labour only the personal friends of those who have the management or control of it are placed upon the work, and others, who are equally deserving, are debarred from that privilege. There is another reason why it is desirable to have this work done by contract and that is that it reduces the number of foremen, sub-foremen, supervisers and officials of that character, and saves expense. The cost of construction is lessened, perhaps I may say the cost of officials who do not work is lessened, and a saving is thereby effected to the department. I have found in my own constituency that where the work is done by day labour and not by contract, the privilege of supplying timber and other materials is usually given only to a few individuals who are often compelled

to take the value of the material, out of the store of the person who has charge of the work. In like manner the workmen are obliged to take out their wages under what is called the truck system. For these reasons it is desirable that the work should be done by contract wherever possible so that all may have a fair chance of participating in the distribution of the money. When work is let by contract this truck system is broken up and that in itself is a good thing. When we were considering the other day the appropriation for David's cove in Digby county I expressed the desire that the work should, if possible, be done by contract, and I urged it because the experience in that county at least has been that very great hardship has been entailed in the past on the workingmen and on those who supplied materials in that they had not been able to draw their pay in cash but were frequently compelled to draw it through the shop of the man in charge of the work. I know that the minister has the welfare of his department and of the public works of Canada at heart, and it is for this reason that I bring this to his attention.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already stated that it was the rule of the department to do work by contract except in cases where it clearly appeared to the responsible officers that it could be done better by day work. With regard to workmen being obliged to take goods from a store in lieu of their pay I wish to state publicly that no foreman has the right to require a man to take his pay otherwise than in cash, and if any complaint is made to the department that a foreman has required those under him to resort to the truck system that foreman would be reprimanded and unless a satisfactory explanation is given he would be dismissed. Of course it may happen sometimes that workmen in anticipation of a cheque coming for their wages desire to obtain supplies in advance from a store, but in all cases it is the well understood duty of the foreman to pay promptly in cash when the money is available in the hands of the engineer.

Mr. JAMESON. I may say for the information of the minister that I know a case in which men who are willing to work and who had applied for work were flatly told that unless they took their wages out of the store of the man who had charge of the work he would not give them employment, and, those who were willing to supply material were told that they would have to take their payment in a similar way in respect to this particular work. I think that is a very serious hardship.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend object to giving me the name of the foreman who made that condition and if he does I assure him that I will have the matter investigated and will see that such a foreman will not receive further employment. Any foreman who insists upon that condition of employment is certainly not discharging his duty.

Mr. JAMESON. I will have great pleasure in giving to the minister privately the name of the foreman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will do.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not suppose it is necessary to publish the name in 'Hansard' but I shall give the name to him privately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well.

Mr. JAMESON. The view taken by the Minister of Public Works is the proper one and I was quite confident he would take such a view when the matter was brought to his notice. Let me say that if foremen generally have notice from the department that such conduct would not be recognized it would go far towards effecting a cure of this pernicious system.

Mr. FIELDING. I like the contract system best, but I am bound to say that I am not so satisfied as my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) as to its popularity in any given district. I do not say that because it is unpopular it should not be adopted but there are views that may be offered on the other side. The contractor may come from a distant part of the country and very often he brings with him his staff and some of his employees to the exclusion of those living in the neighbourhood, a thing which is never very popular. Then again it sometimes happens that the contractor not having sufficient resources gets into difficulties, and I have known cases where the contractors went away leaving claims unpaid and very much discontent. The contract system, as a rule, is the better one, but there is another side to the question.

Mr. JAMESON. If a contractor should bring from outside a considerable portion of the labour to be employed I can well understand that it would not be satisfactory, but in the case of these works ranging from $7,000 to $8,000 I think the contractor would be very likely to find sufficient local labour and would not import any. As to a contractor leaving the workingmen unpaid I do not think there is any excuse whatever for such a condition, because it would be a proof that the officers of the department, who had the money in their hands had not exercised proper supervision and had been derelict in their duty.

Mr. FIELDING. No. I could give my hon. friend a case where no one was at fault; where the contractor took his work at too low a price and although his intentions were honest enough he got into difficulties and he was not able to pay the workmen. The usual percentage was kept

back but that did not suffice. He was a man of honest purpose but there was not enough money to give him his contract price and a fair profit.

Mr. JAMESON. That would be an exceptional case.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Port Dufferin — breakwater at Smiley's Point, $2,550.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $7,000.

Porter's Lake—boat channel to Three-Fathom harbour, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an important work, Porter's lake being 17 miles in length and surrounded by a good farming country, well settled. The total cost of the work, including breakwater, will be $17,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Halifax county. There have been expenditures in 1907-8 and 1908-9.

Mr. CROSBY. How much more will be required to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated that it will take $10,000 more.

Mr. CROSBY. As the minister states, this is in a very fertile part of the county of Halifax, and the work gives access to a very beautiful lake. I suppose it is intended that the work shall be continued during the coming summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Port Hood harbour—closing northern entrance, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a very important work. A good deal of coal is shipped from Port Hood. Formerly there was a natural breakwater extending from the island to the mainland, but some years ago it was carried away by a violent storm, and we have been for some years gradually closing the entrance so that it will afford a sheltered harbour. We are asking this year for a larger vote than usual, with a view to proceeding vigorously with the work.

Mr. JAMESON. How much has been expended on this work, and what does the minister estimate the total expenditure will be? Also, what material is used in the construction of the breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The material used has been brush and stone. The total estimated cost was originally $215,000. The work has been carried on continuously since 1903. There has been expended $92,796.67, and with this $40,000 it is estimated that $82,250 will still be required to complete the work. I may say that this work has been asked for not only by the people of the locality, but by resolutions of various boards of trade, including the Maritime Board of Trade, which has urged the importance of continuing the work as rapidly as possible.

Mr. WRIGHT. We are frequently told of wharfs being washed away on the Atlantic coast. Is it not possible to devise some method of constructing these wharfs so that this will not happen so frequently? There must be some fault in construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was washed away was the natural connection between the island and the mainland—not an artificial structure, but a natural breakwater or bar, and the fact of its being washed away deprived the harbour of its natural shelter, and it is for that reason that we are erecting a breakwater.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may have misunderstood the hon. minister in this case, but all the same we do have constantly recurring cases of wharfs being washed away.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it often happens that a wharf is washed away. Undoubtedly wharfs are damaged from time to time, and I am afraid that my hon. friend is not sufficiently acquainted with the force of the Atlantic waves, or he would not see anything surprising in that. I am not sure that even concrete works would withstand some of the storms on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to call the minister's attention to the fact that while large sums are being expended on wharfs and breakwaters along the coasts of the maritime provinces, some expenditures are necessary on the inland waters. I have had occasion to refer to the need of a little dredging near Wolfe island. The people there build their own wharfs, but in the latter part of last session I informed the minister that an expenditure of $150 or $200 in dredging would enable vessels to land coal on the island, whereas otherwise the people would be obliged to haul their coal on the ice from Kingston. This would mean a saving of fifty or sixty cents a ton on all the coal used on Wolfe island. I simply want to draw attention to that. The hon. minister said last session that it was then too late to consider the matter. I want now to call his attention to it before it is too late. This is a matter of great importance to the people there, and while we are making these large expenditures down by the sea, we should not forget the people living along the lakes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is speaking of dredging required at Wolfe island. The result of the inquiry I made is

that this is a private wharf, owned by a company, and the business down there is the business of this company, and the work could not be properly regarded as work for the general benefit of the public.

Mr. EDWARDS. The wharf, I believe, was constructed by private parties who were living on the island, but it is used by the general public without charge. I can only repeat that the dredging would result in great and general benefit to the people on that island inasmuch as it would enable coal vessels to land cargoes there, and the people would then get their coal at 50 cents to 60 cents a ton less.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman would write me a letter stating the number of people accommodated by that wharf and mentioning the fact that the wharf is open to public use without charge, I shall be glad to take a note of it for further consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS. The population is some 1,200.

Mr. CROCKET. How long has this work been in progress?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since 1903.

Mr. EDWARDS. When will it be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is proposed to let the contract now and we hope to finish it in about two more years.

Mr. CROCKET. When the work was begun in 1903, how is it the department is only giving a contract now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was experimental. To have made a solid breakwater of crib-work and stone would have cost a great deal more perhaps than we felt justified in spending. This mode of construction was an experiment and we went along gradually to see whether it would stand the action of the waves. It has certainly stood remarkably well, and the department is convinced it will be permanent, so that we feel justified in asking a larger appropriation with the view of entering into a contract.

Mr. CROCKET. What has it cost up to the present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $92,000.

Mr. CROCKET. All that was done by day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimate of the work yet to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $122,250 to finish the whole work.

Port Joly—extension of Herring Rocks breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for an extension.

Port Malcolm—wharf, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to reconstruct. There is a private wharf there now, owned by Mr. Malcolm. The department is going to acquire that for some $2,100, including the right of way. The department will make it a public wharf and reconstruct it. The total estimated cost, including cost of the property, will be $7,000. I am now asking $2,500 and will require a further $2,500 to complete the reconstruction.

Mr. CROCKET. What are the dimensions of the wharf the department is buying?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 225 feet in length and it extends to 6½ feet below water. For a distance of 105 feet it is 64 feet wide; for a distance of 24 feet, 42 feet wide; for a distance of 70 feet, 18 feet wide; and for the remaining distance of 26 feet, 22 feet wide. That is the existing wharf. We propose to reconstruct it.

Mr. CROCKET. How was this figure arrived at? Was that just the amount asked or was an officer of the department sent to examine the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineer, Mr. Bernard Sconi was instructed to make an examination and report, and he estimated its value at $2,100. It is on his report that we propose to buy the property.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the deed been executed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we could not take a deed until we got the vote.

Mr. CROCKET. How large a place is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has a population of 600; the residents are farmers, who engage in fishing during the fishing season. There is a freight and passenger steamer which calls there.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. What county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Richmond.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. If this wharf belongs to a private individual why should the government acquire it?

Mr. KYTE. The parties who own the wharf are out of business. They conducted a large mercantile establishment there until a few years ago. The senior member of the firm died, and the property is in the market. Up to the present it has been used by the public without charge, but the wharf is not in proper condition at present and a request was made to the department to furnish a new one.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. We have hundreds of cases throughout Ontario of wharfs owned

by private parties and used by the public. We have three or four at Gananoque which the owners would be glad to sell to the government if the government feel disposed to buy old wharfs. I do not see why the government should furnish a wharf at this place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Ontario the department has done that frequently. It sometimes happens that a private wharf, owing to the owner having gone out of business, becomes neglected, and there is a justifiable demand for a public wharf. It is often considered best that, instead of building another wharf, the private wharf should be taken over, where it can be had at a fair and reasonable price, and repaired and devoted to the public use. It has been done in several cases in the province of Ontario and in Quebec also. It is not confined to the province of Nova Scotia, I can assure my hon. friend.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is this engineer, Bernard Sconi, one of the regular men?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. In Halifax?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in Antigonish.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would call attention to the wharf at Wolfe Island to which I have already referred. In view of what the minister has said in regard to the policy of acquiring wharfs owned by private individuals who have gone out of mercantile business—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) will pardon me a suggestion. If he wishes to make a suggestion as to the government acquiring a wharf in Ontario, perhaps it might be more convenient to wait until the Ontario items are before the committee.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the minister prefers it. It struck me that it would be cheaper for the people if the government will buy the wharf. It could be got for less money than is being paid for this one.

Mr. CROCKET. By whom was the department asked to buy this wharf? Was there any request from the municipality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) informs me that he presented a petition of the people urging strongly that this wharf should be acquired. I do not recollect the petition at the moment, but no doubt it is on file.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any request from the municipality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is there any income?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Richmond informs me that Mr. Malcolm gave the public free use of the wharf while he was in business.

Port Maitland breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the reinforcing block of creosoted timber on the outer face and partial renewal of the flooring.

Mr. CROCKET. How long is it since the work was begun?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1908. The total estimated cost is $6,700, and this $2,000 is intended to complete the work.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is this in Hants?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Yarmouth.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the work been done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, by day labour.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the principle upon which the department proceeds in works of this kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total work in any one year did not amount to more than $3,000, and it was considered by the engineer better to do it by day work. It was repairing work and, while that class of work can sometimes be done by contract, it is not always so.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is this Mr. Perry, the foreman, one of the faithful?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon member wish to ask if he is a faithful workman? I think he is.

Mr. LAW. Mr. Perry belongs to one of the oldest Tory families in the county of Yarmouth. I may say that it would be impossible to have that work done by contract. The breakwater came near being washed away last winter. The work is the tearing down of old work and building new.

Mr. STANFIELD. I did not intend to raise talk over this matter, but I know that in the county I have the honour to represent the only people appointed on these jobs are the faithful. Occasionally, a man on our side gets a position by promising to help my opponent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not hesitate to say that, so far as the foremen are concerned, if, in any locality, we can get a competent reliable man who is a Liberal I think it is our duty to appoint him. For, a Liberal is interested in doing satisfactory work, work that will be creditable to the government; a Conservative would be interested rather the other way—in work that will bring discredit upon the government. So far as men under the foremen are concerned, let him employ good workmen whatever their politics may be.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there no good Liberals at this place to be recommended?

Mr. LAW. If the hon. member (Mr. Blain) heard what I said, he will know that I stated that this gentleman belonged to one of the oldest Tory families in the county. But I wish to add that he has seen the light.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the explanation. By whose recommendation was the gentleman appointed and what were his special qualifications for the position?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was appointed by my direction.

Mr. LAW. Further, the resident engineer, Mr. Dodwell, has told me several times lately that Mr. Perry was one of the best foreman he had had for men in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAIN. At whose recommendation was he appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not carry in my head the names of those who make such representations. I have no doubt that I satisfied myself that Mr. Perry was a thoroughly competent man. And I may say also that it is one of the instructions to the resident engineer that when a foreman is recommended he must satisfy himself of the competency of that foreman.

Mr. STANFIELD. I suppose we shall have to agree with the minister that, when a position is open, a Liberal must get it. But I would ask him to instruct his resident engineer and director to occasionally give a Tory a job, if it is nothing better than as a labourer. In my county, a Tory cannot get even day's work on one of these government jobs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the labourers are employed irrespective of party.

Mr. STANFIELD. In my county, our Liberal friends go at these things as though it were their own money and we had nothing to do with it. I don't see why a poor Tory might not have a chance occasionally. You might kindly make a note of that.

Mr. FIELDING. Was it the practice to give the poor Liberals a show in former years?

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Always.

Mr. STANFIELD. I have only been in politics a short time, I am a mere lamb in politics, but I understand the Liberals did get a job occasionally. If I remember, one or two Liberals were appointed to the Senate.

Mr. McCOIG. It might be a good idea for the hon. gentleman to send some of that advice up to the government at Toronto.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a subforeman on this work as well as a foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. An assistant foreman.

Mr. CROCKET. How many men were employed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give that information, I have no memorandum as to that.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there also an inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work would be inspected by the resident engineer, Mr. Dodwell, of Halifax.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the resident engineer always relied on to inspect the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The foreman is relied on first of all to see that the work is well done, but the engineer is relied on to visit the work from time to time to see that it is done properly.

Mr. CROCKET. I see that in the majority of cases of construction of wharfs and breakwaters there is an inspector.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is where the work is being done under contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Only where it is under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Done under contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the practice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless you call the foreman an inspector.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the foreman's duty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The foreman is in charge. It is his duty to see, where the work is done by the day, that it is done according to the plans and specifications. We do not have an inspector where work is being done by the day, in addition to the foreman, but where it is done under contract we have an inspector.

Mr. CROCKET. As a matter of fact, those are the chief duties of a foreman, to inspect the work. Does he engage the workmen?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He employs them.

Mr. CROCKET. And purchases the materials?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He purchases the materials and sees that the work is done.

Mr. CROCKET. What are the duties of the subforeman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To assist the foreman. He is really more like the head labourer.

Mr. CROCKET. But the foreman does not take any part in the work, he supervises it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes, the foreman, if he is a good man, very often takes off his coat and works with the rest.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister was very kind in stating that wherever there was a qualified Liberal available he preferred to have him appointed to the supervision of work of this character. Does he think it is good policy that these men, good Liberals as they are, where they are so appointed, should discriminate between Liberals and Conservatives when it comes to engaging a labourer on this work? I mean that a man should be asked his political leanings, how he is going to vote, in order to determine whether or not he is entitled to labour on that government work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The foremen are left free, so far as it has ever come under my observation, to employ such labouring men as in their judgment are best qualified to do the work. The government has never interfered in connection with the politics of a labouring man. The foreman is left free to exercise his good judgment, to get good workmen at fair wages, and to see that they do their work properly.

Mr. JAMESON. Would the minister approve of such a policy? It has been the practice for them to ask workmen how they were going to vote before they were engaged. When the answer came: I am not going to vote Liberal, the men were turned away. I do not suppose the minister is aware that that position exists to-day in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be highly improper that a man should be asked how he is going to vote, that he should be asked to make any promise as to his vote in connection with his employment. The first consideration should be to get good capable men and it generally happens that men are found in both political parties for work of that character. But suppose there is a limited number of men required, what harm would there be if a preference were given to the friends of the government? I do not think we should have any hypocrisy in this matter. I propose every time, all other things being equal, to give a preference to my friend in every relation of life. What is wrong with it?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We have heard the hon. gentleman express that opinion many times in the House but when it comes to employing labourers in work of this kind I am surprised that the minister should make such a statement. It is not the government's money.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say it was.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is the money of the people of this country and surely if a man happens to be a Conservative, he has been taxed for that money and why has he not a perfect right to participate in that work?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see any distinction in respect to the labouring man and the man who might be a candidate for the highest office in the country. Our system of government is a party system. With all its faults it is the best that has been discovered. It is the British system and a preference is given by the government wherever the party system prevails to its own friends. There is nothing wrong in that. It would be perfect hypocrisy to pretend that the Conservative party did not practice that during the whole 18 years they were in power. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) says he is only a lamb. He is old enough to know that in his own county that rule was thoroughly enforced, he knows that a man could not get employment on the Intercolonial railway in the days of the Conservative administration unless he was identified with the Conservative party, and we did not kick about it either, we recognized it and we did not squeal. When these hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the poor Tory not getting any chance, I wish they had a little of that compassion for the poor Liberal in the olden days.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I simply wished to remind the minister that this was not his money.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say it was our money. It is the money of the people of Canada, but the government of Canada are the custodians of that money and they are answerable to the people of Canada for the way in which they expend it. If it is a crime to give a preference to a Liberal the government will have to be turned out for that crime.

Mr. JAMESON. The Minister of Finance has been very frank in his statement to the committee. His frankness deserves that I should be equally candid. He has stated that he considers it perfectly proper that a man should be asked his politics.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not say that. I said I would regard it as highly improper that when a man comes to work he should be asked anything about his politics. In every small community in Canada every man's politics is thoroughly well known, and I say that if a preference was given by the government of the day, be it Liberal or Conservative, to its own friends, always with the condition that they are capable, good men, I do not think there is anything to complain of. No one is hurt, the public interest does not suffer so long as the work is done properly. It can be as well done by a good Liberal as by a good Tory. What is the difference?

Mr. JAMESON. The minister stated that in the good old times the poor Liberals did not get any share.

Mr. TALBOT. They were not the good old times, say the old times.

Mr. JAMESON. Well, call it any kind of a time you like. Now, he says that he considers that in every district in Canada it is unnecessary to ask a man's politics because the politics of the people are generally pretty well known. I am going to say, with regard to the work which was done at Digby during the election of 1908, that men who went to the government pier to make application for work were asked: How are you going to vote?—and if they said that they were not going to vote Liberal, as many of them frankly did, they were told that they could not get any work, that they were bleu. Consequently they were not permitted to share in the labour which was available. The minister has said that in the good old days the poor Liberals did not get an opportunity to share in any of this labour or to receive any benefit from it. On that same public wharf at Digby, when money was expended under the Conservative regime, Liberals and Conservatives indiscriminately were given and had equal opportunities for employment. That is a matter of fact and it is a matter of record which the minister, I dare say, can verify if he chooses to look up the returns in the department, because, as he says, the poltical leanings of the people are so well known in these different districts. I am not finding any fault. The minister does not, I hope, think that I am one of those who squeal, as he has expressed it, because I do not squeal ; I merely ask that every person in the community, without regard to his political qualifications, be permitted to share in this work.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that I would approve of what the hon. gentleman says occurred at Digby. If it is a fact that men came and asked for work and were told that they could not get it unless they voted in a certain way I certainly would not approve of it, and, while I am bound to accept my hon. friend's statement, I would be very much surprised if it occurred.

Mr. JAMESON. I can assure my hon. friend that it did occur.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister would dispose of that fact by the statement that those in charge of these works were not thoroughly versed in the politics of the people.

Mr. FIELDING. I would assume that as a rule they do know.

Mr. EDWARDS. They do know what their politics are?

Mr. FIELDING. As a rule they do know. I may say to my hon. friend that they are well informed people in Nova Scotia and as a rule in any of the small districts the average man knows the politics of his neighbour. If a preference were given to men who were friends of the government, always provided they were good men, nobody would be hurt.

Mr. CROSBY. I spoke about this the other evening when we were discussing this matter, and I told of men applying for work being required to bring a certificate from the local committee as to their politics. Nobody expects the Liberal government to give a position of importance to any but their friends—I think that is a fair proposition—but, all things being equal, we do expect that the workingmen shall not be subjected to the necessity of bringing a certificate from any committee when they are prepared to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. I can remember the Minister of Finance in the city of Halifax, time and time again, getting up and thanking, not the Liberals, but the Conservatives of the county of Halifax for electing him. I know he can remember that and I know he can remember that if the Conservative party had been as decided in seeing that the local government should be in line with the federal government my hon. friend would not have occupied the position that he did very long. He knows that he was elected time and time again by the votes of good Conservatives. I know many good Conservatives who supported him, but it was only on the ground that local and Dominion politics should not be mixed up together. My hon. friend was always willing that that should be the case, but a fellow has a pretty poor show now in both local and Dominion affairs if he happens to be a Conservative or a Tory. I am not complaining of it. We put the evidence on record in the city of Halifax. We had men brought up who had the signatures of the late members representing Halifax and we proved in court that these members gave orders to men to get work before the last election. We had the same thing prevailing in the Eastern Passage, a district in our county. I do not complain, but I say be fair, reasonable and honest. Give them all a chance; God knows you are spending enough money to enable you to do so. Do not turn the Conservatives down . Do not make them go and get certificates from the committees because the committee is pretty hard upon them. Sometimes it is well to be nice to your opponents, because, if you are, you may get them to assist you. We find that we have to be nice to the Liberals. I could not have been elected in Halifax last year if it had not been for the kind-

ness of the Liberals. I ask for nothing that is unfair or unjust. Appoint your foremen and those occupying the principal positions from your own ranks, but do not say to the poor honest, decent fellow who comes along that he shall not have a job until he goes to some Tom, Dick or Harry and brings a certificate to say that he is this, that or the other thing. I appeal in all fairness that when day's work is done we shall not look into a man's mouth or at his teeth to see if we can find how he is going to vote. Let us have a little fairness in that regard, and I know it is only necessary to bring the matter to the notice of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you suppose would happen if we appointed a good Tory foreman?

Mr. CROSBY. I presume he would do about the same as anybody else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He would employ Tory labourers.

Mr. CROSBY. Perhaps he would. If he did I would say he would not be doing right. But I do not deny that the Minister of Public Works or any other minister has the right to employ anybody else than his own friends in positions of trust. Perhaps that is a fair proposition, but I am simply speaking of the labourers. This is public money and let the people have the money. There are always men who are particular to say that they are a great help to the party when sometimes they are not much of a help after all. All I plead for is that the ordinary workman shall be given a fair show and that he shall not be handicapped on account of his politics.

Mr. FIELDING. I should be surprised if it could be shown in the case of any work requiring any considerable number of labourers that the men were all of one political faith. It has generally happened in cases that have come under my observation that men of both parties have been employed. It generally happens that if you want a good many men you have to take men at certain seasons because you cannot get them at other seasons. My observation is that as a rule there are men of both political parties employed. My hon. friend seems to think that it is a great crime for a member of parliament or a prominent Liberal to give a recommendation to anybody to get employment. I cannot quite see it in that light. I have no doubt that every member in this House is in the habit of getting a recommendation from some one asking him to be good enough to do something to help somebody. What is wrong in that?

Mr. CROSBY. It is perfectly proper to give a man a recommendation, but what I complain of is that the rule was made that a man could not get work unless he was recommended by a Liberal.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that he has heard me many a time in Halifax express my gratitude to good Conservatives. That is true, but don't make any mistake about it, I never had anything to thank the Conservative party machine for. I never ran an election in Nova Scotia that I did not have to fight the whole Conservative party machine for what is was worth. I never owed them anything, but I do owe much to high-minded independent Conservatives who were good enough to vote for me and I have always been ready to express my indebtedness to them. I never ran an election for the local legislature that I was not opposed by every power the federal government could bring to bear against me.

Mr. McCOIG. The conditions must be very different in Nova Scotia from what they are in Ontario if opponents of the Nova Scotia government are employed on public works. In my riding of West Kent, where the federal government has very kindly given an appropriation for public works, we have Mr. Fluke, a Liberal contractor, doing the work, and at the last elections he had eight or ten men in his employment who were nearly all Conservatives. We also had another contract where a Conservative was the contractor and he had many Conservatives working for him drawing the money which was appropriated by this government. If the Conservatives have any grievance in Nova Scotia they certainly have not in the other provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. Was that contract let after public competition, or is the work being done by day work?

Mr. McCOIG. The work was let after public competition and Mr. Fluke was the contractor and the men working on the job were nearly all Conservatives. I can assure you that as far as my riding is concerned the Conservatives are not discriminated against. They have the same chance of getting work as the Liberals have, and I only wish the Conservative government in Toronto would be as generous to the Liberals as the Liberal government here is to the Conservatives.

Mr. BLAIN. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman compliment the Conservative government of Toronto on the policy they adopt of letting public works by open competition.

Mr. McCOIG. I did not say anything about that. I merely expressed the hope that the Ontario government would be as willing to give employment to Liberals as the Liberal government here is to give employment to Conservatives on public works.

Mr. BLAIN. The policy of the Ontario government is to put everything possible up to public competition but the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCoig) was a member of the Ontario legislature and he supported a government which did not carry out that kind of a policy.

Mr. McCOIG. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Take for instance the policy of the Ross government with regard to the school books.

Mr. TALBOT. Is the question of the Ontario school books before the Chair?

Mr. BLAIN. No, but my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) introduced the subject and I tell him he was a supporter of a government in Ontario which instituted a school book monopoly that was put out of business when the Conservative party came into office. The Conservatives put the publication of the school books up to public competition and awarded the contract to Timothy Eaton & Company, the heads of which firm are prominent Liberals.

Mr. STRATTON. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman. I was a member of the Ross government in the province of Ontario and there is no doubt at all that Mr. Ross, who was Minister of Education at the time, invited competition for the publication of the school books and awarded the contract after public competition on the merits of the tenders.

Mr. WRIGHT. The Minister of Finance advocates the employment on public works of the party friends of the government, and he says that is the British system. I say that in Britain the government never distinguishes between the two parties in such matters and the Minister of Finance cannot convince the House that such is the case. It is not the British system; it is un-British and the present government here has carried it on to an extent never before equalled by any government either federal or provincial. I deny that the present government of Ontario pays any attention whatever to the party leanings of its officials. There never was a government in power in Canada, less partisan in this respect than the government of Mr. Whitney. In my riding there are men in the employment of the provincial government to-day who during my election of 1904 were in the employ of the Ross government and who chased me all over the riding. These men are still in the employ of the Ontario government and every time I go on the streets I have to meet these officials with a smile on their faces, still they are holding office. It is an unjust charge to make against the Whitney government that in any way it discriminates in favour of its party friends. The system in Ontario is very different from the system followed by the Nova Scotia government if we are to take as a standard of its doings the dictum laid down by the Minister of Finance.

Saw pit—block and span wharf, $1,500.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is that in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Lunenburg.

Mr. BLAIN. There is to be a by-election there very shortly, and I hope the Finance Minister will not send down the policy which he has announced to-night. The hon. gentleman is getting bolder every year in announcing that policy. A few years ago he was very mild, but later he announced that it was the policy of the government to give work to their own political supporters. Now he announces it with a flourish of trumpets, and I thought he would probably go to Lunenburg and announce it in the by-election. May I ask when this money will be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time next summer.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be competition for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it will be done by day work. It is to repair damage done by ice, and cannot very well be done by contract.

Shelburne harbour — deep water wharf, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is new work. It is the construction of a much-needed deep-water wharf.

Mr. EDWARDS. When was the lapsed vote of $8,000 taken?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two years ago.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why has the vote been increased by $2,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason is that we propose calling for tenders for the work, the total estimated cost of which is $30,000, and we expect to expend $10,000 during the coming year.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will this be a revenue-producing wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be when it is handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the government any other wharf accommodation at Shelburne?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at this point.

Mr. CROCKET. Who makes the estimate of $30,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineer, and his figures are verified by the chief engineer.

Mr. CROCKET. When did he make his report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About two years ago, when this item was first voted.

South Ingonish—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards extending the wharf by adding a new block 24 feet square to the present structure. The new block will be in deep water. It is going to cost altogether $6,200, of which we are asking $5,000 now, and a balance of $1,200 will be required to finish it.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the present wharf the property of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. When was it built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1903 or 1904.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the cost of the original wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the statement of the cost of the present wharf, but if the hon. gentleman desires it, I will give it to him at a later stage.

Mr. CROCKET. Will that be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my present view.

Spanish Ship bay (Liscomb)—wharf on west side of bay, $1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. The total estimated cost is $1,800.

South Cove—wharf, $6,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to give a water frontage of forty feet. This is the total estimated cost of the work to be done by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What request was there for the expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no record of any, but it was very strongly recommended by the member for the county (Mr. McKenzie). It is in North Victoria, Cape Breton.

Mr. HUGHES. What were the reasons given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That large shipments would be made from this place if this wharf were constructed. A daily steamer passes within a short distance, but does not call there as there is no landing place.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no town, but in the locality there are a hundred farmers who would ship their produce by this wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there never been a wharf there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not within seven or eight miles.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it the hon. gentleman has neglected this important part of the county so long?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are so many important works to be attended to, that we cannot do them all at once.

Mr. BLAIN. Last session a great many votes were allowed to stand over on the promise of the minister to take them up before any new expenditures were incurred. Have all these been attended to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can safely say they all have except in some cases where, on further consideration, I have not been convinced of their urgent necessity.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be any revenue from this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When handed over to the Marine Department, I think there should be some revenue, but it will be a great accommodation to a considerable number of people.

Swim's Point and West Head—removal of rocks from approaches to wharfs, &c., $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a very good wharf there, but there are rocks quite near which are a menace to vessels, and it is necessary to have them removed.

Sydney Mines—wharf at Barrington Cove, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards reconstructing the wharf so as to enable it to accommodate at all tides vessels drawing ten to twelve feet of water. It is proposed to build out to a distance of 730 feet from the end of the public road. It is going to be quite expensive, but the work is very important. There is a large shipping business done there. This is going to cost about $35,000 in all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In whose riding is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cape Breton, North Victoria.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but the work will be let by contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there any other government wharf there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. What population will this accommodate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 8,000.

Tenecape breakwater—addition, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build an extension eighty feet long and forty feet wide. This will complete.

'The Wharfs,' Lunenburg county breakwater, $2,000

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a breakwater. It is a fishing station; $2,000 will do the work. This is a new work and will afford shelter for the fishing boats.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this be done by day labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided. I think it would be better done that way.

Three-Fathom harbour—renewal and repairs to breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Halifax. It is to repair damage done by storms.

Toney river—extension of channel protection piers at mouth of piers, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to afford an extension fifty feet long and ten feet wide and will complete the work.

Tusket Wedge wharf—restoration and extension of, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a government wharf in the county of Yarmouth. This will complete.

Mr. HUGHES. Is any provision made for placing a light on the rock where the 'Hestia' was wrecked?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter has been attended to, I believe.

Upper Prospect breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a breakwater 200 feet long by 30 feet wide and with a height of 19 feet at the outer end, as a shelter for the fishermen of the locality. It is in the county of Halifax. This sum will complete the work.

Upper Washabuck (McDougal's) — wharf, $1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a pile wharf, 40 by 50 feet, with an approach 110 feet. The timber of the wharf will be creosoted to resist the ravages of the teredo. The amount asked for will complete the work.

West Advocate — breakwater — revote of $4,800 lapsed, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Cumberland. The work is to provide proper shipping accommodation and for the protection of vessels entering the port. A large number of vesseds go to West Advocate.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it a new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this vote complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it will require $20,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will it be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

West Baccaro—extension of breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Halifax. It is a necessary work, and all that is asked is an extension of existing breakwater.

West Dublin bay—dredging approach to wharf, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to remove some 30,000 cubic yards of mud to make a channel from Curry's wharf to the main channel, 100 feet in length, allowing a depth of 9 feet. The estimated cost is $9,000. This is in Lunenburg county.

Mr. EDWARDS. What population has this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 200. It is a farming and fishing population.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this to be done by government dredge or will it be given out by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided that yet.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do many vessels call there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Considerable shipping is done and vessels are not able to get to the wharf conveniently owing to the channel being filled in.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are there any regular passenger boats to this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are mostly sailing vessels.

Mr. EDWARDS. Fishing vessels?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And trading vessels, too.

Mr. CROCKET. It seems to me that when the minister asks for money for dredging he ought to be able to state whether the work is to be done by government dredges or under contract. A great deal of dredging goes on all over the country, contracts are let and immense sums are wasted. I am satisfied that the sums paid for dredging are excessive to the extent of fifty per cent in many cases. In the province of New Brunswick there are many dredging contracts. One spoken of last year was the dredging of Maquapit lake in the constituency of Queen's and Sunbury. A channel was to be dredged from a depth of seven feet, and it cost the people of this country no less than $48,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How many cubic yards were dredged?

Mr. CROCKET. I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the hon. member can say whether there was any money wasted or not, he ought to know the quantity of work done.

Mr. CROCKET. I remember that it was at the rate of 50 cents a yard. And I have heard it stated by men competent to judge that it was not worth 10 cents a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a great wonder they did not tender for the work.

Mr. CROCKET. They did not get a chance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did; tenders were called for by public advertisement and every one had a chance to tender.

Mr. CROCKET. I know the minister stated that last year, but it developed that the work was actually in progress by the Maritime Dredging Company when the tenders were called for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not make any difference.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister takes steps to give these things good appearance. But the result was that the Maritime Dredging Company and Mr. John E. Moore, the minister's friend, received three or four times the value of the work. And the Auditor General's Report, which I have consulted, shows that the inspection charges require investigation. About $600 or $700 was spent for inspection on this work. There were three or four inspectors, one at $5 a day, one at $3, and another at $2.50, and my recollection is that they had seventy or eighty days more than the time within which the work was in progress. These inspectors are appointed by the ministers, and I have not the slightest doubt appointed upon the recommendation of the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless the hon. member has information to that effect, he ought not to make that statement. I tell him that there is no foundation whatever for the statement. No inspector in New Brunswick or elsewhere is put on at the recommendation of the contractor. The hon. member ought to know that he should have the most positive evidence before making a statement of that kind.

Mr. CROCKET. Notwithstanding the minister's statement, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that, in the dredging that goes on in New Brunswick, the inspectors are in league with the contractors. What does the hon. minister think of the dredging at Dalhousie and the inspection certificates put through in that case? It developed in court that the dredging inspection was done and the records kept by an employee of the firm of A. & R. Loggie, who sued the inspector, issuing a summons against him in the magistrate's court. And the matter was fixed up. Does the minister mean to say that Mr. Alleyne, the dredging inspector, was thoroughly independent of the firm of A. & R. Loggie, or that the inspection was done without reference to the interests of the firm? It is very well for the minister to make such statements as that which he has made, but it has been and will be pretty difficult to make the people in communities where the dredging is done believe that fraud is not being committed on the public treasury in connection with these dredging contracts in different parts of the country. It is only necessary to examine the certificates and note the handwriting of some of these inspectors. They are men who write with the greatest difficulty and could not possibly figure a cube. Such things are reported to me from different parts of the country. I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that these dredging grafts are worked in many cases by dishonest and fraudulent inspection. So, I think that when the minister comes down with an estimate of this kind for dredging, the House is entitled to have information as to just how that money is to be expended—whether it is to be expended by contract given out in this way or upon dredges owned by the government. It seems to me that there is a great deal of dredging done and let by contract to private contractors that ought to be done by the government dredges. The government own a very extensive dredging plant and I thought it was the intention that as much dredging as possible should be done by the dredges owned by the government. There is no doubt that men have gone into this dredging business who had no experience and have gone into it to make money out of it relying on their political pull with the department and with the government. Since my hon. friend became Minister of Public Works the firm of A. & R. Loggie has embarked upon that business with very profitable results to them. They have not been in the business very long but they have contracts to the extent of thousands of dollars. That firm is composed of gentlemen who have been very close to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Close in what way?

Mr. CROCKET. Politically and in every other way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what other way?

Mr. CROCKET. In every other way——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman mean now, 'in every other way.'

Mr. CROCKET. I say they were close friends and closely associated with the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what way?

Mr. CROCKET. The minister regards A. and R. Loggie as among his closest friends in the province of New Brunswick. Then there is the McAvity and the John E. Moore interest, who have also formed a dredging company. They are also very close to the Minister of Public Works, and I think when we see the thousands and thousands of dollars going to these firms, we should scrutinize these dredging contracts closely. I have no desire to make any reflections on any of these gentlemen, I am not here for that purpose. Any reflections I make are upon the department for allowing these things to take place. I have no hesitation in criticising them as wasteful expenditures. Dredging could be done in some cases for one-quarter or one-fifth of what has been paid by this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that there was fraudulent dealing in connection with the dredging. There can be nothing fraudulent unless the contractor is guilty of fraud. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile that statement with his other statement that he makes no reflection on the contractors? If there is fraud, the contractors must be a party to it, and I cannot imagine a more serious charge for a member to make than to allege that the contractors have conspired together with the inspectors to send in fraudulent returns and so defraud the government. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he has information of that character, if he has information which would justify him as a public man in making that statement behind the backs of these contractors and sending it broadcast throughout this country, giving to it all the authority and weight that should be attached to the statement of a respectable and honourable member of this parliament, then he is negligent in his duty as a public man if he fails to give the necessary information to the officers of my department or to the officers of the Department of Justice in the province from which he comes, so that they may take the necessary proceedings in order to prevent any further defrauding of the public revenue, and to punish those whom he believes guilty of fraud. That is the duty the hon. member owes to himself, to parliament and the people whom he represents. Let me say to my hon. friend that he should be careful and take warning by the fate that has befallen some gentlemen who have preceded him in this parliament. I remember that an hon. member representing one of the Simcoes was in the habit of rising in his place in this parliament and making similar accusations with regard to the treasury being defrauded by dredging contracts. He was never able to prove the assertions he made and when he went back to his people where a considerable amount of this dredging was being carried on and where he had alleged fraudulent transactions were going on from week to week and from month to month, the people of the constituency let that hon. gentleman know what they thought of the exaggerated accusations he had so often made in this House. Let me say to my hon. friend that as one occupying a seat in a parliament of gentlemen he ought not to make these accusations unless he is prepared to back them up and give the proof of the statements he makes.

In regard to A. and R. Loggie, I do not know whether they went into the dredging business after I became minister or not. I think they were in the business before I became minister, in fact I am satisfied they were, and my deputy so informs me. Let me say further that they are not intimate personal friends of mine, I do not know whether I can say they are active political friends. I think that they but seldom take an active part in politics. They are men who stand in the very front rank of merchants and manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada. They are men who by patience and energy and devotion to their business have built up a very large business which extends over various parts of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and I think it extends up into the province of Quebec. Until to-night I have never heard any insinuations thrown out against their integrity. The hon. gentleman has chosen to insinuate that they have gone into the dredging business because they are friends of the Minister of Public Works, and he throws out the insinuation that they hope in some way by reason of that fact to secure benefits at the expense of the treasury of this country. Let me say that, so far as I know, since I became minister the Messrs. Loggie have never secured a single contract except by public competition when they were the lowest tenderers, and I know of no misconduct on the part of inspectors, I know of no misconduct or wrong doing on the part of Messrs. Loggie, and I have yet to learn that it is any crime for any man in this country to tender for a public work. I have yet to learn that it is any crime on the part of the minister to award a contract for any public work to the man who happens to be the lowest tenderer, even although he may belong to the same political party as the minister.

With regard to Messrs. Moore and McAvity it is true they are engaged in the dredging business, but they are both men of large activities, they are men who en-

gage in many lines of business, they are active, energetic, enterprising men. One of them Mr. Moore, is the president of the Maritime Dredging Company. What connection Mr. McAvity has with the company I do not know, but whether he has any connection or not makes no difference. Let me say that the contract for dredging both upon the St. John river and Maquapit lake and the harbour of St. John were let to the Maritime Dredging Company after public competition and after everybody had had full and fair opportunity of tendering for the work.

Mr. CROCKET. And after they had been put to work on the job.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember whether they were on the work, but if so it was distinctly under this agreement that the work should be let by public tender and that for any work which they did in the meantime, pending the awarding of the contracts, the Maritime Dredging Company were to receive the price at which the work was tendered for by the lowest tenderer. But no assurance was given them and they had no expectation that they would receive the contract unless they happened to be the lowest tenderers. Tenders were advertised for in the leading daily newspapers of St. John and everybody had an opportunity of tendering for this work. Take the case that my hon. friend spoke of. The hon. gentleman says that it is well known that the money is being wasted and that the contractors are receiving amounts larger than they are entitled to. Upon what does my hon. friend base that statement?

Mr. CROCKET. I did not say that in reference to the St. John Harbour contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, my hon. friend, I understand, limits his charge to the Maquapit lake work.

Mr. CROCKET. That and the payment of 90 cents per cubic yard to the Maritime Dredging Company for the Gasperaux river work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will deal first with the Maquapit lake work. This is out of order and I would not have referred to it but for the extraordinary statement of the hon. gentleman. As to the Maquapit lake work, my hon. friend ought to know that dredging in different places does not always cost the same amount of money. A good deal depends upon the extent of the work that is to be done. Then, the question of the cost of a dredge enters into the calculation of the contractor. A good deal depends upon the nature of the soil which has to be excavated. But it so happens that all these considerations were taken into account, I presume, by the contractors who tendered for this work at 50 cents per cubic yard. My chief engineer, who has had a large experience in these matters and who had the report of the resident engineer before him, certified that the price was fair and reasonable and the contract was awarded to the Maritime Dredging Company.

Now, let me speak of the work which my hon. friend referred to at the Gasperaux river. Tenders were called for the work. I am not quite sure whether there was any tender put in except that of the Maritime Dredging Company. The work was very widely advertised but there were very few people, if any, outside that company who were willing to undertake it. The work is at a very exposed place, at Port Elgin—whether it is upon the straits of Northumberland or not I do not remember at this moment—and the cost of towing the dredge there was very large. There was a great deal of danger connected with it. While the work of dredging was going on one of the scows was wrecked involving a very large loss to the contractors. Although the Maritime Dredging Company were offered the work for the next season at the same price of 90 cents per cubic yard, they refused to again enter into a contract and declined to go back there last spring. In consequence of that we were obliged to wait for a number of months before we could make any arrangements for doing the work, and, being unable to get them to send their dredge back, we were obliged, late in the fall, to undertake the continuance of that work by means of the government dredge which we brought from Nova Scotia.

Now then, in face of these facts, how can the hon. gentleman expect this committee to believe there was anything wrong in the awarding of that contract to the Maritime Dredging Company? The only other contract to which reference has been made is that in the city of St. John. What took place there? You have the right to look at all the work which this company is doing. Before I became Minister of Public Works my predecessor, having invited tenders by public competition, received tenders for this work and the lowest tender received was 90 cents per cubic yard. When I became minister, recognizing the necessity of continuing that work, I asked myself how it would be possible to get the work done at a lower price? In past years the practice had been to let contracts from year to year. I determined that I would let a contract extending over a number of years because I thought that in that case there would be an encouragement to the contractors to purchase a dredge and that they would be willing, as they would be sure of the work extending over a number of years, to tender at a lower price than they would be if they only had the contract for one year. I called for tenders and the result was that the Maritime Dredging Company tendered for the work at 39 cents per cubic

yard, a little more than one-third of what had been previously paid for dredging in St. John harbour. The hon. gentleman referred to the dredging work that Mr. Mayes did at one time at 55 cents per cubic yard, and afterwards at 90 cents per cubic yard. We are getting the dredging done, and a very important work it is, in the harbour of St. John, by the Maritime Dredging Company at either 39 or 39½ cents per cubic yard.

Just a word in regard to the inspectors. I say to my hon. friend that in no single case has an inspector been appointed who was supposed to have any relations of any kind or description with the contractors. So far, I know of no inspector having been appointed upon the recommendation of the contractors, and we have always been careful to see that they have no connection of any kind or description with the contractors so that they would not be likely to be in the slightest degree influenced in favour of the contractors. We have endeavoured to get honest men, and I believe we have honest men. I believe we have honest men in the employ of the government to-day as dredge inspectors, and until I have some better evidence than the mere statement of my hon. friend that these inspectors are dishonest, I shall continue to believe that they are honest. I shall continue to believe they are honest until I have evidence to the contrary.

I would say to my hon. friend that I think the fair thing for him to do would be to investigate these accounts thoroughly. I have no objection to the most thorough investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, but I do say to him that in all fairness to those who are not here to defend themselves he ought not to be throwing out these insinuations unless he has the facts to support such statements, and if he has the facts to support them, then it is his duty to submit these facts to the proper officers of the Crown whose duty it is to take criminal proceedings and give them an opportunity of taking such a course as they may deem to be best in the public interest. The hon. gentleman has now the opportunity of going to his own political friends. It so happens that the Premier of New Brunswick, who is also the Attorney General of that province, is a political friend of the hon. member who represents the county of York and who has made these insinuations. I have no doubt that if he goes, in the discharge of his duty, and submits the facts to the Attorney General he will feel it to be his duty to take the necessary steps in order to punish those who have defrauded the treasury of this country, if there has been any defrauding of the treasury, although I do not hesitate to tell the committee that I do not believe it, and I shall refuse to believe it until I have some positive evidence that there has been such fraud as my hon. friend insinuates.

Mr. CROCKET. I think I have a full sense of my responsibilities and duties as a member of this House, and that I do not require any instructions from the Minister of Public Works in that behalf. I stated that I believed in many cases in connection with dredging contracts in New Brunswick the public treasury had been defrauded of large sums of money. I stated that and I reiterate that now as my firm belief. I say this after having investigated, to some extent, the accounts in connection with the dredging operations and after having had communicated to me information by letter and by personal interview by several very reliable men in different parts of New Brunswick. I referred to one case, the contract of A. and R. Loggie for dredging at Dalhousie. I state what is my absolute and firm belief founded on information communicated to me by persons of unquestioned reliability. I have a letter from Dalhousie stating that Mr. Alleyne who was appointed—and I have since discovered that he was appointed upon the order of the Minister of Public Works to do the inspecting at that place—has been paid day after day during the whole season, and that for many days he was not there at all. There is a memorandum upon the file signed by the Minister of Public Works asking that this same Mr. Alleyne be appointed. He was appointed, but the work was done by another person, and my information is that he was an employee of the firm of A. and R. Loggie and that a summons was issued in the magistrate's court.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Issued by whom?

Mr. CROCKET. Issued by the man who did the inspecting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Against whom?

Mr. CROCKET. Against the inspector who was receiving the money from the government. That is my information, and when the summons was issued and served it was fixed up through the intervention of the contractor. As to the dredging of Maquapit lake this was the easiest sort of dredging, dredging a channel where there was three feet of water to the depth of seven feet. The minister has said that there has been no case in which a contract has been let to the firm of A. & R. Loggie, and I think he added, or to any other firm in New Brunswick, without a tender. What has the Minister of Public Works to say as to this? I hold in my hand a copy of a telegram which reads:

Dalhousie, Oct. 14, 1908.

Eugene D. Lafleur, Ottawa.

Kindly authorize resident engineer Stead to put dredge 'Hayward' at work at Bathurst

at same price as Caraquet contract, to be certified fair and reasonable by Mr. Stead, work not to exceed $5,000.

Signed, WM. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the date?

Mr. CROCKET. The 14th October at Dalhousie, when the minister was down there in the election campaign and after no doubt he had seen his friend, Mr. Loggie.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that to be at the same rate as the other?

Mr. CROCKET. Prices to be certified fair and reasonable by Mr. Stead. Well, I have had occasion to look into some of Mr. Stead's certificates and to judge of the value of his certificates as to what is fair and reasonable, and perhaps when we come to some other matters that have occurred in the province of New Brunswick this House will have more light as to the value to be attached to any certificate furnished by Mr. Stead as to fairness and reasonableness. But there is the telegram signed by the minister himself telegraphing from Dalhousie, where Mr. Loggie was, to his engineer and instructing him to give Loggie's dredge this work at prices to be fixed by the minister's engineer, Mr. Stead. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the province of New Brunswick, where this work is being done, will require something more than a display of affected indignation on the part of the Minister of Public Works. He invariably shields himself—that has been his habit for many years—when a statement is made which reflects upon himself or his department by trying to treat it as something said against somebody else, and then he proceeds to laud that somebody else to the skies and to speak of him as some one of the highest reputation for honour and integrity and righteousness in which he is excelled by no man in the Dominion of Canada. He has said that of his friend, Mr. McAvity, he has said that of his friend, Mr. Loggie. Well, these are private contractors and I am not here to criticise them, but to criticise the Department of Public Works which is the trustee and servant of the people for not properly guarding the people's interests.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentlemen say that a contractor has conspired with an inspector to defraud the department and yet makes no reflection on him?

Mr. CROCKET. What I said was that I was not here for the purpose of making reflections on these people who were dealing with the department, but my criticism is directed against the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why do you do it then?

Mr. CROCKET. Because I am here as a representative of the people to criticise the conduct of the department. I have no hestitation in saying that my firm belief is that there has been fraud in this connection and that the country is paying as much as fifty per cent and one hundred per cent in same cases for dredging above fair and honest prices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman suggest to this committee that there can be fraud unless the inspector and the contractor are parties to that fraud?

Mr. CROCKET. I am not saying whether that is so or not, but I do say and the great majority of the people in the communities who know what is going on, believe it, that these certificates upon which payment is being made to these very contractors are certificates which cannot be relied upon. I have referred to the certificate of Mr. Alleyne, appointed by the minister himself in connection with the Loggie contract; a certificate which has been brought down, and which would convince anybody that the man was not competent to estimate the quantity of dredging material worked by that firm or any other firm. In addition to that there is the information which has been communicated to me by a prominent resident of that community in reference to Mr. Alleyne's neglect of his duty, and the fact that it was known that he was not there day after day and for weeks at a time, but he signed these certificates upon statements prepared by another man who was in close relation with the Loggie firm. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts the House will be in a better position to properly judge the weight of the statement which the minister made, and as I say, it will require more than these exhibitions of affected indignation to which the minister always resorts when he claims that there are foul insinuations made against him or his friends; it will require more than his affected indignation to change the opinion of the residents of these communities where these things have gone on. So far as I am concerned it is not an insinuation. I state, as a member of this House, my firm belief, after examining the documents which have been brought down in connection with these contracts, and after having had communicated to me by reliable people these facts of which I have made mention.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister said he did not know whether this work would be done by contract or by the government dredge. Is there not a government dredge in that vicinity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROSBY. Is there not one at Lunenburg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a government dredge; it belonged to the W. J. Poupore Company.

Mr. CROSBY. I understood there was a government dredge at Bridgewater not very long ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was a Poupore dredge, but of course we have dredges at several places.

Yarmouth harbour improvements, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the very necessary work of improving the harbour at Yarmouth.

Mr. DANIEL. How is the dredging being done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is done under contract. Tenders were called for, several were received, and the lowest tender was that of the Dominion Dredging Company, which is doing the work. The prices are 50 cents a yard for taking out to sea, and 30 cents to cast over.

Mr. DANIEL. How far do they have to take the material?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information.

Mr. LAW. About five miles.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will depend on the extent of the improvement we shall make. We are widening and deepening the channel so as to accommodate the large steamers which now come to Yarmouth, especially those running to Boston. If we were to continue the work to the full extent that would be useful the cost would run up to a large amount; but we do not think it necessary to do that. We can keep widening the channel gradually. At present we have in contemplation only the work for which we are now asking for an appropriation.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the work at Westport be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The hon. member for Cumberland asked what the $367.77 was expended for at Diligent River harbour. It was for removing what is known as the Gore rock, which was a menace to navigation, about 225 tons of stone having been removed. Then, the hon. member for Digby asked me with regard to the wharf at Centreville. I may say that I have had a report made upon that wharf, and while it is a fairly useful work, I find that it will cost from $75,000 to $85,000. Therefore I am afraid that I cannot hold out much expectation that that work will be done in the near future.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not want the minister to confuse the repairs necessary to sustain the present structure with the very elaborate harbour improvement referred to in the report. The wharf at present there is liable to be carried away during any tempestuous weather and a comparatively small sum would retain that, and that is what I referred to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The difficulty, in the opinion of the resident engineer is that it would be a waste of money to repair the present wharf, while to build a new one, which would be the only way to make it effective, would cost the sum I have stated.

Mr. JAMESON. All I can say is that it would be a most disastrous thing to allow that wharf to go down for the lack of a comparatively small sum of money. I know the wharf quite as well as the resident engineer. The entire business carried on there is dependent on that structure, and if it is allowed to go down, the business done there will be brought to an immediate termination, and many thousands of dollars invested in valuable plants will be entirely lost and hundreds of people thrown out of employment. So I hope the minister will either ask the resident engineer for a special report on that wharf, or send a special engineer to make a special report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot promise to send a special engineer, but I will again look carefully into the report. My hon. friend also mentioned Battery Point, Digby, Nova Scotia. I find that a part of it belongs to the Department of Militia and Defence and the other part to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company. Therefore, there is no obligation on my department to make any improvements.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 9, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada. —Mr Cash.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Ethier.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Winding-Up Act, R. S., 1906, c. 144. He said: I may say that I went to see the Minister of Justice a couple of times for the purpose of getting remedied an oversight in this Act. As I was not able to see him, I introduce this Bill for that purpose. The amendment is rendered necessary by the creation of the Manitoba Court of Appeal. When the Manitoba Court of Appeal was established, it was necessary to amend the Winding-up Act and others so as to provide for apealing to this Court of Appeal from the order of a single judge, instead of to what was called the Court en Banc. That provision was made by 7-8 Edward VII. chapter 74; but there was an oversight, I think, in paragraph (c) of section 106, not making provision for an appeal from the Court of Appeal in Manitoba to the Supreme Court of Canada. This Bill is to remedy that oversight.

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Bill apply only to the Court of Appeal of Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

KINGSTON BATTERY SOLDIERS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. At whose request and by what authority have the battery soldiers at Kingston been employed in producing films for a five cent moving picture theatre?

2. Has any money been paid for such services? If so, how much and to whom?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. At the request of the Kalem Company, manufacturers of moving picture films, authority was granted by the O. C. Eastern Ontario Command, who saw no objection to the men taking part in these pictures.

2. All the men taking part did so voluntarily, and were paid 75 cents each time they turned out, which was on half holidays and during their spare time.

The money was paid to the men direct by the Kalem Company each afternoon they turned out. Some $65 to $75 was paid to the men but the exact amounts are not known.

EMPLOYMENT OF J. NAPOLEON AUCTIL.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Has the government in its employment J. Napoléon Auctil, of Rivière du Loup station?

2. If so, from what time has he been employed by the government? What are his duties and salary?

3. What are his qualifications for the employment he is now engaged in?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. (a) His employment with the railway has been continuous since 26th April, last. (b) His duties are inspecting the construction of the machine shop, boiler house and chimney, brick store and office building, addition to freight shed and addition to engine house at Rivière du Loup. His salary is $3 per day.

3. His services have been quite satisfactory.

LAKE NIPISSING IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Has the canal of Lake Nipissing improvements to Monetteville been completed? If not, why has it been delayed?

2. If completed, what tonnage has passed through the canal during season of 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1 and 2. Not yet completed; delay mainly due to unfavourable conditions for economical work on account of continuous high water during past season and also to consideration being given to possibility of controlling Lake Nipissing water level, which is now under study and which would govern depth of cuts to be completed.

NAPANEE RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. URIAH WILSON:

1. Is it the intention of the government to do any dredging during the coming season in the Napanee river?

2. Is the government aware that the said Napanee river is in a very bad state for navigation purposes owing to the inefficiency of the dredging of the past season?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Until the large number of applications, which are before the department, for dredging during the next season have been carefully considered, it is impossible to say whether or not it will be possible to do any dredging next season in the Napanee river.

2. The district engineer reports that the present condition of the Napanee river is not due to the inefficiency of the dredging performed during the past season by the department, but rather to the extreme low stage of water in Lake Ontario and the Bay of Quinte which governs the depth of the Napanee river; the difference between the level in September last, when the work was performed, and to-day, or up to the close of navigation, is 14 inches.

DAM AT LONG SAULT RAPIDS.

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Has an application been made by any persons or persons, or corporation for permission to dam the St. Lawrence river at Long Sault rapids, for power purposes?

2. If so, what is the name of the person or corporation making such application?
3. Has a report been made by the International Waterways Commission re proposed dam?
4. Is it the intention of the government to grant such privilege?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Application has been made for permission to construct a dam at Long Sault rapids, for power purposes.
2. St. Lawrence Power Company, Limited.
3. No.
4. The government has not yet considered the application.

ST. LAURENT, MANITOBA, PIERS.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Has the government spent any moneys on a wharf at St. Laurent, on Lake Manitoba? If so, when, and how much?
2. At whose request was the expenditure made, and what is the nature of the work done, and the object for doing it?
3. Are the moneys expended, if any, of value to the public?
4. Is it the intention of the government to complete the undertaking? If so, when?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Expenditure for construction and repairs of piers, exclusive of dredging, in 1903, 1904, 1906 and 1909: $15,988.87.
2. (a) Petitions received from residents of St. Laurent and surrounding district and from Winnipeg Board of Trade. (b) Construction of guide piers and dredging of a channel and basin inside of these piers. (c) The object was to afford greater facilities for traffic and transportation on Lake Manitoba and develop traffic by way of said lake and the connected lakes to the north. It was expected, at the time, that this place would be the main shipping point at the south end of Lake Manitoba and that the Canadian Northern railway would build a spur from their main line, which passes close by; the erection of freezers by the fishing industry was contemplated and it was also thought that the Manitoba Gypsum Company would make this their shipping point.
3. The work that has already been done is in excellent condition and is sufficient to provide for any shipping on Lake Manitoba.
4. Further expenditure at this point will be considered should the shipping increase to such an extent as to warrant same.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. LAKE:

1. Who are the present holders of homesteads for the northwest and southwest quarters of sections 24, township 38, range 10, west of 3rd meridian?
2. Was seed grain supplied to any of these men? If so, to whom, and how much to each?

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Northwest ¼ section 24, township 38, range 10, west 3rd meridian, Thomas Warwick; southwest ¼ no entry at present. Allan R. Mudie allowed 30 days from 25th November, 1909, to make entry. Entry not reported up to date of last return received from Saskatoon agency which is dated 23rd November.
2. No.

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Are there any cities in Canada in which free mail delivery has been established, and in which the distribution office has been closed? If so, what are the names of the cities?

Mr. FIELDING:

In all cities where letter carrier delivery has been established it has been the practice to close all post offices, except the head office, within the city limits and continue them as sub-post offices. As sub-post offices they do not deliver mail to the public, but all mail matter for the different neighbourhoods is deposited in a letter box placed at the door and collected by the department and sent to the head office. All other post office business, such as registering letters, issuing money orders, taking savings bank deposits and sale of stamps is carried on by sub-post offices. The delivery of mail formerly undertaken by these offices is, of course, carried on by the letter carriers.

GOVERNMENT WEIGHER AT MONTREAL.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Has a government weigher been appointed at the port of Montreal?

Mr. FIELDING. A weighmaster has been appointed under the Inspection and Sale Act, but his powers are confined to grain.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Referring to the ratification of the Franco-Canadian treaty, is the Canadian government now prepared to establish a similar treaty between Canada and the German empire?

Mr. FIELDING. The ratification of the Franco-Canadian convention has not yet taken place. The question of treaties with other countries is under consideration.

NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMISSION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

What are the names of the chairman and members of the commission appointed to conserve our national resources, and what salaries, if any, are paid to them?

Mr. FIELDING. The Hon. Clifford Sifton is chairman. The other members are as follows:

The Hon. Benjamin Rogers, of Alberton, Prince Edward Island; Professor Howard Murray, B.A., of Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Mr. Frank Davison, of Bridgewater, Nova Scotia; Mr. Cecil C. Jones, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., chancellor of University of New Brunswick, of Fredericton, New Brunswick; Mr. William B. Snowball, lumber merchant, of Chatham, New Brunswick; Mr. Henri S. Béland, M.D., M.P., of St. Joseph de Beauce, Quebec; Mr. Frederick Debartzch Monk, K.C., D.C.L., M.P., of Montreal, Quebec; Doctor J. W. Robertson, C.M.G., director of Macdonald Agricultural College, of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec; Monseigneur J. C. K. Laflamme, superior and rector of University of Laval, of Quebec, Quebec; Sir Sanford Fleming, K.C.M.G., LL.D., M.I.C.E., chancellor of Queens University, of Ottawa, Ontario; the Hon. Senator William Cameron Edwards, of Ottawa, Ontario; Mr. Edmund Boyd Osler, M.P., of Toronto, Ontario; Mr. Charles Arthur McCool, lumber merchant, of Ottawa, Ontario; Mr. J. F. Mackay, journalist, of Toronto, Ontario; Professor Bernhard Fernow, of Toronto, Ontario; the Reverend George Bryce, M.A., D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C., of the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Doctor W. J. Rutherford, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and member of the faculty of the University of Saskatchewan, of Regina, Saskatchewan; Professor H. M. Troy, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., president of University of Alberta, of Edmonton, Alberta; Mr. John Hendry, lumber merchant, of Vancouver, British Columbia; and the following who are members ex-officio: the Hon. Sydney Fisher, of Ottawa, Minister of Agriculture; the Hon. Frank Oliver, of Ottawa, Minister of the Interior; the Hon. William Templeman, of Ottawa, Minister of Mines; the Hon. Francis L. Haszard, of Charlottetown, Premier of the province of Prince Edward Island; Attorney General of the province of Nova Scotia; the Hon. Ward Chipman Hazen Grimmer, of Fredericton, Surveyor General of the province of New Brunswick; the Hon. Jules Allard, of Quebec, Minister of Lands and Forests of the province of Quebec; the Hon. Frank Cochrane, of Toronto, Minister of Lands and Mines of the province of Ontario; the Hon. Hugh Armstrong, of Winnipeg, Provincial Treasurer of the province of Manitoba; the Hon. James Alexander Calder, of Regina, Commissioner of Education and Provincial Treasurer of the province of Saskatchewan; the Hon. Alexander Cameron Rutherford, of Edmonton, Premier and President of the Executive Council of the province of Alberta; the Hon. Frederick John Fulton, of Victoria, Chief Commissioner of Lands of the province of British Columbia.

Under the provisions of section 9, chapter 27, 8-9 Edward VII., no fees or emoluments of any kind shall be received by the chairman or other members of the commission. Their expenses are paid.

LEVEL CROSSINGS PROTECTION.

Mr. STANFIELD:

Has the railway department received Mr. John Murphy's report on electric devices, electric bells, &c., for the better protection of level crossings? If so, will the minister lay copy of same on the table of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM: The department has not received any such report from Mr. John Murphy.

CANADIAN FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many commissions have been appointed to inquire into the condition of the Canadian fisheries since 1896?
2. Of whom did they, respectively, consist, what was the date of appointments and date of completion of duties of each?
3. What special branches of the fishery and what territory did each, respectively, deal with?
4. In what instances were reports made?
5. In what instances were reports made and evidence taken, printed, and in such cases how many copies were printed?
6. How many copies of the respective reports and evidence, if printed, were distributed, by whom and among whom?
7. In what instances were recommendations made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by said reports?
8. In what instances were the recommendations as made, carried out?
9. What was the cost of the respective commissions?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1. Nine.

2, 3 and 9. On the 27th September, 1898, the following persons were appointed to inquire into the condition and requirements of the Canadian Lobster Fishery: Professor E. E. Prince, Moses H. Nickerson, Wm. Whitman, H. C. V. LeVatte, S. E. Gallant, Patrick Sweeney, Robert Lindsay, Archibald Currie and Donald Campbell. The commission reported April 25, 1899. It cost $7,437.24.

On January 25, 1902, the following commissioners were appointed to inquire into the salmon fishery of British Columbia: Professor E. E. Prince, G. R. Maxwell, Aulay Morrison and Ralph Smith. Interim report March 4, 1902. Cost of commission, $878.70.

(Note.—George Riley was appointed to fill vacancy caused by death of G. R. Maxwell by order in council January 9, 1903.

Commission never finally reported and was ultimately superseded by another commission in 1905.)

On November 14, 1903, the following commissioners were appointed to inquire into the conditions and requirements of the herring and sardine fisheries and industry, in the Bay of Fundy and tributary waters, and of the lobster fishery of the western portion of the Bay of Fundy and St. Mary's Bay, as well as the dogfish pest: R. N. Venning, Col. J. J. Tucker, A. J. S. Copp, R. E. Armstrong and E. C. Bowers. Their final report was dated March 3, 1905.

These commissioners, together with Reverend J. S. Turbide, were at the same time empowered to investigate the conditions and requirements of the lobster fishery and the dogfish pest, at the Magdalen Islands, and they also finally reported in this connection on the 3rd March, 1905. Cost of both commissions, $3,943.11.

On April 11, 1904, Professor E. E. Prince and P. Morais were appointed a commission to inquire into the salmon and lobster fishery, as well as the dogfish pest, of Gloucester county, New Brunswick. Their report was dated May 5, 1904. Commission cost $389.32.

On July 22, 1905, the following commissioners were appointed to investigate the conditions and requirements of the fisheries of Georgian bay: Professor E. E. Prince, John Birnie and James J. Noble. They reported on February 16, 1909. The cost of the commission was $21,546.99.

(Note.—The powers of this commission were extended by order in council 14th August, 1906, so as to include the fisheries of Lake Erie; but owing to the subsequent appointment of the International Fisheries Commission, it did not report in regard thereto.)

On July 22, 1905, the following persons were appointed a commission to inquire into the condition and requirements of the fisheries of British Columbia: Professor E. E. Prince, Campbell Sweeney, J. C. Brown, Richard Hall, Reverend G. W. Taylor and J. P. Babcock. They reported on July 24, 1907. The cost of the commission was $16,934.06.

On June 4, 1908, Professor E. E. Prince and S. F. Morrison were appointed a commission to investigate the condition and requirements of the shad fishery of Minas Basin and adjacent rivers and Bay of Fundy waters, and Simon Melanson was added to the commission when investigating the New Brunswick waters affected. The commission reported on February 6, 1909. It cost $2,651.07.

On March 16, 1909, Professor E. E. Prince, T. L. Metcalfe and D. F. Reid were appointed a commission to inquire into the condition and requirements of the fisheries of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and on September 3, 1909, J. B. Hugg was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Metcalfe, on his appointment to the Bench.

Interim report submitted December 2, 1909. Work of commission not yet completed. Cost to date $1,070.85.

On June 25, 1909, Commander W. Wakeham was appointed a commissioner to inquire into the condition and requirements of the Canadian lobster fishery.

His report has not yet been submitted. Cost to date $1,375.97.

4. In all.

5. The reports of the Lobster Commission of 1898, the British Columbia Commission of 1905 and the Georgian Bay Commission of 1905, were printed. 4,500, 1,500 and 1,200 respectively, but no evidence printed in any case.

6. A number of copies were sent to the inspectors of fisheries of the districts affected for distribution among those interested and all applicants to the department were supplied with copies.

7. In all.

8. The recommendations of the Lobster Commission of 1898 were practically all carried out. The recommendations of the commission appointed 14th November, 1903, so far as the lobster fishery of the Bay of Fundy and St. Mary's bay and of the Magdalen islands is concerned, were carried out. In the case of the British Columbia Commission appointed on July 22, 1905, the recommendations were carried out. The recommendations of the Georgian bay, the Shad and Manitoba Commission are under consideration.

MOBILIZATION EQUIPMENT.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the government aware that in the imperial army the fullest details as to mobilization equipment is carefully tabulated, periodically promulgated through army orders, and that copies thereof may be procured by the public either directly or through any bookseller?

2. Was not the establishing of a similar system contemplated in Canada by paragraph 250 of the Regulations for Canadian Ordnance services, Part 1?

3. Have the mobilization store tables, required under this paragraph to be issued for the regulating of the details of mobilization stores, been yet prepared and promulgated through general orders? If not, why not?

4. In view of the English practice, and of its apparent adoption by Canadian Regulations, why should such information have been refused to this House by the Minister of Militia and Defence, on December 2, 1909, on the ground of the publication thereof not being in the public interest?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Details as to the complete equipment required by each unit of the regular army on moblization are tabulated, and are 'pro-

mulgated ' in imperial army orders. Copies of ' war establishments ' which contain certain of the details, and of mobilization regulations can be procured on repayment by the public, but the only tables which contain complete details, known as ' Mobilization Store Tables ', though promulgated, are not on sale, and are only issued to officers concerned.

2. Yes.

3. A number of detailed tables have already been compiled and promulgated in Militia Orders, but the preparation of complete Moblization Store Tables involves a very large amount of detailed work, and these tables are not yet complete.

4. It is not the English practice to make public information as to the quantities of stores and equipment which are in existence and in possession of the War Office, nor to state in what localities the several stores or articles of equipment are held in charge. It is information on this point which was refused, in the answer given to the hon. gentleman on December 2, on the ground of the publication thereof not being in the public interest.

STEAMER CHRISTINE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. From whom was the Dominion government steamer ' Christine ' purchased, on what date, upon whose recommendation, and what was the price paid?

2. How much has since been expended in improvements?

3. When and where was the ' Christine ' built, and for what service?

4. In what service had she been employed previous to her purchase by the government, and for what department was she purchased?

5. To what department was she transferred, and for what reason?

6. What is her maximum speed and average speed, respectively, as recorded in the log?

7. What is the established standard speed required of vessels in the Atlantic Fishery Protection Service of Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Captain J. A. Farquhar. June 30, 1908. The steamboat inspector's. $17,000.

2. $10,479.92.

3. In 1881, at Glasgow, Scotland. She is a steam yacht.

4. Do not know. The Department of Customs.

5. The Customs Department. In exchange for the cruiser ' Constance ' to enable her use in the Fisheries Protection Service.

6. Maximum speed 10 knots. Average speed 9 knots.

7. No standard is required.

' FIELD ALLOWANCE.'

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are officers of the camp staff and of the permanent forces paid a special allowance during the annual camps of training, in addition to regular pay and rations, for the alleged purpose of aiding in the expense of being placed under canvas? If so, what are the daily rates of such allowances?

2. Are such allowances paid to the officers of the active militia who are attending the same camps of training with their regiments?

3. If not, what nature of expense is entailed by staff officers, and officers of the permanent force, by being placed under canvas, which is not also entailed by officers of the active militia, and why is such distinction made?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes, they are paid the 'field allowance' at the following daily rates:

(a) Officers on the camp, divisional or brigade staffs, whether of the permanent or non-permanent active militia:

	At Camps of not more than 16 days.	At Camps over 16 days.
Commandant..	$5 00	$3 00
Other officers duly appointed..	2 50	1 50
Warrant officers..	0 75	0 40

(b) All ranks of the permanent force, whenever encamped, and not only in 'annual camp' receive the 'field allowance' of, for officers:

Field officer..	$2 00	$1 50
Captain..	1 75	1 25
Lieutenant..	1 50	1 00

2. Not unless they are appointed to the camp, divisional or brigade staff:

3. Regimental officers of the active militia who attend camp have their own regimental messes and are allowed the use of batmen or soldier servants for the mess and themselves from their own corps. And they have other ways of cheapening the cost of messing. And unless they are mounted officers they are not required to find grooms and mounted kit.

Officers of the camp, divisional or brigade staff have to form their own mess afresh for each camp. The mess is necessarily smaller than a regimental one, and, as all mess equipment has to be hired from the contractor as well, is, therefore, an expensive one. They are all required to be mounted and have to provide mounted kit, and to find their own servants and grooms, who are only paid by the public if they belong to the militia. They have to do much more official and other entertaining than regimental officers. And it is considered desirable to make their allowance suitable to the positions they have to fill, and so to attract regimental officers to qualify themselves for these posts.

As regards officers of the permanent force, they draw 'field allowance' like other ranks of the corps whenever under canvas. The allowance, which before 1900 was a flat rate of $2.50 per diem for all officers, is intended to compensate for the extra ex-

pense of establishing a mess in camp, which is necessarily a smaller and much more expensive one than in quarters (a fair estimate of the additional expense would be $1 per diem), and to make up for the extra wear and tear on clothing, which for the men at least forms part of their emoluments. They are usually employed for much longer hours than the regimental officers of the active militia, and they have to do more entertaining.

HEATING AND LIGHTING CONTRACT FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. When contracts are awarded for the construction of public buildings, is due care exercised that heating systems and electric wiring are installed concurrently with the main construction?

2. Is it the case that many such buildings are otherwise completed for some time before lighting and heating contracts are awarded, or even called for? If so, does the government consider the same a sound practice?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

1. Yes.

2. It is the case that heating and lighting contracts have been let separately from the main contract, but the practice now is to include both these in the main contract.

ORDNANCE CORPS LODGING ALLOWANCES — ORDNANCE LANDS — LEASE TO OTTAWA COLLEGIATE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What amount of money is now being paid out monthly to all ranks of the Ordnance Corps at Ottawa as lodging allowances and upon what amount do such allowances represent interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum?

2. Is the property upon which the Ottawa Collegiate Institute stands Ordnance lands? If so, what are the terms of the lease thereof from the Crown?

3. (a) May possession of such lands be resumed by the Crown if required for military purposes; (b) has the Collegiate building been, somewhat recently, further extended? If so, when?

4. If the growth of the Ordnance services has necessitated the hiring of space as an overflow storehouse, why was not the possession of the unoccupied land resumed, previous to the extension, to provide for such increasing requirements?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. The monthly amount for lodging allowance paid to all ranks of the Canadian Ordnance Corps stationed at Ottawa is $416.95, making an annual cost of $5,000.

2 The building, with the exception of the northern ends of the centre and eastern wings, which encroach some 30 and 15 feet, respectively, upon the adjacent ordnance property, stands on land belonging to the Collegiate Institute. The land thus encroached on forms part of a strip, some 45 feet x 312 feet, of ordnance property, adjoining the northern boundary of the Collegiate Institute property, which is leased to the institute for a period of 99 years from the 1st June, 1900, being a continuation of a previous lease granted the institute in 1871, at an annual rental of $1, on the condition that the government can assume possession of the whole or any part thereof at any time if required for military purposes.

3. (a) Answered by No. 2; (b) Yes; last year.

4. The recent addition to the Collegiate building is not on ordnance property.

CANADIAN SOUTH AFRICAN CONTINGENTS—EXPENDITURES BY CANADIAN AND IMPERIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What forces and at what periods were dispatched from Canada to South Africa during the Boer war?

2. What part of the expenditure in each case was undertaken by Canada, and what by the British government?

3. What was the total amount paid by the Canadian government, and what by the British government, for the Canadian contingents?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

Corps.	Date of Embarkation.
First Contingent—	
2nd (Special Service) Battalion, Royal Canadian Regiment	Oct. 30, '99
Second Contingent—	
Canadian Mounted Rifles, two battalions	Jan. 21, '00
" "	" 27, '00
Three batteries of Field Artillery	Feb. 21, '00
The Strathcona Horse	Mar. 16, '00
Canadian Mounted Rifles, (2nd Regt.)	Jan. 14, '01
10th Canadian Field Hospital Co	" 28, '01
South African Constabulary	Mar. 28, '01
Canadian Mounted Rifles, (3rd Regt.)	May 8, '02
" " (4th Regt.)	" 17, '02
" " (5th Regt.)	" 23, '02
" " (6th Regt.)	.....

2. With regard to the first and second contingents, Canada equipped, transported to South Africa and paid them up to the time of arrival in that country, the British government paid and maintained them while in South Africa, and transported them home.

With regard to the third, fourth, fifth and sixth contingents, the British government paid all expenses.

As regards the Strathcona Horse and the South African Constabulary, the expenses

were borne in the case of the former partly by Lord Strathcona and partly by the British government, in the case of the latter by the government of Cape Colony.

3. The total amount paid by the Canadian government was $1,972,255.20. The government is not aware of the total amount expended by the British government in this connection.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—EXPENDITURES FOR TERMINALS.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What has already been paid by the government for terminals in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and at what points?

2. What is the estimated total cost to the government of these terminals at each point?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. (a) So far as the eastern division is concerned nothing has been paid for terminals, except $2,187.50 per month paid to the Canadian Northern railway being the government's proportion of rental for terminal facilities at Winnipeg under the agreement of March 1, 1907. (See Cap. 52, ED. VII., 6-7).

(b) The government pay no sum for terminals on the western division (Winnipeg to Prince Rupert) of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. They merely guarantee the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's bonds to the extent of $13,000 per mile on the prairie section' and to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost of the 'mountain section.'

2. No estimate has been made of the total cost of terminals.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What is the total cost to the government to date of the Quebec bridge, and what is the approximate sum required to complete it?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. (a) The total cost to date, to the government is $6,905,852.35; including subsidies paid of $374,353.33.

(b) A contract has been awarded to M. P. Davis for the substructure of two pneumatic caissons; two abutments; two anchor piers; one intermediate pier which will be all required, if the ultimate decision is for a cantilever bridge, at $2,448,475. If the decision is that a suspension bridge is to be built, the abutment, centre pier, and anchor pier, will not be required; but anchorage piers for the cables will be required. No estimate for the latter has been made pending requirement for same.

There is a provision for withdrawing the items named. The cost of the two pneumatic caissons is $2,000,800, and will be required as planned whatever type of bridge superstructure is ultimately decided upon. Pending such decision it is not in the public interest to give the estimate of cost of superstructure.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. FOSTER:

Have any temporary loans been made by the government since the beginning of this session? If so, where and on what conditions?

Mr. FIELDING:

No temporary loans have been obtained by the government since the beginning of the session. The cable despatches in the press recently no doubt arose from arrangements that were being made for obtaining a temporary loan at an early date.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SHIPMENT OF WHEAT.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. How many carloads of wheat have been transported over the National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Fort William or Port Arthur up to November, 30 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Ten car loads.

BREAKWATER AT GULLIVER'S COVE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any petitions been received by the government or by the Department of Public Works from the residents of Gulliver's Cove, Digby county, asking for the construction of a breakwater?

2. If so, when were the same received, from whom, and what action was taken thereon?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. (a) A petition signed by the residents of Gulliver's Cove was transmitted to the department by Mr. A. J. S. Copp, M.P., on April 18, 1901. (b) A report was secured from the resident engineer, estimating the cost of the proposed breakwater at $12,000.

NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS AT CALGARY.

Mr. McCARTHY:

1. Have any applications been received by the government for the transfer to any railway corporation or corporations, or person, of the grounds now occupied by the Northwest Mounted Police in connection with their barracks at the city of Calgary?

2. If so, from whom have such applications been received for the transfer of the same, on what date, and for what portion of said property?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway, on March 23, 1909. Sufficient area for a terminal.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What employee, if any, is responsible for the franking of free mail matter dispatched from the Department of Justice?
2. What are the several franks, if more than one, recognized as indicating that the missives to which they are affixed are entitled to be sent by the Department of Justice free of Canadian postage?
3. What official, if any, is charged with the supervision of the franking privilege in this department, and the duty of checking improper use of any frank?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. The deputy minister.
2. Those of the minister and Solicitor General and of the deputy minister.
3. The deputy minister.

DRY DOCK ON THE TRENT CANAL.

Mr. HUGHES:

Is it the intention of the government to construct a dry dock on the Trent canal at Fenelon Falls, or Buckom, or Burleigh, or some similar point on the canal where the lift is such that the dock could be unwatered without any cost of pumping?

Mr. GRAHAM:

The matter has not been considered by the government.

SUBSIDIES TO CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. RALPH SMITH:

1. Does the Canadian Northern Railway Company own or in any way control any of the following railway companies: the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Port Arthur, Duluth & Western Railway Company, the Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company, the Minnesota and Manitoba Railway Company, the Minnesota and Ontario Bridge Company, the Saskatchewan North Western Railway Company, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, the Alberta Midland Railway Company, the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company?
2. What subsidies either in land, money, or by way of guarantee of securities have been granted to any of the railway companies mentioned in question on account of the main or branch lines or both, of the said companies, either by the Dominion government, or the provincial governments of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, or any municipality through which their lines run?
3. How much of these subsidies have been earned to date?
4. How many miles west of Edmonton is there a line of railway constructed and in operation by the Canadian Northern Railway Company?
5. Has any work other than location survey work been done west of this point up to date? If so, how much and of what nature?
6. If any, will it eventually form part of the proposed line to Vancouver?
7. When was the location plan of the route of the Canadian Northern railway between Edmonton and Vancouver, by way of the Yellow Head Pass, approved by the Minister of Railways and the Board of Railway Commissioners?
8. Has any application been made since to change or in any way alter this location plan?
9. To what extent, if any, has the government of Manitoba exercised its right of control of freight rates under section 8 of schedule B of the Act 1 Edward VII, chapter 53?
10. Has this section of said Act had any effect in reducing freight rates in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a voluminous question and the answers would be voluminous. If the hon. gentleman will let it stand, I will investigate.

QUARANTINE FRONTIER INSPECTORS.

Mr. WM. H. SHARPE:

Referring to page D—73, volume 1, of the Auditor General's Report, where Dr. A. Bradford, Dr. L. J. Carter, Dr. J. D. Duncan, Dr. R. S. Thornton, Dr. M. Wallace, Dr. J. May, Dr. T. D. McKenty, Dr. J. C. Little, Dr. D. Henderson, and Dr. L. B. Scott are described as inspectors, and were inspectors from March 14 to August 15, 1908, each having drawn $508.06, what were their duties, and how many reports did each send in to the government?

Mr. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture). Quarantine frontier inspectors of persons entering from the United States during the prevalence of an epidemic of small-pox south of the line. Dr. Bradford, 5; Dr. Carter, 5; Dr. Duncan, 5; Dr. Thornton, 1; Dr. Wallace, 5; Dr. May, 2; Dr. McKenty, 5; Dr. Little, 5; Dr. Henderson, 4; Dr. Scott, 4.

ALCOHOLIC GOODS IN SCOTT ACT COUNTIES.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Minister of Railways if he will place on the table of the House the instructions which have been given to the employees of the Intercolonial railway with regard to the handling of alcoholic goods taken into Scott Act counties. He will remember that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick gave a decision to the effect that so far as that amendment to the Canadian Temperance Act was concerned, if did not apply to the Intercolonial, and the minister I believe has given some instructions to the employees. It is to obtain a copy of these instructions that I ask the minister to place them on the table of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. As my hon. friend says, a difficulty arose, and certain instructions

were given to the Intercolonial management of the Intercolonial railway which, I think, have obviated the difficulty. It is questionable whether my hon. friend ought to ask for instructions passing between the management of a railway and its employees, or whether they ought to be laid on the table. However, if he will move for the documents, I will consider it carefully. The same request has been made to me half a dozen times by other people who appear interested, and I am informed that the purpose sought to be attained has been accomplished by the instructions given at that time. I thought if that was the case, then the object of laying the correspondence on the table, or even of giving it to the public, was not obvious. However, if my hon. friend will move for the correspondence. I will look into it, and will give him a further answer.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On order for House again in committee on Bill (No. 41) to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture present. The other day he asked this order to stand, and probably he desires it to stand yet. I am ready to go on.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be obliged if the hon. gentleman would permit it to stand until the return of the Minister of Agriculture. It would be a convenience.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Order called for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Miller for the second reading of Bill (No. 8) to amend the Interest Act.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the permission of the House to withdraw this Bill, having given notice of the introduction of another Bill to the same purpose. I move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

On order for second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Bank Act.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I move that this order be discharged as the purpose of the Bill is covered by another proposed Bill.

Motion agreed to.

HOURS OF LAROUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maissoneuve) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 21) respecting the hours of labour on public works. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I do not propose to go at length into details, inasmuch as a discussion took place last year when this Bill was before the House. At that time it was proven conclusively that the hours of labour ought to be shortened. Of course, during that discussion it developed that some hon. members were in favour of the measure, and some were opposed to it; others stated that they had not had time to give to the Bill the careful study which a measure of its importance deserved. I think, Sir, that if the hon. members of this House gave as much care and as keen study to this Bill as some of them give to Bills of private interest, this measure would already have been enacted into law. Now during the discussion last year it was stated that by shortening the hours from 10 to 8, or from 9 to 8, we would probably diminish production by one-fifth. At that time the Minister of Labour, then the Postmaster General, stated that he had not studied the measure, but he believed that it would have the effect of reducing production by one-fifth. It was proven clearly by those who spoke in favour of the Bill that such was not the case. It was also shown on that occasion that the deputy Minister of Labour had made investigations in British Columbia, and recommended the adoption of an eight hour law for the miners. It was also proven that in Alberta they had adopted an eight hour day, and that a commission had been appointed in other provinces to study the question.

Of course, it may be said, that we should leave this question to the different provinces to discuss and pass laws upon. I claim that this government must be a model employer, that we should start at the head and pass a law on this subject so that we can at least study the question from observing its operation. During the discussion last year some hon. members of this House said that long hours of labour had no effect mentally or physically upon man. Is it reasonable to believe that long hours of labour, especially in some of our large industries, will not have a detrimental effect, morally, physically and otherwise, on our working people? The question of the rate of wages has nothing whatever to do with the Bill before the House. Some hon. gentlemen say that if you shorten the hours of labour organized labour will want more money. I want to know if this House has anything to do with that question. Let the working people ask what they think is right and let them discuss it with their employers. The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard), when we were discussing this question last year, remarked that fifteen hours of labour was not any too long for farm hands. I claim that there is a vast difference between working on a farm, or in the open air, and working in the large industries of the country. Then, some one made the statement that the best way to

solve the problem was to abolish day work altogether and let everybody work by the hour and work as long as he chose. Are we in this twentieth century going to allow every man to work as many hours as he likes? Are we not supposed to protect the weak members of society? That is why ten, and nine hour laws have been passed in different states of the United States. Last year, while this discussion was on, one hon. member of the House—I believe it was the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson—made the statement that this was class legislation. I would like to know what kind of legislation we generally pass if it is not class legislation. It is all class legislation. There are classes of one kind and classes of another kind, but we never specify it as being class legislation unless it is legislation in the interests of labour. It was stated that I wanted to make a lion of myself by posing as a defender of labour in this House. I have nothing to fear and I have nothing to hide in connection with my conduct and the labour movement in this country or in this House. Under these conditions it is absolutely unfair to bring such a charge against me. To command the respect of my fellow workers in this country it is not necessary, as some hon. members have asserted, to bring a measure of this kind before the House and I am not actuated by any such motive. If I have brought this measure before the House it is because I am perfectly convinced that it is absolutely necessary for this and every other parliament to study this question and study it at as early a date as possible in order to bring relief to those who are labouring to-day under trying conditions. It was stated further that the country is not quite ready for a measure of this kind. The question was also asked: Why should we give more leisure to the men who are working for the government than to others, and why should we be asked to adopt legislation of this kind in the interest of government employees any more than for any body else? That will be found on the 'Hansard' of last year. I believe that it was the hon. member for Halton who used these words. I am a young man, I am not as old a parliamentarian as my hon. friend, but I studied the rules of this House when I came here and I saw that it was impossible under the British North America Act for any body to present legislation in respect to this subject except it had reference to the men who were working for the government. When it is asked: How is it possible to grant an eight hour day on one side of the street and a ten hour day on the other, I reply that this parliament has nothing to do with that. All we have to do is to consider whether it is necessary to have a shorter day. I shall not take up the time of the house by quoting from magazines and books, but I could present a great deal of evidence to prove that there is an almost universal call for a shorter working day. It was stated that it will demoralize production. Are we willing to admit that it will demoralize production especially when it was proven last year that we could produce as much with a shorter day than we can under present conditions? Then, there is the question of the unemployed, and it will be admitted by all that we want to make more work so that those who are now unemployed may have something to do. But, it may be said, if you agree that we can produce as much in a short hour day as in a long one, how is it possible that we are going to give work to the unemployed? I answer by giving greater purchasing power to a man than he has at the present time. Is it not reasonable to believe that if a man is not working his purchasing power is diminished, while if you give a man a chance to work it will create a demand for larger production because he will have more means and therefore greater purchasing power. If you give more leisure time to those who now work such long hours you will give them a chance to better their condition. Is it not a fact that as soon as we improve our condition we are anxious to get a little better living. This is a perfectly legitimate desire on the part of everybody and therefore by improving the conditions of the workingman you are increasing his purchasing power and consequently increasing the need of greater production. Over production? During the great financial depression of last year, or the year before, it was said in the papers and in other places that labour was to a certain extent responsible for that great financial depression? I would like to ask any member of this House if the workers were not as steady at their work then as they were before? They were, but notwithstanding that we had depression. When depression comes over-production comes as a result of it. During the depression to which I have referred the stores were full of goods from top to bottom and every man in the country was wearing as many clothes as he was before. There was over-production because there were too many hours of labour in the different industries. With the improved methods and machinery that we now have at our disposal there is liable to be over-production, especially during good times when, in the large industries, people are sometimes working night and day. They believe they will make money by doing this. But, if they believe that they can make more money by increasing the hours of work they make the greatest mistake of their lives, because they are over-producing, and when the market is full of goods they are obliged to close our doors. If they close the door of an industry for two or three months the purchasing power of men

who are idle for a space of time is not the same as it would be if they were working steadily. The shortening of the hours of labour would to some extent solve the difficult problem of the unemployed. I am ready to thank the government for having appointed a Minister of Labour who can devote all his time and energy to the study of labour questions, and the fact that the labour people of this country have asked for the creation of such a portfolio for years and years past shows the necessity for it. When the Minister of Labour takes part in the debate to-day I hope he will be able to assure us that the eight hour day movement will be recognized by the government. Now, a couple of years since the hon. member for Hants brought before the House a resolution asking this government to aid in the prevention of the white plague. Is it not well known to the medical men of this country that it is in the large industrial establishments that the white plague starts, and very often finishes? Would not one of the best means of preventing the white plague be to give the workingmen of Canada a chance to breathe the pure air of Heaven? How often is it that you see labour men go to the country for a few weeks or even a few days in the summer, by the lake shore, or the sea shore or in the forest; it is very seldom indeed they can afford to get a day's vacation. If we shorten the hours of labour we will enable the working people to enjoy some of the privileges which Providence has placed at the disposal of human beings, and I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree with me that this is all the more important in regard to factories where female and child labour is employed. Further, I think that if any gentleman in this House study the conditions of labour in America and Europe as well as in Canada, they will come to the conclusion that ninety per cent of the people are not clothed as they ought to be. I shall practice what I preach and be brief in my remarks, and in conclusion, I hope that the Minister of Labour will have something to say in favour of this measure, and that it will not be pushed along on the road to the cemetery as a good many similar measures have been. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville) that this is an extremely important measure, but at the same time I have to remark that the hon. gentleman himself has not been wonderfully active in promoting the best interests of the Bill. I made a short examination of the previous fates of this Bill and I find that it was first introduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville) on the 11th of December, 1906, when he said:

The object of the Bill is to establish an eight hour day upon all public works throughout the country. It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the Bill at the present time as they will be discussed on the second reading. The Bill as it stands has no effect on wages to be paid on public works.

Then the Bill was read the first time, and the last time for that session. The Bill was again introduced by the hon. gentleman on the 14th of February, 1908, when it was read a first time, and that was the end of it. Then we come to last session when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville)—the Bill having been introduced previously—on the 27th of April, 1909, very shortly before the close of the session, moved:

That order 35 of the Public Bills and Orders for the second reading of Bill (No. 22) respecting hours of labour on public works be now called for the purpose of it being discharged on the Order Paper.

Mr. AMES. Why does the hon. gentleman wish the order discharged?

Mr. VERVILLE. Because its discharge will enable me to bring the matter before the House this session in another form. The question as to the hours of labour on public works is, I consider, of considerable importance at the present time.

The Bill then made its exit for the third time and was not again introduced as a Bill or in any other form that session. Now, Mr. Speaker, this question is before the people of this country as it is before the people of the neighbouring republic, and as a humble member of this House I think parliament should dispose of it in some businesslike manner. The American Congress has been dealing with this question for a great many years, and Bills have been introduced and discussed. I have in my hand a copy of what I think was the last Bill introduced during the session of 1904, and I see by a recent utterance of the president of the United States that he has declared his intention of in some way having the matter dealt with at the approaching session of Congress. One reason why I say this present Bill should be dealt with by parliament is that if you look at its contents you will find that its name is a misnomer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville) has persistently called it 'an Act respecting the hours of labour on public works,' but as the Bill is submitted to the House it contains provisions of the most drastic nature. It is not a Bill regulating the hours of labour upon public works of the country, and if it were I think there are many hon. gentlemen in this House who would be willing to go some distance to regulate the hours of labour which the government would permit on its works or which it would allow its contractors to exact. I believe that such a proposition would be favourably considered by a great many members in this House, but the Bill sub-

mitted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Verville) is not designed to carry out that object. As a matter of fact this Bill as it is worded—as any gentleman of the legal profession will see if he reads it—would prohibit the government or the contractors for the government from going into the markets of the world to purchase any material whatsoever which was produced under a system which required the workmen who produced it to work more than eight hours a day. The government might make a contract to purchase uniforms in one department or to purchase groceries in another department, and if any of the work on any of the component parts of any articles the government so purchased were not confined to an eight hour day, then the whole contract would be void, and no matter how much value was given to the government under it, the contractor would not be able to recover one dollar, and the result would be disastrous. In other words, the Bill before the House would void and vitiate every contract the government might make for the purchase of materials, provided that any of the articles so purchased had been turned out of a shop or factory in which work of more than eight hours a day had been exacted. Now, that is altogether impossible and not at all in the interest of those who are asking for this legislation. The American Act has been drawn with much more care. That Act on more than one occasion has gone to a select committee of the House of Representatives, and an immense mass of testimony has been taken by that committee on the prospective operation of the Act. There have been at least, as I have found, two commissions on the subject. The report of the last commission, appointed during the year 1904, I hold in my hand. It is entitled:

Eight Hours on Government Work—Hearing before the Commission on Labour of the House of Representatives on the Bill H.R. 4064, intituled, a Bill Limiting the Hours of Daily Service of Labourers and Mechanics Employed upon Work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia or for Other Purposes.

The Bill is a very much more modified form of legislation of this nature than the Bill before this House. I will not burden the House by reading it, as it is somewhat lengthy. After dealing with the main features of the legislation intended to be enacted, it provides that the Act shall not extend to the following matters:

Nothing in this Act shall apply to contracts for transportation by land or water, or for the transmission of intelligence, or for such materials or articles as may usually be bought in open market, whether made to conform to particular specifications or not, or for the purchase of supplies by the government, whether manufactured to conform to particular specifications or not. The proper officer on behalf of the United States, and territory, or the district of Columbia may waive the provisions and stipulations in this Act during time of war or a time when war is imminent, or in any other case when in the opinion of the inspector or any other officer in charge any great emergency exists. No penalties shall be imposed for any violation of such provision in such contract due to any emergency caused by fire, famine, or flood, by danger to life or to property, or by other extraordinary event or condition.

The American Bill also gives the contractor the right of appeal first, to the head of the department under which the work is being done; and, secondly, to the executive government or to one of the courts of the country. So that in the American Act there are not only various exceptions, which seem to me, at first sight, to be reasonable, but also provision for an appeal in case any person considers himself aggrieved under the operation of the Act. The matter in my opinion is entirely for the government to deal with. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill may indulge the hope that it will have a better fate than the resolution which was introduced into this House a few days ago by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Be that as it may, the government should, in my opinion, grapple with this question. We all in this House sympathize with labouring men. At the same time, this is a matter that has to be proceeded with cautiously and prudently, or it will revolutionize the condition of the country. It is a matter on which, in my opinion, this House is not well enough informed at the present time to deal with. The American Congress on more than one occasion found it convenient to refer the question to a select committee to obtain evidence and make recommendations thereon. On the other side of the line they are still in that stage; and it seems to me that if this matter were dealt with in a similar way, so that the various interests affected might get their views before parliament or a committee of parliament, a Bill might de drafted which would in a reasonable way meet the demands, so far as they are just, along this line. If the government chooses to refer the Bill to a committee, before whom all parties and all interests affected will be heard and considered, I for one will back them up. It is not going too far, at this stage in our history, I think, to advance the matter to that extent. If that were done, the matter, in some concrete form and intelligible manner, could be brought before the House and dealt with. It is not in such shape, in my opinion, at present. The Bill is altogether an impossible one; but the practice might be carried into certain of the public works of the country, with proper safeguards, after having the

hearing I suggest. If that were done, it seems to me we would have the matter advanced, and no harm could come to any interest. It is not an expensive matter. The committee could be confined to hearing evidence on this point, and could report at this session.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). There are one or two features of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) to which, in the interest of the people I represent, I wish to draw attention. The proposition to reduce the hours of labour on government works to eight hours a day will, in my estimation, undoubtedly have an effect on other labourers. I can imagine that as soon as the system was introduced on government work, labourers working on other jobs would in a short time be agitating for an eight hour day also. That seems to me only reasonable. But the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House is that this will undoubtedly affect the agricultural classes. It is well known that one of the great problems in Ontario and the older provinces is that of getting farm labour. We also know that it is utterly impossible to have an eight hour day on the farm. It seems to me, therefore, that the passage of a Bill of this kind could not fail to have the effect of increasing the difficulty which farmers now experience in obtaining the labour they need so very much.

As regards the plea made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), on which he grew particularly eloquent, that of giving opportunity to the labouring men to breathe the pure air of heaven, I might say that his argument only applied to a part of the population, because, according to the principle laid down very clearly and decisively by the Minister of Finance not later than yesterday, none but Grits, so far as government work is concerned, need apply, so that the pure air of heaven, though it might be given to Grit labourers under this Bill, would still be denied to any who happened to be of the Tory persuasion.

Another feature to which I would call attention is this. This measure must inevitably interfere with labour in large manufacturing concerns. Suppose it should pass and be applied to government contracts, if the government contracted with a large cement firm for some thousands of barrels of cement, is it not likely that the men employed by that firm would make a demand that they should be given the eight hour day, inasmuch as the work they were doing was to supply a government contract? That is all I have to say in connection with this Bill except this, that I cannot agree with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) that a man will do as much in eight hours as in nine. Carry that out to its logical conclusion, and it will mean that a man will do just as much in one day as in two. In any event there is a feeling throughout the country that men employed in government work, do not kill themselves, that they take things comparatively easy, and there is also the impression that in many cases men are employed on government works a few months before the elections, and employed solely to get their votes. I might refer, as an instance of this, to the facts in connection with the construction of the Newmarket canal, on which the number of men employed was very considerably increased just previous to the last election. In conclusion I would repeat that the passage of a measure such as this would make the obtaining of farm labour still more difficult than it is to-day, and that is my chief reason for addressing the House on the subject.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). This is a public Bill which will have a very direct influence on a very large number of people in this country should it become law, and while, generally speaking, I am in favour of any proposal tending to shorten the hours of labour, I am afraid that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has gone rather far in the measure he has introduced. During the past four or five years I have given this matter much consideration. I have discussed it to some extent with various representative bodies in my riding; and so far as the Bill is limited in its application to public works, in the strictest sense of the term—the erection of buildings or works of that nature—I think we might fairly give the system a trial and see what would be its effects. It would practically apply only to the building trades. I cannot see that any great harm would follow. In the city of Guelph where I reside, in all the building trades now they have the nine hour day. It is not so many years since they had the ten hour day, and the nine hour day has come about without legislation, and I do not think that it has injuriously affected the hours of labour in the factories or on the farms in that county. In that respect I do not think the Bill will have any such effect as my hon. friend fears, but as has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), it goes much further than government contracts and will embrace every kind of contract. One can well understand what difficulty would be created should the Bill pass in its present form. Take a contract for the supply of clothing or furniture to the government. A manufacturer tenders and is awarded the contract. That contract will not occupy his whole staff, probably only a small portion, and, under this Bill, that contractor would have one portion of his men working eight hours and another nine or ten hours. I can see difficulties of that kind, but I would like to see the Bill

more limited in its scope and have the experiment tried on public works, properly so-called.

I agree with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that we do not know enough of the subject to legislate on it intelligently. I have read the many reports of investigations and commissions which have taken place in the United States during the past five or six years. They are very voluminous documents. Manufacturers from all parts of the United States were summoned to express their views, the transportation magnates, the heads of all the labour organizations, appeared before that commission, and yet I do not believe that in the United States they have got any way near a satisfactory conclusion up to the present. If we are going to proceed with this measure—and I think it is entitled to the same consideration as every other public Bill—it should be referred to a special commission with power to examine the various interests to be affected. The Bill is entitled to fair consideration and the House is entitled to the fullest information before being asked to pass on the strict terms of the measure itself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The promoter of this Bill wants to reduce the hours of labour from ten to eight. But suppose I am a government contractor and this Bill becomes law, and I am paying my men $2 a day for a ten hour day. Under the provisions of this Bill, I would have to shorten the day to eight hours and I would reduce my wages to $1.60 per day. How would the hon. gentleman meet a case of that kind?

Mr. VERVILLE. I do not believe that we have any right to deal with the question of wages. There is nothing in the Bill that speaks of wages. If it should become law, it would be up to the employer to pay whatever he believed right, and it would be up to the men to insist on being paid what they deemed just.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). I listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) in introducing this Bill. I have read also the hon. member's remarks on introducing a similar Bill last session. The hon. member has gone to a good deal of trouble in carrying out research upon this question, and in bringing before the House facts concerning the hours of labour. In the province of British Columbia, in the year 1901, we dealt to some extent with this question in relation to the mines. Then, as now, there was the struggle between the two great parties interested, the employer on one side and the workmen on the other. But we were fortunate in that we introduced then an eight-hour law, and I am glad to be able to testify here that the results of the operation of that law have been eminently satisfactory. I can state from personal knowledge that, up to the introduction of the Eight Hour Bill, in that portion of the country with which I am most familiar, the mining district of the Kootenay, only a small percentage of the labouring men owned their homes, or, apparently, took any interest in their homes. Any one familiar with that district at that time is aware that the homes of miners were usually shacks and the occupants paid little attention to the improvement of the surroundings, or of the home itself. Since the introduction of this eight hour law, that has been greatly changed. A large number of miners have purchased and now own their own homes and are active in improving their surroundings. They have a certain amount of daylight at home, which, under old conditions, they could not have. With the ten hour day in the mines, it meant practically twelve hours, as any one will understand. Men had to rise long before daylight in the morning to get to their work, and they usually did not return until after dark. It was generally said, and very truly, that the men hardly saw their families in daylight from one end of the year to the other. Since the introduction of the eight hour law that has been changed. The effect has been a marked change in the men of the mining district, as I have described. That is an argument that ought to be of weight with the House. Surely, in this advanced age, with our great improvements in machinery and our rapid advance in many lines of economic improvement, the labouring men should have some share in these improvements and the benefits to be derived from them. It has been said that the adoption of such a measure as is here proposed would lead to shortening the hours of labour in other avocations, and it is inferred that it would be detrimental to the agricultural interests. I venture to think the conditions of work in agriculture are altogether different from those of the classes of labour to which this measure is intended to apply. Their harvest makes special demands upon those engaged in agriculture, and during certain seasons they naturally work from daylight till dark. But, during a considerable portion of the year, they have time for recreation and improving their minds. This Bill, if I understand it aright, is meant primarily to apply to those engaged in labour under factory conditions or in the building trades. I have listened with pleasure to the arguments of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). Speaking as a layman, it seems to me that the hon. member's argument carries considerable weight. It is right and wise that, in a case of this kind,

we should carefully consider all the circumstances and get all the light possible. I would not undertake to dispute the arguments advanced by the hon. member for South Toronto and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who are, of course, well informed on the legal aspects of this question. On the contrary, I think it would be in the interest of the Bill itself that we should move very carefully. Should any mistake be made, instead of advancing the interests of labour, which, of course, is the object sought by the introducer of the Bill, the very purpose in view might be defeated. Therefore, I think the suggestion made by these gentlemen was a very wise one—that we should carefully weigh all the facts in this case, so that when we place a measure of this kind on the statute-book it may be one that we are sure will be of advantage to working men generally and will be accepted by all fair-minded men as promoting the best interest of all classes.

Mr. JOSEPH TURCOTTE (Quebec). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House suggests a few remarks. In the first place, I notice that this Bill which, on a previous occasion, was submitted to the House but at the time did not reach the committee stage, is this year introduced earlier. That is an improvement which I am happy to note and which, I think, portends a better outcome to this proposed legislation.

It has been contended by opponents of the measure that its enforcement would be objectionable. For instance, it has been alleged that, should this Bill be carried, it would result in serious inconvenience to contractors on government public works now under contract, as said contractors could no longer expect a ten-hour day on the part of their men, but only an eight-hour day. They would thus find themselves in a disadvantageous position, since they would get only eight hours' work for ten hours' pay. That may be so, but let me say that there are precedents to legislation of this kind, and I have no hestitation in saving that to my mind this is a desirable change.

We have in the civil service, for instance, men whose work is pretty much, if not entirely, the same as that carried on by men engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits; nevertheless, we find that their hours of work are different, that their day's work is much shorter than in the case of people doing such outside work. Now, who thinks of complaining of this? Nobody, to my knowledge. True, the government official may be called upon to do more work, to show greater efficiency, to expend greater energy, to bring greater powers to bear on his work, and that may justify the requirement of shorter hours from him. We are satisfied with shorter hours from our government officials, but we require from them greater concentration of the mind and more rapid work.

Now, I think that this precedent to be found in the management of the various departments, might well have its counterpart in manual occupations. For I understand that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) voices here the views of the working classes in general, of men in all the various trades and handicrafts. Considering that an exception is made in favour of the civil servant, why should not a similar measure of relief be extended to that class of people who, while getting a living through what is actually manual labour, are performing duties quite similar to those of some public servants. As a matter of fact, I take it that there is a close connection between the mental work carried on in various departments, and the manual labour effected on behalf of those same departments.

I understand that this Bill is not taken exception to on strictly technical grounds; at any rate, I am not aware of any contention to that effect. Now, is such legislation desirable? That is a moot question under many skies. Experiments have been made and in some cases have turned out favourably, as stated by the honourable member who preceded me. Why should we not undertake ourselves some such tests? I stated a precedent, there are others. It is known that the men in the service of the Department of Marine at Quebec work nine hours a day in summer and eight hours in winter. Of course, there is a cut in the wages in winter time. That is a practical application of the system advocated by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. In all business and industrial establishments in Quebec, the working hours are from seven or eight o'clock in the morning to five or six o'clock in the evening. However, in the government workshops the men work eight hours only, and nobody finds fault with the practice. So, I am satisfied that, if no exception can be taken on technical grounds to the stand of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, the government should put his system to a practical test with a view of drawing conclusions. Several hon. members who have spoken previously against this proposal, are to my mind more anxious to forward the interests of employers rather than those of the working men. Fundamentally, it is always the same story; the unceasing struggle going on between labour and capital, between the employed and the employer. There are certain views which are held tenaciously by the employer and which the latter strives to uphold. But there is also the viewpoint of the workingman, which he is equally entitled to hold, and

which his representatives in this House are in duty bound to protect as far as possible.

I am satisfied this Bill does not contain a single provision inimical to the public interest, on the other hand, it extends relief to a numerous class of our people. Besides, I am satisfied that the hon. member for Maisonneuve when vindicating in this House the rights of labour, is in complete sympathy with the labouring classes. I know that he is a member of some powerful labour associations, he having been for some time one of their most prominent and active officers, and when he raises his voice in this House it is their sentiments he expresses, he is the true exponent of the views of labour.

Now, one more consideration should not be lost sight of. As we are aware, laws should not have for their object to safeguard the interests of one class exclusively, and I believe that legislation as it is makes rather for the protection of employers. Some attention should be given to the working classes. Should we not do something towards relieving them from over-exertion, and too much misery, should we not strive to improve their moral and physical conditions? Such is the view which I take, and I object to the dilatory proposal made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who suggests the opening of a protected investigation, the effect of which would be the postponement of the settlement of this question if not indefinitely, at least to such a date when likely all of us would have disappeared from parliament before having been given in the meantime an opportunty to vote on the question. By referring the Bill to the Committee of the Whole the object we have in view will be attained. There shall we consider it, and subject it to a fair criticism, sufficient at any rate to enlighten the government and justify them in trying an experiment which shall give results of an instructive character. It will always be an easy matter to change the law if experience shows that it is in opposition to public interest. However, as already stated, that experiment has been tried in one department, I mean in the Department of Marine at Quebec, where the men are required to work only eight hours per day at certain seasons, and that experiment has given satisfactory results. They are of a nature to induce us to vote in favour of this Bill, and accordingly lay down as a rule that men employed in public works shall not be required to put in more than eight hours work a day. That is, to my mind, what should be done.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland). I have given more or less attention to the subject of an eight hour day, even before I became a member of this House, and the result of my reading, together with direct experience of the conditions of labour, have led me into a position of absolute sympathy with the movement of the labour men to secure what is known as a uniform eight hour day. I approve of the principle of an eight hour day, and of the movement which has been inaugurated by organized labour in this and other countries to secure an eight hour day. The objections that have been offered to this measure to-day have been largely technical, legal objections. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), while in favour of an eight hour day on government buildings alone, is not in favour of this measure, because he says it goes too far. He, in common with many other hon. gentlemen, go upon the assumption that an eight hour day would mean that you would only get eight-tenths as much work in a given space of time. I think hon. gentlemen forget the fact that for years this eight hour day has been in force in various countries. They have it in British Columbia; in Victoria the eight hour day is practically universal. I have in my hand a very excellent work entitled 'Eight hours for work,' written by Mr. John Rae, M.A., published by MacMillan and Company, and I think this is the work from which the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) obtained the material for his speech last session. At the end of the book, I find a chapter entitled 'The eight hour day in Victoria,' and the author quotes figures tending to show the effect of the introduction of the eight hour day there. If the House will permit me, I would like to read two short extracts showing the effect of such a day in operation in Victoria. Speaking from the figures, he says:

> They show the utter folly of the assumption, so much pressed by the more ignorant advocates of an Eight-hours Bill, that the shortening of the day of labour has the necessary, certain, and uniform effect of abolishing the unemployed.
>
> On the whole the reduction of the working day to eight hours has had no very sensible influence on the numbers of the unemployed in Victoria any more than on the rate of wages, and both these circumstances point to the conclusion, to which other and more direct evidence also conducts, that shortening the day has exercised but very inconsiderable effect on the amount of the workmen's production. A shortening of hours has always two immediate effects—it improves the mettle of the masters, and it improves the mettle of the men. The masters set themselves at once to practise economics of various sorts, to make more efficient arrangements of the work, to introduce better machinery or to speed the old, to try the double shift and other expedients to maintain and even augment the production of their works. The men return to their toil in better heart after their ampler rest, reinvigorated both in nerve and muscle, and make up in the result sometimes in part,

sometimes wholly, by the intensity of their labour for the loss of its duration. Victorian experience shows the recoupment almost completely.

One other short paragraph, showing his conclusion as to the effect of the eight hour day in Victoria:

Altogether, the more we examine the subject the more irresistibly is the impression borne in from all sides that there is growing up in Australia, and very largely in consequence of the eight-hours day, a working class which for general morale, intelligence, and industrial efficiency is probably already superior to that of any other branch of our Anglo-Saxon race, and for happiness, cheerfulness, and all-round comfort of life has never had its equal in the world before. For all this advantage, moreover, nobody seems to be a shilling the worse. It is truly remarkable how immaterial apparently has been the cost of the eight-hours day in Victoria. Look for the effects of it where you will, they still ever elude your observation. Wages have not fallen, wages have not risen, production has not fallen except in certain trifling cases; prices have not risen except again in certain trifling instances; trade has not suffered, profits have not dwindled (or we should have heard croaking), the unemployed have not vanished, not so much as shrunk in any perceptible degree ; the working classes—the great body of the nation—have an hour more to call their own, that is all.

Now, I may say that organized labour has gone to the various provincial legislatures in this country asking for an eight hour day within the province, and they are invariably met with the reply: We cannot enact an eight hour day for this province, because our employers would be compelled to produce goods under an eight hour day in competition with the employers of other provinces who work under a ten hour day ; and for that reason we cannot grant your demand; were, however, all the other provinces to enact an eight hour day, we would be very happy to grant your demand. The represeentative of organized labour comes to the House of Commons and presents a Bill. Unfortunately, owing to the limitations imposed upon this House by the British North America Act, we are not able to enact a comprehensive measure, and, therefore, we say to the representative of organized labour: You must go back to the provincial legislatures, there is the place to get your legislation. I may say that so far as this Bill is concerned, even if it had the effect which the interpretation placed upon it by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) would produce, I am prepared to vote for it. I believe if that measure were adopted this country would be not one whit worse off economically; while the introduction of an eight hour day throughout the Dominion of Canada would have the effect of bringing up a class of labouring men such as those described by this author in Australia. So strongly do I favour this measure that, in spite of the objections that have been urged against it, I shall be pleased to vote for it as it stands.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). I have no intention to take up the time of the House in speaking on this measure. I was not present last session when the Bill was discussed; I was not approached in any way for or against it at that time. There is a principle, however, involved in this Bill that we must face, we cannot evade it. I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) and was pleased to hear what he had to say. I endorse what he said; I am a supporter of the principle underlying this Bill and am prepared to vote for it. It is a question we have got to face in this country, and the sooner we deal with it in a fair and honourable way the better it will be for the country. There are two features connected with it that appeal to me. We hear much said about the conservation of our natural resources in this country, but the conservation of health is one of the most important things to which we can devote our attention, and this Bill affects health. It also has a bearing on the question of the unemployed. It may effect the profits of some of our industrial concerns, but as between the conservation of health and the diminution of unemployment on the one side and maintaining the profits of capitalists on the other side, I am in favour of it, of looking after the interests of the workingmen, and allowing a few dividends to be diminished.

Mr. SPROULE. I made a few observations on this Bill when it was discussed before the House last time, and I wish to repeat them, or some of them now. Looking over the Bill, as far as my judgment enables me to determine, it is quite impracticable. It is a Bill which never could be put into operation without any amount of trouble as the result. Under a portion of the Bill, any institution that was turning out goods which it had contracted to supply the government would be compelled to grant its men an eight hour day. The Bill aims at that, it seems to me, if it aims at anything. If that be the case, it appears to me that it would bring about no end of trouble. But there is another reason why I oppose it. While I think that in many avocations of life eight hours a day is ample, and more than enough, for any labourer to work, in other lines he can work eight, nine or ten hours, and neither do himself any injustice nor his health any injury. In mining, when a man has to go under ground, eight hours is a fairly long day, but if you are working out in the open

air where you have conditions of a health-giving nature, open air and good surroundings, and working at an occupation which is not too severe, a ten-hour day is not an unreasonably long day, and I think there is no injustice done either to the individual or to his physical or mental vigour in expecting him to work that length of day. If all could obtain a living by doing the same thing, that is, work eight hours a day, it might strengthen the argument that you should only allow men to work eight hours a day. But, the strain of life is so great and the demands upon the resources of one's labour so exacting that many are obliged to work ten, eleven or twelve hours a day in order to supply themselves and those dependent upon them with the necessaries of life. Suppose that these people were engaged on government work, you would say to them that they shall not be allowed to earn what they could, or what their physical powers would enable them to earn, or what the demands upon their resources would require them to earn. Therefore, they must stint themselves in some lines because of the effect of this Bill. I say it is wrong. Then, there is another feature of it. If you bring the provisions of this Bill into operation in regard to public works, what will be the result? Go to the city of Toronto, or to the town of Collingwood, if you like, and there are public works going on; maybe there is a post office or a customs house going up, harbour works going on, or perhaps there is an armoury being built. Labouring men who can get employment on these government works, receive, say $2 a day, and work for only eight hours a day on one of these pubilc work will not labour in any other line in these places, refuse to work 10 hours a day. Therefore you make it almost impossible for men in other lines of life to get labour and have the labourers work the reasonable number of hours which is supposed to bring a fair return to the contractor. They cannot get men. You can go farther. You can go to the farming community around these places. You cannot employ labourers to go out and work on the farm ten and sometimes eleven or twelve hours a day and accept the same wages as the man who is only working 8 hours a day; or if you can get labourers to take the wages they will only want to work eight hours a day. I know that it is very troublesome for the farmers around our towns and villages, where there are factories with shorter hours of labour and paying equally as high wages, to obtain labourers. But, there is another phase of the question which has attracted my attention several times. The agricultural classes of this country represent about fifty per cent of the whole population. There are about 3,500,000 people depending upon agricultural pursuits for their sustenance and they are obliged to work long hours. No man can successfully run a farm if he is only working eight hours a day. It has been said that they may work longer during the busy season but that most of the time they can take it easy. The up-to-date enterprising farmer is just as busy with his work every day in the year as he is during harvest and haying. He is always overcrowded with work instead of having too little to do. Therefore, he is obliged to work long hours. He cannot pretend to run his farm and work only eight hours a day. There are farmers who are obliged to work twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen or even sixteen hours a day during the busy season of seeding, haying and harvest. I have known them to do that over and over again and for what? —to pay for the implements that are made in the factory where, if this Bill becomes law, the men who make these implements will work only eight hours a day. It is an injustice to the farmer. It is unfair, unreasonable and improper, and it will strike at the great agricultural class just as much as it will at any other class of the community. The factories that are turning out threshing machines, binders, reapers, mowers, seeders, and all such agricultural implements will be obliged to give an eight hour day just as soon as this Bill passes. But the farmer cannot have an eight hour day because he is obliged to work longer hours. He has, therefore, to contend with the difficulty that he meets in the hiring of labour, and he is also confronted with the difficulty that he is obliged himself to work very long hours to pay for the productions of men who do not work as many hours in the day as he does. The farmer cannot get men to work for him to-day.

I admit, speaking from the standpoint of medical observation and examination, that there are those who advocate what is called the ideal division of time. What is that?—that humanity shall labour eight hours, sleep eight hours and have eight hours for rest and recreation during the 24 hours of the day and night. Three times eight make twenty-four hours the length of the day. That is an ideal division of time, but where, in any capacity of life, can that ideal division of time be carried out? Is it not the fact that the conditions we have to contend with in our individual capacities and our environment determine the number of hours during which we are compelled to work? There is such a great demand upon the production of our labour or what we make out of our labour, in one case than in another. Therefore, we are obliged to work longer hours to supply that demand or else those dependent upon us will suffer. So you find that in the various lines of work many are obliged to work longer hours to support them-

selves and their families, and if they were not permitted to do this they would suffer in consequence. The hon. member for Kootenay said that they had tried the eight hour day system in British Columbia and that while people predicted trouble from it the system was working all right now. Well, I was in British Columbia immediately after that law came into force and in every mining district I visited I was told that mining operations were literally paralyzed by it. For two years after its passage the mining operations of that country were a failure and many engaged in the industry had to go out of business. That is bound to be the case until an adjustment takes place between what is paid a man working eight hours this year and what was paid the same man working ten hours the year before. I say you cannot establish to the mind of any intelligent man that a working man will do as much in eight hours as he will do in a ten hour day. Of course I recognize that a man may work 10 hours in one kind of labour and not be overworked while in other branches a man may work only eight hours and be overworked, if you are going to try to even it up by a levelling system of eight hours a day you are certainly bound to do an injustice to some classes of labour. There are employers of labour in this country who themselves are obliged to work more than eight hours a day and more than 10 hours a day, and if he expects his employees to do as he is doing he is inflicting no injustice upon them. Now, we are apt to be too much afraid to deal with a question of this kind as we think it ought to be dealt with for fear it will work mischief against us when we come before our electors. I like to see a man with enough moral courage to do what he conscientiously believes to be right regardless of consequences. I believe that the men who are supporting this Bill are supporting it from conscientious convictions, but I believe also that if many hon. gentlemen expressed their opinion of this measure as freely as they do on other measures there would be very strong argument advanced against this Bill.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I am sure that the workingman of this country owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member (Mr. Verville) for having brought to the attention of this House a Bill which has occasioned such an interesting discussion on this important subject. The Bill is entitled 'An Act respecting hours of labour on public works,' but the discussion has been almost entirely on the broad question of the hours of labour generally. And so far as that broad question is concerned I have no doubt we all feel that anything that can be done towards shortening the hours of toil for the great masses who labour, will be of advantage not only to the working classes themselves but to the whole community. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Frontenac in his contention that men cannot produce such effective work by working shorter hours as they can by working excessive hours. The hon. gentleman carried his argument to an extreme when he said that if the reduction of the hours of labour were carried down to the last point it would mean that there would be no work done at all. Well, you can take the reverse of that argument and you can as well contend that if you extend the hours of labour beyond the endurance point, the workingman could not accomplish anything at all because of bodily fatigue. In these days when industrial processes are carried on by great natural powers, by electricity, by water, by steam, the intensity of labour has become tremendously heightened. And, in considering the question of shortening the hours of labour we must bear in mind not only the duration of labour but the intensity of labour as well. One hour's work on a machine that is going at high speed may take more out of a man than six hours at an occupation where his energies are not taxed to the same strenuous extent. I think I may safely say that the whole history of labour legislation in respect to shortening the hours of labour bears out the view that on the whole the shortening of the hours has been of immense benefit not only to the working people but to the industries themselves.

This question of shortening the hours of labour is primarily for the consideration of the provincial legislatures which have within their jurisdiction the enactment of laws respecting the hours of labour, the factory laws, the laws respecting mines, and cognate subjects; but, the discussion of the subject in this parliament is bound to be reflected in future legislation by the provinces and the general expression of opinion in this chamber that the shortening of the hours of labour is a good thing in itself will, we may hope, bear fruit. It has been pointed out that this Bill purports to do one thing, when in fact it does another. That is entitled 'An Act respecting the hours of labour on public works,' but that it goes further and deals with every conceivable kind of contract in which the government of Canada can be concerned. It is well that the House should understand that clearly before it pronounces on the measure. I believe myself that while the measure is intended by the hon. member (Mr. Verville) to relate only to public works, as a matter of fact it goes very much further than he intended. So far as this question has a bearing upon ameliorating the ordinary everyday life of the working people I submit that we should

in this parliament, so far as we have the power—and we have certain powers in regard to contracts let by the government—we should do all that we can to further that end. I believe in the principle that the machine should be the slave of man and not man the slave of the machine; I believe that a man should have not merely an opportunity to live but that he should have an opportunity to live happily; and that he cannot have if he is oppressed by excessive hours of labour. We were told by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) that even if this measure had the effect which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) said it had, he was prepared to vote for it. Now, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) said that the measure was altogether impossible and therefore the position of the hon. member for Cumberland amounts to this, that he is prepared to vote for a measure which is altogether impossible. Well, Sir, I am not prepared to vote for any measure of that kind. I do not believe in trying to humbug the working people of this country.

Mr. RHODES. I rise to a question of privilege. I said nothing which could by any stretch of imagination be considered as humbugging the labouring men of this country, and I object to that language coming from the minister. I mean to stand by every word I said in this House with respect to this measure. What I meant was that if this measure has the effect of causing the eight hour day to be introduced generally, then I am heartily in favour of it, because I believe in the eight hour day as a matter of principle.

Mr. KING. I am just taking the hon. gentleman's words as I put them down, and as I think a reference to 'Hansard' will show that he gave them. The words were: 'Even if this measure has the effect which the hon. member for South Toronto says it will have, I am prepared to vote for it.' Every hon. member knows that the hon. member for South Toronto said that the Bill was altogether impossible.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for South Toronto, in describing the measure as impossible, described its effect. Referring to the effect of the Bill, he said that it extended to cases where men had contracted to supply goods to the government. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) referred to the effect, not the characterization of the Bill.

Mr. KING. I am quite prepared to leave it to the House to decide what the hon. member for South Toronto meant when he referred to the Bill as altogether impossible. The impression which I certainly got, not only from that particular remark, but from the whole tenor of his speech, was that he, like myself, was prepared to support a measure which would really do something effective, but that he was not prepared to stand up in this parliament and say that he would support any measure when in his heart of hearts he felt that it would really do no good to the people on whose behalf it was proposed. And, in view of what has been said this afternoon, I feel that we cannot consider too carefully the question as to whether this measure is likely to do what the hon. gentleman who has introduced it hopes that it may do.

In so far as the Bill relates to the hours of labour on public works, I would like to point out that this government has already taken considerable steps towards meeting the object which the promoter of this Bill has in view. In 1900, the Hon. Mr. Mulock, now Sir Wm. Mulock, introduced into this House a resolution in favour of the payment of fair rates of wages to working men engaged on public works and the enforcing of the hours of labour current in the district where the work is carried on. Since that time the government has endeavoured to see that that resolution has been faithfully and fully carried out; and in all its contracts the government has caused to be inserted a clause requiring the contractor to pay fair rates of wages and to give the workingmen employed by him the hours of labour current in the district where the work is carried on. The government has not relied simply on the safeguard of a general provision of this kind, but has appointed special officers, known as fair-wage officers, whose duty has been to go to the locality where any public work is to be carried on and prepare in advance a schedule of rates of wages and hours of labour, to which the contractor is required to agree before the contract is awarded.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask if that is the case on all public works of the government?

Mr. KING. I understand that it is.

Mr HUGHES. Quite the contrary. I can give you the cases. For instance, right in the town of Lindsay, on the government work of building the locks there, the men are not paid even the ordinary street wages.

Mr. KING. If that is the case, I am unable to understand how the representative of that district has allowed that condition of affairs to go on and never brought it to the attention of the government.

Mr. HUGHES. I will answer the hon. gentleman when he is through.

Mr. KING. Every member of this House knows, or ought to know, that that resolution was passed, and every member of this House knows, or ought to know, that it is part of his duty to his constituents to see that if a resolution passed by this House is

not being carried out, the department which is responsible for the work shall be notified and be given the opportunity of looking into the matter; and I say, without fear of contradiction, that during the 8 years that I was deputy minister of the department and the short time that I have been privileged to be the Minister of the Department, no case has been brought to the attention of the department of alleged non-observance of this resotion which has not yet been fairly and fully investigated. I would ask hon. gentlemen to look at the annual report of the Department of Labour as presented to this House, in which, at page 132, they will find a statistical table of fair wage schedules prepared by the Department of Labour for departments of the government during the period from July, 1900, to March, 1907, inclusive. In that table they will find that the Department of Labour prepared during that period a total of 1,477 fair-wage schedules which have been inserted in contracts awarded by this government from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The total number prepared altogether is much larger than this. These schedules have not only been inserted in the contracts, but have been published in the 'Labour Gazette', so that the workingmen on whose behalf they have been inserted in the contracts would have an opportunity of seeing them and making sure that they were being paid the rates of wages specified. There have been some cases of contractors failing to pay the rates of wages which the schedules call for, and in all such cases which has been brought to the attention of the department the contractors have been obliged to pay the difference to the men. The difference has been deducted in the first instance by the department which awarded the contract, and has been paid to the men. So that the government has not been neglectful of the purpose which the hon. mover of this Bill has in mind. But to take the step which he suggests is to go a good way beyond what up to the present time has been thought by this House to be advisable.

The Bill as introduced suggests no regard for existing conditions in any industry unless those conditions happen to be such that the eight hour day is already in force. Before a step of the kind proposed is taken, I think it would be well for this House to be fully informed as to its effect. I fear that if this Bill were passed in its present form, it would give rise to a good many serious complications. The hon. member for North Grey asked the hon. mover of the Bill whether in cases in which workingmen were to-day working 10 hours for a certain wage, if this Bill became law, they would be prepared to work eight hours for eight hours pay or would want 10 hours pay for eight hours work. The reply of the hon. mover of the Bill was that it was up to the employer to say what he would pay and up to the men to see what they could get. I do not agree with my hon. friend. It is up to this House to tell all parties concerned what an Act of this kind means when it is on the statute-book, and to leave no doubts in any man's mind as to what his privileges or his restrictions are under it. For that reason, if for no other, I think it is desirable that the House should have fuller information than it has at present on a measure which is likely to give rise to such serious complications. In the building trade there are a large number of men who have agreements with their employers. These agreements have been the result of negotiations during a long series of years. They have been effected in many instances, only after serious strikes or lock-outs, and they represent understandings between the employers and the men as to the conditions of employment. Some of these agreements are for three years, some for five years and some for other terms, and it seems to me that the effect of this measure upon agreements of that kind is another feature which should receive our most serious attention before we take any final action. If, for instance, one of its effects would be that contractors would say to their workingmen: We do not wish to enter into an agreement with you, because we may have to change its terms in virtue of this legislation—if that would be one of its effects, it would be most unfortunate indeed. I do not say that such a consequence would necessarily follow, but I think that, on behalf of the workingmen themselves, that contingency should be clearly understood.

It seems to me desirable also that this House should know the extent to which the eight hour or nine hour or ten hour day is already in existence in different parts of the country. I have here a document which contains a mass of information on that subject, prepared by one of the fair wage officers of the Department of Labour. It gives a record of the hours of labour in the building trades and the different other trades in Canada; and I find that in almost every part of the country, there is a difference in the hours of labour, as compared with other localities, depending largely on the circumstances of the locality or of the particular province in which the work is being carried on. In some cases these differences are the result of climatic or other considerations. In some districts men work a shorter day because they can work the whole year round, and in others they work a longer day because they have not the same opportunity throughout the whole year to carry on their calling. Therefore before enacting legislation to determine arbitrarily the hours of work, we should give the men who are to be affected an oppor-

tunity of expressing their views. Under the circumstances, having regard to the desire of the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Verville), that this Bill be not sent to the cemetery, as has been the fate of other measures, the best thing we can do is to refer it to a special committee of this House, before which all parties concerned will have an opportunity of being heard. I would suggest therefore to my hon. friend that he should consider the advisability of having this Bill referred to a select committee, and I would suggest this not that the Bill may be side-tracked in any way but, to use the words of my hon. friend, in order to save it from going to the cemetery, as I fear it would, should a vote be taken now, judging by the discussion we have had.

Let me give another reason or two why I think it desirable that this measure should be referred to a special committee. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has spoken about legislation in the United States upon this subject, and he had in his hand a report of one of the select committees of the American House of Representatives. But that is only one of a half a dozen select committees which have dealt with similar measures across the line. As far back as 1862, the government of the United States enacted a measure very similar to the one now proposed, but what was the effect of that legislation? Whatever may have been the reasons which promoted Congress to pass it, this at least was the effect. Year after year the workingmen were continually representing to Congress that the measure was meaningless and useless, and session after session Congress appointed select committees to find out why it was impossible to make the measure what Congress hoped it would be. We would do well to profit by their experience. It would be well to have the reports of the different committees appointed by Congress laid before a special committee of this House so that they might be considered. I might point out further that in Nova Scotia there is at present a commission inquiring into a number of questions affecting the working classes. One is the question of the eight hour day, and it would be very much to the advantage of this House to have the finding of that commission on that subject. Further I think it would be an advantage to the House to have the opportunity of ascertaining what the fair wage officers of the department who have been preparing these schedules during the past eight or ten years, think would be the effect of a measure of this kind. For these reasons I hope my hon. friend will not press this measure but will agree to have it referred to a select committee, in order that all parties, both workingmen and employers, may have the opportunity of being heard, and in order that this House may have a further opportunity of doing something on behalf of the workingman in whose interests we are invited to legislate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). By the courtesy of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) and inasmuch as I shall not be able to be present for some time after eight o'clock, I would ask to be given the opportunity of making a reply to the question of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. King) as to why the member for the district (Victoria and Haliburton) did not report this matter. I might point out to him that the member for the district is not one of his fair wage officers and is not in the pay of the Labour Department, thank Heaven. I might also point out to him that the member for the locality did draw the attention of the House and of the Minister of Labour to the matter last year—not that I objected to it in any sense whatever, because I do not believe in this doctrine of putting that clause in these contracts. On the contrary, I think that a contractor should be at liberty to get his labour at whatever price he can and engage that labour for periods depending on the duties to be performed. But what had these fair wage officers of the hon. gentleman done for the labouring men? A young gentleman has been put at the head of the Labour Department, promoted over the stalwarts of the party who have been doing its work for years—and I am sure the Finance Minister will agree with me in that statement—and I want to point out an insignificant circumstance in connection with this department of his. There was a labour organization in the town I represent, (Lindsay), which became defunct. There were considerable funds in the treasury when it broke up, and under its constitution the officers of that association were empowered to dispose of these funds on following out a certain well disposed procedure. Were they permitted to do so? Oh, no. A gentleman by the name of O'Donoghue—possibly known to the Minister of Labour—appeared on the scene and undertook to take charge. And into whose hands did he seek to put the disposal of these funds? Into the hands of that horny handed son of toil Senator McHugh.

Mr. KING. May I ask the hon. gentleman to which O'Donoghue he refers?

Mr. HUGHES. I think there is only one.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. member mean——

Mr. HUGHES. I mean the O'Donoghue. I mean the gentleman who, in season and out of season, has been making himself the tool of the Department of Labour for the benefit of the Liberal party; who grinds axes for that party up and down the country wherever he can. This gentleman appears on the scene. And to whom did he

entrust the disposal of this fund? Why, to that horny-handed son of toil, Senator McHugh.

Mr. KING. I would point out to the hon. member that Mr. O'Donoghue has nothing to do with the Department of Labour.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). I am in favour of the principle of an eight hour day for the labouring classes. But I would like to point out that while the Bill now before us, on its face and by its title, purports to be an Act respecting the hours of labour on public works, it is an entirely different measure in its effect. The first section of this Bill reads:

> Every contract to which the government of Canada is a party, which may involve the employment of labourers, workmen or mechanics, shall contain a stipulation that no labourer, workman or mechanic in the employ of the contractor or subcontractor, or other person doing or contracting to do the whole or a part of the work contemplated by the contract, shall be permitted or required to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day——

And so on. It was pointed out by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that this Bill was likely to bring about the anomaly of some men in a workshop employed on government work working for eight hours a day while others in the same shop would be working for ten hours, and this, he said, might breed discontent. I cannot see, from a reading of the Bill, that such a condition could possibly arise. Under the Bill as I read it, the government contractor is not allowed to employ any one, whether on government work or any other work, for a period of more than eight hours in the twenty-four. The Bill does not restrict the hours of labour to eight for those in the employ of the contractors who are on government work, but it says that 'no labourer . . . . in the employ of the contractor or sub-contractor' shall be so employed. If after the word 'sub-contractor' were added 'on the contract' one could understand that this Bill aimed at making the eight hours applicable to work done on the government contract. But as the Bill stands now, this case might arise: In some great industrial establishments, say a steel works, if the owner entered into a contract to furnish steel rails to the government, then, under this Bill, he could not employ his coachman, or the help round his own home, for more than eight hours a day. It seems to me that, as it stands at present, the Bill is impracticable. Let me point out for a moment the effect it would have, for instance, in the case of a certain industry in the riding which I have the honour to represent. We have there the works of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company which owns a line of steamships which carry iron ore from Wabana and dolomite and limestone from Bras d'Or Lakes. If this Bill were in force, and the Dominion government should buy some steel rails from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company—they bought $29,000 last year—then when one of the company's boats left Wabana for the port of Sydney with a cargo of iron ore, at the conclusion of an eight hour day they would have to drop anchor or seek the shelter of a port till next morning; or, a vessel coming from Marble Mountain with a cargo of dolomite would be obliged to do the same thing. Thus the Bill is impracticable to the employer and impracticable to the employed. I submit that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) might well act on the suggestion offered by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) and have this Bill referred to a committee with power to alter it and have it made practicable in operation.

Now, with regard to the general principle of an eight hour day, I wish to take issue with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who says that it is ridiculous, preposterous, and declares that it cannot be successfully demonstrated to him that a man can accomplish as much work in eight hours as in ten. I may say to the hon. member that the product is not the result alone of the time devoted to the labour but also of the skill and the vitality put into it by the workman. For instance, in the coal mines of Nova Scotia within recent years, they have introduced coal-mining machines which are worked by compressed air at a very high pressure. The air is taken in from the reservoirs at the pit bottom at about 900 pounds pressure to the square inch. It is conducted through the mines and used on these machines. A man is stretched out on his stomach at full length, grasping the handles of this powerful machine, weighing, perhaps, nine hundred or a thousand or even twelve hundred pounds, working, as I have said, at heavy pressure and pounding with a pick on the working face. There is a recoil that shakes and vibrates every part of the anatomy of the man operating the machine. It has been stated on apparently good authority that a man's working life devoted to the operating of such machinery, even at eight hours per day, is only five or six years on the average. People of high-strung, nervous dispositions operating machinery of this kind would break down more quickly than those less nervously constituted.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. member: Is not that exactly what I said? In some lines of life eight hours would be a long day, but in others it would not be a long day.

Mr. MADDIN. That is what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said at one point of his remarks. But he said

also that no man could convince him that the same amount of work could be accomplished in eight hours as in ten.

Mr. SPROULE. In ordinary lines of work—and I still stick to it.

Mr. MADDIN. However, the research of those who have devoted attention to this matter has led to conclusions on the subject. It has been stated by some manufacturers that they thought it was the last hour that gave them their profit, but they have discovered that it was the last hour that registered their loss—that their workmen had lost the vim and vitality with which they had pursued their labours earlier in the day, and that the last hour was carried on at a loss which seriously interfered with the profits of the employer. There is one instance which I will recommend to the hon. member for East Grey. The Messrs. Holden, of Bradford, England, the largest wool combers in the world, who have mills in France running 72 hours a week and mills in England running 56 hours a week, find that they can comb wool more cheaply in England than in France, though they pay higher wages for the short day in England than for the long day in France, and employ exactly the same machinery in both cases.

As pointed out by the Minister of Labour, this question is not a new one, it has been discussed from time to time in various countries throughout the civilized world. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Labour say that this was a matter upon which the House had very little information, and that consequently the House was not in a position to deal intelligently with it. Why, Sir, it is only the other day, in discussing the resolution on technical education, that the Minister of Labour pointed out that his department had taken the greatest care to gather statistics and data with regard to technical education, and that he had at his fingers end this data. I submit that, familiar as he is with the history of the eight hour question from 1862 in the United States, and for the last ten years since he has been Deputy Minister of Labour in Canada, with the knowledge that this proposed legislation was first introduced into this House on the 11th of December, 1906, almost three years ago to-day. One would have thought that his department would have the necessary information to enable this House to deal intelligently with the subject. The subject has been agitated by labour organizations throughout this country for the last thirty years, and by labour bodies in a very active manner within the last ten or fifteen years. It is a matter with which the Department of Labour should be quite familiar, especially in view of the fact that they have had such ample notice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the government has introduced in public contracts a fair wages schedule insisting that the hours of labour on government contracts shall be those current at the place of employment, and this was granted at the request of organized labour. Now, it is not sufficient for this government to say, when labour asks for an eight hour day: Oh, never mind that, we will think it over, and we will gather information; we gave you a fair wages schedule and insisted on current hours of labour under government contracts. Why, Mr. Speaker, what contractor could hope to obtain anything else but current hours of labour under his contract? If a contractor undertakes to erect a public work at Vancouver or at Sydney, can he hope to obtain any other than the current hours of labour at Vancouver or at Sydney, and would it not follow that those would naturally be the hours of labour, whether they were embodied in the government contract or not? The same with regard to a fair wages schedule. The wages that obtain in Victoria and obtain in Sydney are well known to the trades in those places, and contractors seeking for workingmen in those places will find it difficult to get such labour at a lesser schedule, even if there were no fair wages schedule in government contracts.

With regard to the applicability of this Bill in its present form, I do not feel like supporting it in all its details. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that from the point of view of that part of Nova Scotia from which I come, it would not be in the best interests of labour, nor would it be in the best interests of the industries there to adopt this Bill in its present form. This government bought from the different coal mines of Nova Scotia last year, for the use of the Intercolonial alone, coal to the value of nearly $1,750,000. I must say that whilst practically an eight hour day obtains amongst the miners of that province who are employed at the working face, it would be impracticable, almost physically impossible, for any of the coal mining companies in Nova Scotia to furnish coal to the government under the provisions of section 1 of this Bill as it stands at present.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MADDIN. Some reference was made during the course of this debate to the suggestion that this Bill savoured of class legislation, that it was unfair to the farmer who was obliged to work very long hours. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) took occasion to say that farmers, to his knowledge worked twelve, fourteen and sixteen hours per day. That will be con-

ceded by any one familiar with the duties of the farmers, but when it is borne in mind that the farmer is not thusly engaged every working day in the year, one will at once note an important difference. During wet weather, whilst a good many of the farmers find employment indoors for most of their time, there is nothing to prevent, and nothing does prevent large numbers of farmers from folding their arms, sitting at the window, and looking out upon their broad acres while they are making from $20 to $50 a day. Then again, during the winter months, after the farmer has harvested the products of the soil and has laid away for himself a caddy of Macdonald's tobacco, a chest of tea and other things necessary for a severe winter, he is in an entirely different position from the man who is at the beck and call of his master for ten hours during every working day throughout the whole year. Furthermore, the farmer is his own master and on such days as he does not feel like working, or is ill, he may either work for a short time or lie off at his own discretion for the rest of the day. His crops require to be harvested and of necessity they must be got in immediately, but during the intervals between seed time and harvest and harvest and seed time he has ample time to recuperate and ample leisure for all the purposes of an ordinary man's life.

This legislation is altogether experimental in so far as this Bill is concerned. It is proposed by the Bill to have an eight hour day applied to work on government contracts. This, I submit is an experimental piece of legislation which should be undertaken by the government. Whether or not it would be wise for this country to introduce this legislation generally is a matter which inquiry would reveal. But the experiment has been tried in other countries and has been found to be successful. There are objections raised to it but whether these objections are of such a substantial character as would warrant this government in turning down legislation of this kind remains to be seen. The question may be raised as to how this measure would affect competition in certain classes of manufactured goods. A manufacturer, for instance, says: I cannot manufacture these goods on the basis of an eight hour day because my competitors across the line in the United States, or in Germany, France or Switzerland, are employing people for twelve, fourteen and sixteen hours a day and in some of the markets that compete with my products the same manufacturers would have to submit to no regulations in regard to child labour or the labour of women and it would therefore be unfair to compel the manufacturer in this country to compete on an eight hour day basis if his competitors in other countries enjoyed a longer working day and employed a cheaper class of labour. However, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for inquiry on the part of the government. It was found that in the production of cutlery in England under an eight and nine hour day the English manufacturer was able to produce his goods and to compete in the market with the German manufacturer who employed child labour and who employed labourers for twelve and thirteen hours per day. It is evident that there are some classes, at least, of labour, where an eight hour day is practicable. It is for this government to select those classes of labour. There are again instances in which perhaps an eight hour day is not practicable. But, Mr. Speaker, to say that this is provincial legislation, that it is not within the province of this parliament to enact legislation dealing with an eight hour day, is to evade the real object of this particular Bill. This Bill does not seek to make a universal eight hour day but seeks only to recognize the eight hour day in connection with government works. It is experimental and should be inquired into by the government. They should be prepared to blaze the trail, set the example to the provinces and to employers of labour to see to it that the toiling classes get an opportunity of experimenting with the application of a workable eight hour day system. How can this be obtained? I submit that here and to-night this House can resolve itself into committee, take this Bill up and amend it in such a way as to make it a practicable Bill, a Bill that would warrant hon. members on both sides of the House supporting it, so that it would be of some practical use to the people in whose interests it is presented to this House.

There is one other phase of this matter which I propose to deal with. At the meeting of the Trades and Labour Council, held from September 20 to 24, in the city of Quebec last year, at which meeting the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) presided, the parliamentary secretary, Mr. O'Donoghue, solicitor of the council, making a report on the 22nd, spoke in reference to the eight hour Bill as follows:

> Mr. Verville introduced a Bill to provide for an eight-hour day on government contracts. The Bill stood while I was endeavouring to prevail on the government to make it a government Bill and thus insure its passage into law. I further endeavoured to secure enough supporters to at least make certain of a division on the second reading. The absence of the Hon. Mr. King, and illness in the family of the then Minister of Labour, Hon. Mr. Lemieux, were other causes that contributed to the delay. Finally, when it was determined to push the Bill, it had become tied up on the Order Paper and the only thing that could be done was to have the order discharged so that a discussion could be had on the merits. Through the courtesy of the Prime Minister this was done, and the subject was duly ventilated on May 7. Mr. Verville presented the resolution in a very forcible and able speech,

his efforts being ably seconded by Mr. G. A. Turcotte (Nicolet), Mr. Joseph Girard (Chicoutimi et Saguenay), Mr. J. D. Taylor (New Westminster), and Mr. A. B. Crosby (Halifax).

Hon. Mr. Lemieux said:

He found that there were some very grave difficulties in the way. In nearly all states of the American commonwealth there exists, he said an eight hour law, but it has been limited to certain industries. As drawn, he would not support the Bill, but he declared it was legislation that was worth studying and investigating. An eight hour law on government contracts, he argued, would be in conflict with provincial legislation as it stands. We could only pass such legislation as regards government works, because individual contracts come within the definition of 'civil rights' which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces.

Further on this parliamentary correspondence says:

It is quite apparent that the Hon. Mr. Lemieux was not able to give to the subject the study it deserved or he would not have spoken as he did. In the first place the delegates will recall that on several occasions the hon. gentleman declared himself fully in accord with our demand in this regard and stated that all we had to do was to convert his colleagues. If the hon. gentleman thinks the Bill is class legislation, he cannot fairly be in favour of it, whether in its present form or in any other.

In conclusion. this gentleman says:

The debate served a useful purpose at all events in showing what we have to meet when the Bill is next introduced. While the opposition jeered at the honesty of purpose of Mr. Verville, it is worthy of note that the Hon. Mr. Borden did not speak in favour of the Bill nor did others of the opposition except those mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say with regard to this parliamentary report of the parliamentary solicitor of the trades and labour council; this man who is nothing more nor less than a political henchman for the Grit party and has been serving in that capacity in connection with that body for some time now; I wish to characterize his public statement to the trades and labour council as a falsehood. He says: 'I, however, endeavoured to secure enough supporters to at least make certain of a division on the second reading,' and in connection with that statement I wish to point out that five members are enough to bring about a division on any question before the House, and I say that I have come in personal contact with and have spoken to no less than 64 Liberal-Conservative members in this House who were never spoken to by Mr. O'Donoghue with regard to that legislation. Notwithstanding that there were a number of members on this side of the House not only willing but anxious to support an eight hour day, this gentleman undertakes to tell the delegates at the Trades and Labour Council that the Liberal-Conservative party jeered at it, while at the same time he becomes the apologist for the ignorance of the Minister of Labour on the subject. Then he goes on to speak of the courtesy of the Prime Minister, and he remarks that the Hon. Mr. Borden did not speak in favour of the Bill. What about the other 210 members who did not speak in favour of the Bill; he has nothing to say about that. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Trades and Labour Council or any organized labour body in Canada which seeks legislation from this parliament, if they are sincere about it and will play fair they will always receive from the Liberal-Conservative party courtesy and fair consideration for their demands. But, Sir, I protest against being misrepresented in the Trades and Labour Council or any other trade organization by this parliamentary representative of theirs.

Now, this Bill has been on the Order Paper for at least four sessions, and it would seem to me that Mr. O'Donoghue has let the cat out of the bag when he tells the delegates that he used his utmost endeavours to have the government adopt it as a government measure and thus ensure its passage. Why did he not take the trades and labour council into his confidence and tell them what success his efforts met with. But, if Mr. O'Donoghue does not care to reveal that secret of his, I, for my part want to know to-night what is the attitude of the Department of Labour and of the government towards the adoption of the eight hour day on government works. It is the duty of the government to give this House an answer to that question, yes or no. Are we to suppose that a department of government whose sole function, judging by its past record, has been to compile statistics is not able to tell parliament—after having had this Bill staring them in the face for four years—whether this Bill can be put into practical shape or not. It is the duty of the government to grapple with this important question and to grapple with it now. It is a question that is deeply interesting not only to employees but to employers as well, and I say that the proper thing to do is for this House now to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole and to consider the Bill clause by clause and legislate on it. This is experimental legislation and it is the duty of the government to carry on such an experiment. In the different colonies of Australia they have experimented with the eight hour day more thoroughly than anywhere else in the British empire and under the eight hour system which prevails in the greater part of the Australian commonwealth, they have

developed strong men, virile men, men with imperial ideas, men who, when it comes to voting for national defence or contributing to the mother country talk of Dreadnoughts. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that as the Bill now stands I would not vote for it, but I believe that it can be made workable and the time to do it is here and now to-night. Let the government grapple with the Bill now and don't let them send it to that committee graveyard whence so many Bills of this character have been consigned.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). When this Bill was introduced I did not think it was going to take a political turn, and I did not quite expect that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) would wax so warm and so eloquent from the party standpoint in regard to it. I know a good deal about labour and labouring men. I do not profess to be so familiar with the doings of the Trades and Labour Council as the hon. member (Mr. Maddin), but I do not think he has much reason to blame the council or its representatives if they do come to a certain conclusion in respect to the attitude of the Conservative party in this country towards labour legislation. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) personally had 18 years or 24 years out of 40 years of experience in dealing with any legislative body and during the whole of that time he failed in getting one line of legislation in the interest of labour, he would not be to blame, any more than the Trades and Labour Council is, if he came to the conclusion that he had nothing to hope for from that quarter. That, Sir, is the history of the Conservative party in respect to labour in this Dominion. The Conservatives had 18 years of continuous control in this country; the conditions with regard to labour during those 18 years were just the same as they have been before and since and it can be truly said that although the labour men continuously asked for relief, the Conservative party never did anything to improve their condition.

My hon. friend from South Cape Breton has nothing to complain of, in the face of that record, if labouring men generally have no confidence in the party to which he belongs. If anything has been said which he regards as harsh, it is only due to the reputation which that great party has earned for itself. My hon. friend admits that this Bill cannot go very far as remedial legislation for the workingmen of this country. The class of people with which this Bill undertakes to deal is an infinitesimely small fraction of the working people of this country, that is, the people who work on government contracts or who are in the employ, directly or indirectly, of the government. They are a class of people from whom we hear no complaints. I have never heard any complaints from men employed by the government, either in offices or on public works, that their hours were too long or their conditions arduous or uncomfortable. For that reason, I do not think this legislation is at all necessary for that class of people. The only good purpose this Bill serves is that it brings this question straight before this House and gives the members an opportunity to express their opinion respecting it. It is the principle at stake, and it is the assertion of that principle by the members of this House that is of value. It is admitted that this House has not the power to pass legislation on this subject that will be of use to the workingmen of this country generally, and I do not think there is much use of going about it piecemeal and passing legislation which will merely deceive and mislead workingmen. After we go back to our constituents, if this Bill passes in its present form, we shall be asked: Haven't you passed an eight hour law? We shall have to tell them that we have not; therefore, they will be deceived, because they will think we have, when we have not. It is better to be straight and honest with these people and tell them that we have no jurisdiction to pass a uniform law for all the provinces. I think we should have a uniform law on this subject throughout the Dominion, and the only way in which that can be brought about is by means of a conference of the governments of the various provinces. This government would be doing a great service to the workingmen of this country if they would exercise whatever influence they possess in bringing together the governments of the various provinces and inducing them to agree upon legislation which, although enacted by the separate provinces, would be uniform in its effects throughout the Dominion.

Now, this question is not new in the province from which I come. It was discussed in the legislature of Nova Scotia in 1904, the last year that I had the honour of being a member of that body. The different workingmen's organizations, particularly the Provincial Workingmens' Association, which was the only organization in Cape Breton at that time, met the government and discussed with them the pros and cons of the question. No decision was reached at that time, but since then the government of Nova Scotia has undertaken to deal with the question in a thorough and business-like manner. I find that an Act was put upon the statute-book of Nova Scotia in April, 1908, which provides:

1. The Governor in Council is authorized to appoint a commission of three members whose duty it shall be to inquire into and report upon the economic effect of a limit to a working day for the workmen employed in the

various industries in the province of Nova Scotia, with especial reference to the effect of such limitation upon the following matters: (a) production, (b) wages, (c) employment, (d) export trade, (c) Canadian industries, regard being had to the different conditions obtaining in different districts, of amount and cost of production.

2. The commissioners shall have all the powers of a commission appointed under chapter 12 of the Revised Statutes, 1900, 'Of Inquiries concerning Public Matters.'

The government of Nova Scotia has taken a proper and systematic way of dealing with the question. That commission was appointed nearly two years ago, and has been inquiring into this question during the last 18 months at least. I hope that at the next session of the Nova Scotia legislature we shall have from that commission a report of value to the whole country, reaching a conclusion on this difficult and complex question. It would not be of any use to jump at passing an Act in this House that would bring no practical good. The discussion on this Bill is, however, of great value. I am delighted to hear from a member from British Columbia who has had to deal experimentally and practically with this question, the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve). It is worth a good deal to this House to have the opinion of a gentleman who has gone through the experimental stage of this question and is prepared to stand up in this House and say that in British Columbia the eight hour system has proven itself satisfactory. There is no reason why, if it has been satisfactory in British Columbia, it should not be satisfactory in every other province of the Dominion. Expressing my own opinion, which may have to be modified to some extent after we hear the conclusions of the commission to which I have referred, who have had a much better opportunity than I have had to form correct conclusions; but, speaking for myself, I am in favour of the principle of the eight hour day, and I regard any favourable expression of opinion that may be obtained from this House as an advancement of that principle. But I think we are courting a difficulty if we send this Bill in its present form to a committee. I cannot see what a committee could do with it. They could not reject the Bill altogether, for that would mean rejecting the principle involved. They could not adopt it, for that would lead to difficulty with no compensating result. I think a resolution of the House approving of the principle of an eight hour day is about all we can get out of this Bill as it stands at present. The hon. member for South Cape Breton says that it would interfere with the work on ships in connection with the Dominion Coal Company and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. I do not think it would go that far. So far as work on ships is concerned, it would be just as bad to enact a ten hour law as an eight hour law.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE.

Ships and shipping are operated under an entirely different law. This Bill, whether passed or not, would not interfere with the Shipping Act and the articles of the seamen under which ships are operated. In the county of Cape Breton we have, I suppose, more labouring men, in the true sense of the term, than any other county in Canada. We have on the island of Cape Breton some 9,000 workingmen, who can be really called workingmen, and possibly 95 per cent of those are in the county of Cape Breton. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman and myself undertake to talk about an eight hour day law, we ought to talk about something that will be of practical benefit to the large number of people we have the honour to represent. But so far as this Bill is concerned, I do not regard it as being of any benefit to the people from the labour standpoint. It is only to benefit those working on government contracts, and I do not think they are in need of any sympathy from me; but whenever my hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman will introduce a Bill—if such a Bill can properly be introduced in this House—that will be of benefit to the workingmen and that will give them an eight hour day, I shall be quite willing to support it, and will support it, in every legitimate way. However, as it is conceded that this is a matter within the jurisdiction of the provinces, I do not think there is much use in our discussing it except in the expectation that our view will be of great benefit to the different provincial legislatures in enabling them to reach a conclusion favourable to the eight hour day.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to explain to my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that this Bill would apply to shipping, being enacted by the same body as makes the Merchants Shipping Act and seamen's regulations. The Bill says:

Every contract to which the government of Canada is a party, which may involve the employment of labourers, workingmen or mechanics, shall contain a stipulation that no labourer, workman or mechanic in the employ of the contractor——

It does not say employed on that particular job——

—shall be permitted or required to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day.

That in effect repeals the Shipping Act, and would make it necessary for a vessel to drop her anchor wherever she might happen to be at the end of eight hours.

Mr. BEATTIE. I have a good deal of sympathy with the object of the Bill, but it does not go far enough. If the mover of this measure would include all the workingmen, I should be happy to support it,

but, in its present shape, it would only give relief to one out of a thousand. If the hon. gentleman will make his Bill apply to workingmen in general, it will have my support.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). Last session a resolution was submitted to the House, which has been referred to to-night, and I may say that on that occasion I was very much disappointed in the mover of that resolution, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). I was very much disappointed at the manner in which he brought it up. We are asked to pass a Bill applicable, not to the workingmen throughout the Dominion, but only to those employed on government contracts and government construction work; but, of course, when lawyers take any measure in hand they can always make it look either like five cents or five dollars, as they think best, and every one of them puts a different construction on it. As I understand this Bill, it is intended to bring about an eight hour day on all government construction work. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McKenzie) said that the Conservatives had never done anything for labour. Well, if any one would look over the hon. gentleman's record, he will not find that he has ever done anything for the workingman. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) drew our attention to the declaration of the Minister of Finance, who expressed himself distinctly in favour of no one going on government work except Liberals; but I tell the hon. gentleman we are going to have a change very soon. I believe we shall have it before this Bill goes through. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. McKenzie King) said that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) was prepared to vote this Bill through, no matter what happened. But if I understood the hon. member for Cumberland properly, he was in favour of the Bill and would vote for it if it compelled every man, who made a government contract, to establish the eight hour day system in his works. That is what I understood the hon. gentleman to say, but I do not think that any one has any other desire than to deal with this Bill on its merits as it affects public works. We have had a great deal of talk about the eight hour day and the nine and ten hour day, and the twenty-four hour day. In fact, the labouring man works for twenty-four hours, so they say, and never stops. When we had a twelve hour system, we had double shifts, but a man had to work twelve hours and keep the machinery going all the time. Now, if we adopt the eight hour day, we can have three shifts in the twenty-four hours. There is no trouble keeping the machinery going all the time; but this Bill does not refer to any thing outside the construction of government work. We are told by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) that this is a measure which must be dealt with by the local legislatures. Just think of our sending a Bill to a local legislature and asking that legislature to enact an eight hour day solely for the public works of Canada. The Bill is one which should be dealt with by this parliament, and we must deal with it. It has come here to stay. First we had the 12 hour day, which was cut down to 10 and then to 9, and I would like to ask any body if he regrets any one of these changes. We were met with the same cry when we talked about limiting the employment of child labour and preventing a child from going to work under 14 years. When that was proposed, those who opposed it said that the children would be so well educated they would not go to work at all. Now, in our province—we always lead in those matters—we have that condition, and what is the result? Everybody is happy, and the children of the workingman are educated. There has never yet been a reform in connection with labour which has not met with the opposition of the employers. It is not because he gets down and figures out how it is going to do him harm; he only thinks that it will do him harm. But it will not do him any harm. Why should we have this one or that one telegraphing: Don't let that Bill go through? Are they all government contractors? Have they all got a pull with the government? Some certainly say that they have a pretty strong pull, but I do not know about that. But we have nothing to fear. This is a Bill that it is the duty of this parliament to deal with. We are asked how will this Bill operate with regard to factories? Why, it will be just the same as in the employment of clerks and book-keepers under present conditions. The government have a civil service whose duties are essentially those of accountants, book-keepers and clerks. These people work from three to five hours a day, I think; will any man say that when a private employer engages a book-keeper or clerk he must allow him the same hours as those of the civil service? If not, why should it be supposed that when a private employer engages a labourer or stonemason he will have the same hours as a similar workman in the employ of the government? We have heard a good deal about the farmers in this connection. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) spoke about that. Why, the farmer gets a return for every hour he works; in fact, his farm is making money for him even when he sleeps. The farmer has his sowing season and his reaping season, but part of the year he can sit in his easy chair. The

workman has to work every day or starve. If anything happens to him and lays him off for a few days, he does not get anything for the time so spent. If he is sick and is laid up for a week or two, he does not call in a doctor, for he would never recover if he did—if he does recover, the doctor keeps him in hot water a good while. I am surprised to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) talking as he does about the farmer, for that hon. gentleman generally gives us good advice, and I am glad to follow his advice on nearly all occasions. But, as I have shown, there is no comparison between the farmer and the workman; we are all working for the farmer, and even the weather works for him when he is asleep. I am surprised that the hon. member for East Grey is not more considerate of his own profession by improving the position of the workman so that the doctor may have a better chance of having his fees paid.

Mr. SPROULE. How about the farmer when he has a crop failure?

Mr. CROSBY. He never has a crop failure—the government always fixes that. Even if things do go wrong with him, the government always sees to it that he has enough for the winter. But the workman has no one to protect or help him, except a few of us here who are going to do what we can for him.

I stand by the principle of this Bill as I read it. I do not wish to quibble, or twist, or turn by sending the Bill here or sending it there. Of course, if we cannot deal with the Bill before this House, I will not oppose sending it to a committee. We have enough lawyers here to spoil any Bill, but I am willing to take hold of the Bill with some other laymen and put it in shape so that the working people and the country generally will be satisfied with it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). The discussion this evening has resolved itself into a debate on the general question of the eight hour day. That is a principle, I believe, that the large majority of this House will regard very favourably. There has been considerable experience of the eight hour day not only in Canada, but in some other countries. In Australia, they have general laws regulating the hours of labour, not only for government employees, but for the general industries of the country, which laws have worked with very great satisfaction. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) has reminded hon. members that in British Columbia we have very important legislation in relation to the eight hour day. Our law applies to certain industries only—coal mining, metalliferous mining and smelting. The people of British Columbia generally believe that that legislation has worked to the general interest of these enterprises as well as to the benefit of the province as a whole. It is true, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), says in answer to the hon. member for Kootenay, there was some little trouble with regard to maintaining the same standard of wages for eight hours as had been maintained under the ten hour system. Of course, that disorganized the industries for some time. But now and for some years the law has worked satisfactorily. The coal miners of British Columbia had an eight hour day before there was legislation on the subject. But we on the Pacific coast are liable to be affected by American influence, and the miners of British Columbia were afraid that with the introduction of American capital into the coal mining of that province the influence of those concerned might possibly add to the length of the working day. The miners considered that it would be wise to make provision by law that eight hours should be a working day in mines. That was done, so that we now have had for some years an eight hour law at the coal mines and in the smelting works which has operated very satisfactorily in that province. The principle of an eight hour day has always been difficult of general application. I think the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was quite right when he sought to discriminate between industries, in showing the difficulty of operating an eight hour day in all industries alike, inasmuch as a man can do as much work in six hours in some industries as he can do in ten or eleven hours in other industries. So I think to that extent my hon. friend is quite right.

In England they have sought to legislate on this question, and last session they passed for the first time a law regulating the hours of labour in mines for all persons, restricting the hours to eight hours a day. Thirty-five years ago they passed a law in England relating to factories and mines, and dangerous employments for women and children, and it has worked with great satisfaction. Personally I would support an eight hour law if it could be made practicable. There is great difficulty, however, in having absolute equality in the hours of labour in all industries, and when we come to consider certain employments, my contention is that it is impossible for men to do their best for any longer period than six or seven or eight hours a day. In other employments, perhaps, a man could work with advantage a longer number of hours.

But the principle of an eight hour day which seems important to me is the opportunity that it gives to men generally to appropriate the benefits of education. It seems to me that when we discuss the economic results of the reduction of hours on production, we forget the effects it would

have on men themselves, at least in certain employments. As I have said, there is no doubt that men can usually produce more in a shorter number of hours than they can by working ten hours a day. There is no doubt about that principle, for the reason that when men get the benefit of shorter hours, they are in a position to take advantage of the social and educational conditions in which they may find themselves. So the economic loss in reduced hours is overbalanced by the greater strength and efficiency of the workers. So I think the general principle of the eight hour day is well settled in the minds of people everywhere. The trades unions have done more for themselves by a reduction of hours than they have done by anything else. In England where the hours of labour are the shortest in the world, shorter than in Germany, shorter than in the United States, and I believe in some trades shorter than in Australia, they have an eight hour law; and all the benefits of that condition of things in England have been brought about by a strong and intelligent organization amongst the workmen themselves.

Now, in the course of his remarks, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) made one or two statements that I wish to refer to. He remarked that the Minister of Labour had suggested that it was necessary to have a select committee to collect evidence before dealing with this question. Now I agree with that position entirely. But my hon. friend complained that the Labour Department ought to have been in possession of such evidence already. Now, Sir, I assume that the minister's answer to that position would be that he wants a committee to study the evidence he already has in his possession. The minister may have that evidence, no doubt has the evievidence, but it is impossible for every member of this House to have that evidence. I have not the evidence, for instance; but we ought all to have it in order to study it before legislating on this question. I do not see that any harm can come from a complete and thorough investigation of this question. Now I want to say how far I am prepared to go on the question of regulating the hours of the public servants in this country. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) says that the government have already brought the hours down three or four a day. My understanding is that the Civil Service has been put on the basis of an eight hour day, that instructions are posted up in the departments insisting that the civil servants shall come to their office at nine o'clock in the morning and work until five in the afternoon, which, of course makes an eight hour day.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not refer to the Civil Service as regards their working hours, I only referred to them to establish a comparison between their hours and the hours of men working for private individuals. Nobody expects that men in private industries should work no longer hours than the civil servants. I did not reflect upon the Civil Service hours at all.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I did not say my hon. friend was reflecting on the Civil Service, but his remarks will carry their own reflection. If I understood my hon. friend correctly, he said more than once that under this government civil servants worked only three or four, and not more than five, hours a day. My understanding is that some months ago regulations were posted up in the departments insisting that the employees should come to their work at nine in the morning and stay till five in the afternoon. I mention that to show that the government has accepted the principle of an eight hour day in the Civil Service at Ottawa. I believe that the government should be a model employer. The government represents the people of this country, and if the people generally are in favour of the principle of an eight hour day, there can be no objection to the government carrying out that principle with their own servants. I believe every man in the employ of the government, especially those engaged in mechanical operations, should only work eight hours a day.

Now I want to look at this Bill and see whether it is possible to accomplish the object aimed at by the Bill in its present form. I want to say that I do not believe we ought to pass legislation in this House that cannot be made practicable in its operation. I do not think it is possible under all circumstances to operate the principle of this Bill. I am strongly in favour of an eight hour day for all government employees, and I am in favour of the government establishing all over this country the best possible conditions for their employees, as they have done by the fair wage principle. I agree with that absolutely, but I do not think that the proposal of my hon. friend would accomplish the object which he professes to have in view. I believe that his intention is good, I believe my hon. friend wants to do something to improve the conditions of labour in this country, and I think that he is right in seeking the assistance of the government to bring about that object. But the very worst thing my hon. friend can do is to propose legislation to this parliament which this parliament cannot possibly pass.

In looking over the Bill one must see that it is impossible for this government to determine that in every contract that the government enters into it must regulate the hours of labour not only of the men employed on that particular government contract but regulate the hours of labour for the whole business which is being operated by the man who has the contract with the gov-

ernment. Let me give this illustration: Suppose that a grocer doing business in the city of Victoria, perhaps to the extent of $10,000 a month, fills a contract for supplying groceries to a government steamer in the harbour of Victoria to the extent of $100 a month; that grocer would be compelled to carry on his business on the principle of the eight-hour day. The Bill ought to provide for these important effects of its operation. All the systems of transportation having contracts with this government must operate on the principle of the eight-hour day. All subsidized steamers and steamers having contracts with the government to carry the mails from Liverpool to Montreal must carry on their operations, under the principle of the eight-hour day. All systems of transportation having contracts with the government must be operated under the principle of the eight hour day if these contracts are to be maintained, because the Bill provides that wherever there is a contract with the government the whole business of the contractor must be carried on under the principle of the eight-hour day. I believe that my hon. friend has the best of intentions and motives in presenting this legislation, but it is utterly impossible for this parliament, however well disposed it might be, to carry out the principle of this Bill worded as it is. Therefore, I am strongly in favour of the Bill going to a committee. There is another thing that I would like to say. I believe that the effect of this legislation, if it were put in operation, especially in some parts of the country, would be to reduce the wages of men who are employed on government contracts. Let me give my hon. friend an illustration: Suppose that carpenters and stonemasons in Quebec and Montreal work ten, eleven or twelve hours a-day. I believe they do because the province of Quebec is farther behind in social legislation than any other part of this Dominion. My hon. friend, of course, for some time, has been bringing his influence to bear upon the legislature of Quebec which has the general legislation with respect to hours of labour affecting public business in its own hands, but there is no place in Canada where men work as long hours as they do in Quebec. Suppose that the general hours of labour and business of stonemasons, bricklayers or carpenters in the city of Montreal numbered ten or eleven a-day, that under this Bill you put up a building and the contractor was obliged to employ his men on the eight-hour day principle. We must remember that the wages and conditions under government operation are regulated by the principle that the wages must be the standard wages of the district and the conditions and hours must be the standard conditions and hours of the district. If carpenters are employed in Montreal at $2.50 a-day for ten or eleven hours and the conditions of the district have to determine the conditions under the government contract then the government itself in its own labour department would be compelled to reduce the wages so as to meet the general conditions applicable to work of this kind. I think the application of this Bill would really reduce the wages of labour to men who were employed on government contracts. I think the discussion has been important, but I think this Bill is impossible. I am prepared to support the principle that the government ought to give their own employees an eight-hour day and ought to use all the influence they can to regulate the hours of labour on government contracts, but I do not think the object that my hon. friend has in his mind can be accomplished by this Bill. I therefore strongly recommend to him the suggestion of the Minister of Labour that a committee be selected from which we may be able to have a Bill before this House which will be practicable and thus bestow some benefit on the workingmen of this country as far as those employed by this government are concerned.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver City). Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of what the last speaker (Mr. Ralph Smith) has said I am prepared to agree. With his declarations of sincerity in regard to the principle of an eight hour day I am prepared to agree. But, I would venture to say that his logic is a little astray when he tells this House and the country that he is an avowed advocate of the principle of the eight hour day, and when that principle goes up against a grocer in Victoria who happens to believe in the principle of a ten hour day, he tells us that this is a difficulty in the way, that it is the lion in his path. For my part I have this amount of courage that if I believe that the principle of the eight hour day is correct I am prepared to say that everything in the way of the adoption of that principle must give way. If that grocer in Victoria—I thought he was in Vancouver, but he is in Victoria—being a contractor for the government, adopts a different principle from that which the speakers here to-night have been declaring they believed in, then it is up to that favorite government contractor to abandon his ten-hour principle and adopt the eight-hour principle. I regret that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), in whose sincerity I have not one particle of doubt and of whose careful study of this question I have personal knowledge, has dropped into exactly the same fallacy. He tells us, as does the hon. member for Nanaimo, that he will allow the great labour population of Canada to be denied their rights because some contractor will be

obliged to change his system of labour employment in his factory or other industry.

Mr. KING. Will the hon. gentleman kindly inform the House what statement I made that enables him to draw such an inference? I am not aware of having made any statement which would warrant an inference of that kind.

Mr. COWAN. I think that the report of my hon. friend's speech will show that I have drawn an exact and accurate inference from his remarks. I hope that I am mistaken because I would be sorry to find the Minister of Labour, with the responsibilities of office upon him, stand up in his place in this House and declare that he is in favour of a principle but he is not in favour of carrying out that principle because it would interfere with those who disbelieve in the principle and act in a different way. I hope I will find that I have made a mistake. But, I know that I have made no mistake in regard to the hon. member for Nanaimo. He has given an instance. A grocer in Victoria has a contract with the government. That grocer has one principle of employment different from the eight hour principle. It would demoralize the system of employment and therefore we must deny the labouring men of Canada their rights. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) in that position. I do think too that the Minister of Labour fresh and young and full of enthusiasm and actuated I believe by a single and sincere desire to advance the cause of labour—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. COWAN. Yes, I am prepared to give every member of this House the largest measure of credit in the matter of motives, but I am not prepared to give the Minister of Labour credit for a single attempt to-day to crystallize in the statutes of Canada any provision for the betterment of labour. Had there been a case made out for referring this to a special committee I would have been content to reserve my judgment on the sincerity of the gentlemen who advocate such a course, but not one particle of argument has been advanced to indicate that there is the slightest necessity for any evidence, which is not already within the knowledge of the House, in support of the case. I say that this Bill should get its second reading and go to the Committee of the Whole. I hope therefore, just to test the courage and sincerity of the members of this House in facing what I am prepared to admit is a difficult question, that the member for Maisonneuve will continue to press that his Bill be dealt with now.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I am sorry to have to disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan). I believe that when he has been here a session or two he will not have the opinion he now has as to the sincerity of the government when they make a motion of this kind. Our experience during the past week is enough to satisfy us on that point. When the resolution of the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was put on the Order Paper I thought it was placed there at the instance of the government in order that they might get some credit for it, but we found the Minister of Labour moving an amendment which practically side-tracked the issue for the balance of the session. Now we have another Bill introduced by the member for Maisonneuve. That same Bill was introduced last session by the same gentleman, and the session before, but every time it appeared on the Order Paper the influence of the government was brought to bear on the hon. member for Maisonneuve and he was afraid to move the Bill in the House and take a division on it. This year he wants the Bill pressed but the Minister of Labour gets up and says: Oh, he agrees with the principle, he is in favour of it, but yet he wants to side-track it. He tells us he wants the labouring men of this country to believe that he is in favour of the eight hour day, but he wants a special committee to examine into the question, and that is the last you will hear of the Bill this session. Is that fair to the labouring men of this country. We all understand the Bill and the Minister of Labour understands it as well as anybody else, but the truth is he is afraid to come out fair and square on the issue. I think the time has come for every man in this House to show his colours and declare whether he is in favour of the Bill or not. I shall vote for the Bill, and I refuse to have it side-tracked at the instance of the government. Let the government come out honourably and show the labouring people whether they are in favour of this measure or not. I do not hesitate to say to the labouring men from the Atlantic to the Pacific that the action of the Minister of Labour so far as this Bill is concerned is a fake from the beginning to the end, and that the minister is acting in opposition to the interests of the labouring men of Canada.

Mr. EMMANUEL DEVLIN (Wright). I wish to offer a few remarks which I hope will be construed as I want them to be, as fully sympathetic to the cause of labour. It has been my good fortune to have had considerable experience, not altogether in a practical way, but to have come into contact with the labouring classes, and I feel that no man in this House is actuated by sentiments more favourable towards the labouring classes than I am. I have listened to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville, and I want to say right

away that I am heartily in favour of the eight hour day. I feel that the labouring classes of this country should not be called to work harder even than hon. gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House. I believe that the labouring classes should have the same fair treatment that capital receives in this country. I would like to see the Bill go one step further, if it were possible, and regulate the wages which the labourer would receive under government contracts when their day's labour is cut down to eight hours. After reading the Bill over several times, I see that the contractor who assumes a contract with the government of this country shall be forced to regulate the hours of labour, and he is left free to deduct from the poor labourer's wages an amount corresponding to that reduction of hours. I do not think it is in the interest of labour that such legislation should be enacted, and I speak most sincerely when I say that I believe no hurried action should be taken in this matter. I believe that the suggestion of the Minister of Labour and the suggestion of the member for Nanaimo, as representing labour in this country, to refer the Bill to a special committee for further study should be accepted. I think that every consideration ought to be given to this Bill and that it should be the duty of that special committee to study all the questions involved so that the labouring men of this country shall not receive lower wages because of the shortening of the hours of labour.

Mr. GEORGE H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this Bill and with more than ordinary interest to the speech of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). While that hon. gentleman was making his speech, I could not help thinking how he would have graced the position of Minister of Labour. It may be provincialism to a certain extent, but in my opinion he is the man who, both by training and by natural ability, was entitled to the position; but I can quite understand that the province of British Columbia could by no possibility expect to have two members in this government. With regard to this Bill, everybody seems to be in favour of the principle of it, but nobody seems to want it to go through. I think there should be very little difficulty in straightening out the Bill. If the hon. member who introduced it would be willing to have it amended in committee in such a way as to meet the objections which have been raised, there is no reason why it should not pass its second reading, and for my part, if he chooses to press his motion to a vote, I am prepared to support him. With regard to the speech of the hon. Minister of Labour, he sought to make a little trouble for the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes); but the hon. member for Cumberland was at least definite in what he wanted to say, while I doubt if anybody knew just what the views of the Minister of Labour were on this question when he got through. His position reminds me somewhat of an undertaker who, a short time ago, while away on a visit, was asked what his calling in life was. After hesitating a moment, he said: 'I follow the medical profession.' It seems to me that the Minister of Labour has undertaken the role of undertaker to the government, for this is the second time in seven days that we have seen him bury a Bill which I am inclined to think in his inmost heart he believed to be right. I am in favour of this Bill.

Mr. ERNEST ROY (Dorchester). Mr. Speaker, I am a new member of this House and am not very familiar with parliamentary procedure; but I cannot understand the statement of one hon. member on the other side of the House, that the Minister of Labour has not the courage to adopt the principle of this Bill. If I understand the procedure of parliament correctly, when a minister proposes to refer a Bill to a select committee, it is understood that the principle of the Bill will be adopted, for the second reading of the Bill has to take place before it can go to a committee. I think it is understood by every hon. member that the Bill in its present form must be modified before it is passed. I think the Bill should be referred, not to a standing committee of this House, but to a special committee, which would be in a better position to obtain the information necessary to pronounce on the Bill. Therefore, I think the position taken by the hon. the Minister of Labour is the proper position to take on the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the matter with which we are immediately concerned, I would like to correct a very grave misapprehension on the part of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. MacKenzie), who has declared that no legislation in the interest of labour was ever passed by a Conservative administration. I want to tell my hon. friend, and I am surprised that he is ignorant of it, that the most important measure ever passed in the interest of labouring men in Canada was passed by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. But for that legislation men combining to strike to-day in Canada would be criminals in the eyes of the law. A Conservative member of parliament, the late E. F. Clarke, for many years a respected and honoured member of this House, was in jail in the city of Toronto under the law as it was before Sir John A. Macdonald brought in the Act which gave labouring

men the right to strike without subjecting themselves to a criminal prosecution.

Mr. BRODER. It was George Brown who put him in jail.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but we need not go into matters of detail. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour has spoken on this question. It is a question that has been before parliament for four years. One would have supposed that a government responsible for all the legislation that goes through parliament, as every government under modern conditions is, would have taken up this subject. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Labour concurs with the statement made by the hon. member for Nanaimo that the government at present have all the information necessary on this subject. Am I to infer that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour concurs in that statement?

Mr. KING. The government has a great deal of very valuable information, but I think it would be of decided advantage to the House to have an investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is rather non-committal. It seems to me that the question resolves inself into this. The government either have or have not the information; if they have not, there have been four years during which this matter has been mooted more than once in parliament, and one would have thought that in that time they would have appointed a royal commission to obtain the necessary information, as was done by the government of Nova Scotia two years ago. When the question was first mooted in parliament four years ago my hon. friend was deputy Minister of Labour. Where have been his affections for the labouring men of this country during these four years? But there is another very curious circumstance in connection with this matter. The government are to-day acting in absolute reversal of the position they took in 1907, when they brought in a so-called Conciliation Act. I asked at that time, by a resolution which I moved at the beginning of the session, and afterwards on the third reading of that Bill, that all matters touching disputes between employers and employees should be referred to a committee of this House in order that both sides might be heard. I took the ground then, which I am prepared to stand by to-day, that in these matters it is only fair that both sides should be heard before legislation of such great importance should be dealt with by parliament. What was the answer at that time? It was that the government had all the information in their possession. I have the words of the Minister of Labour of the day, Hon. Mr. Lemieux, under my hand He said:

I therefore believe that, at the present time, with the information we have before us, with the reports of the Royal Commission of 1903, with the monthly reports which we receive from our correspondents from all parts of Canada, and with the ample reports that are presented to this House by the Labour Department, it is quite unnecesary to appoint a Committee of this House to take evidence in connection with this Bill.

My hon. friend from Nanaimo was at that time very strongly in favour of the position the government took, that there was no need to appoint a commission or to have any hearing before a commission. My hon. friend, I remind him in all kindness, takes a different stand to-night. He says that although the information is there, we should have a special committee for the purpose of passing on it and reporting to this House. I would ask my hon. friend if that is a good arugment to-day, why was it not a good argument in 1907? I urged that very argument myself in 1907, but I did not succeed at that time in securing the ear of my hon. friend, because I had the misfortune of seeing him vote against me, both on the motion I made in the early part of the session, and on the motion I made on the third reading of that Bill.

This subject, as my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) has truly said, is one that must be met. In common with every member of this House, I am disposed to give the most sympathic consideration to every measure that will improve the condition of the labouring men in this country. We want our labouring men to live and prosper under fair conditions so that, as has been well said to-night, we shall have a strong virile population, not doomed to work to the last limit of their physical strength, or to compete on unfair conditions with the pauper labour of any other country. We ought to give every possible consideration to their claims in this regard and I am disposed to do that. The question is one which must not be shelved by any proposal to submit it to a committee. I am willing that it should go before a committee for exactly the same reasons that I gave when I asked for a special committee on the Conciliation Act of 1897. I think that Act should have gone before a committee in order that both sides might have been heard; and had that course been followed, there would have been infinitely less dissatisfaction with that measure and it would have worked out infinitely better and have been very materially improved. I am disposed to send this Bill to a committee of the House, not in order that it be shelved—because we must have a satisfactory understanding from the government that it will not be shelved—but in order that employees and employers may be heard, and in order that any information in possession of the government—if they have any, if they have had enough

interest in the subject to collect information—shall be put before the committee, and in order that the committee, after giving a fair hearing to all parties, may make a report to the House. Under the circumstances I would accept the proposal, on the distinct understanding from the government, that the committee will meet at once and expedite its work and bring back a report to the House to be dealt with before the end of the session.

Mr. VERVILLE. I am very proud indeed to have brought this question before the House this afternoon and especially to find that it has excited so interesting a debate. This is probably the first time we have had so much discussion on the hours of labour, and many hon. gentlemen on both sides have expressed themselves, in different fashions, in favour of a shorter working day. As I said on moving the second reading of the Bill, my intention was not to make any extended remarks myself, but to obtain the views of others, and to my great satisfaction. I have heard a great deal more than I expected. Some remarks have been made regarding farm labour but there is no comparison whatever between farm labour and that which is dealt with in this Bill. We have also heard it argued that men could not do as much work in eight hours as in ten. Well, we heard that same argument every time a proposition was made to reduce the hours. Not very long ago men worked twelve hours a day. Then the day was reduced to ten hours, and no one will say that the same amount of work is not done in the ten hours as formerly was done in the twelve. The same result will follow a reduction to eight hours. Experience has proved that the longer day is not productive of more work. We have had some question about the working of the fair wage law. Well, I acknowledge that it has done a great deal of good for the labouring classes, but as regards the hours of labour, we have no body but ourselves to thank for their reduction, because what gain we have made has been achieved only after very hard struggling. I heard the hon. member for London say that he would favour a Bill which would apply generally.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is quite right.

Mr. VERVILLE. I heard the hon. gentleman say the same on the public platform.

Mr. BEATTIE. I introduced an eight hour Bill here in 1898.

Mr. VERVILLE. There would be no use in any one introducing such a measure in this House because it would be beyond our jurisdiction, and it was for that reason I have not brought in a Bill of that nature. The arguments which have been urged this afternoon against this Bill are exactly the same as were advanced in other countries on similar occasions. In 1847, in England, when the ten hour law was before the House, exactly the same arguments were used against it. In 1856 and 1857, when that question was brought up in Australia, we had the same arguments over again. The plea was always that if you shorten the hours of labour, you will reduce the sum of the work done. However, I am gratified to know that we have made a considerable step in advance, and if the government will promise that this measure will not be shelved, I am quite willing to refer it to a special committee. I am willing, if the Bill receives its second reading, to make a motion to have it referred to a special committee. We will then have affirmed the principle of the Bill, and it will be for the government to see that no obstacle is allowed to prevent the committee from getting through with its deliberations. I would like to have before that committee those men who are strongly opposed to any reduction in the number of hours in the labouring day while at the same time they are quite willing to reduce their own hours of labour to three or four. I would like to meet these men before the committee. I would like also to have some of the labour men come before that committee and express their views, and then let the committee compare notes, and I am sure we shall win because we are on the right side. If the Bill be given a second reading, its principle will then be adopted, and if the government will give a chance to the committee to get to work right away, we shall have their report before the session is over and be in a position to enact legislation which will materially improve the condition of the working class.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. VERVILLE. I desire to move the reference of the Bill to a special committee as suggested. I move:

That the said Bill be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. King, Macdonell (Toronto), Smith (Nanaimo), Staples, Prowse, Marshall and Verville.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). It seems to me that, before the House assents to the adoption of that motion, we should have some assurance from the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) that he expects the committee to make a favourable report on the Bill. Having passed the second reading and adopted the principle of the Bill, I think we are entitled to have a committee that is known to be favourable to the measure, and that the committee to whom it is referred should not be expected to say whether we shall adopt such a Bill or not, but to perfect the Bill, because, as has been stated by hon. members here to-night,

in its present shape the Bill is not workable. I think we are entitled to a declaration from the government as to what they expect from this committee, for, though the motion has been moved by the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) it is upon the government that the responsibility rests, and if the government do not know what to expect from that committee, I think it is their business to find out. We ought not to take this step in the dark.

I would like to say, while on my feet, that some hon. members have taken what seems to me a most extraordinary position as to why this matter is before us. The question is not one of pity for or sympathy with the employees of contractors who are working for the government. It impresses me rather in this way: This is supposed to be a government of the people; a very large proportion of the contributors to this government are the organized workingmen who believe in the eight hour day; these people simply come to their servants in this House and ask them to see to it that in the expenditure of their money on contracts carried on for the Dominion government, a provision shall be inserted that the principle which they hold so dear shall not be violated. I think that is a reasonable request, and that having passed the second reading of this Bill we should not entrust it to any committee unless we have some assurance as to the attitude of the committee towards the Bill.

Mr. KING. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) has made what seems to me a most extraordinary proposal. He suggests that I should give him an assurance how this committee will report. I fail to see what other meaning can be put upon his words than that he feels that members of this House who are selected as a committee are not prepared to report to this House honestly, straightforwardly and intelligently on the evidence that is brought before them.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I object to the hon. gentleman (Mr. King) putting any sinister interpretation on my remarks. I spoke very plainly, as I usually do, and without any meaning other than was plainly expressed in my words.

Mr. KING. The hon. member objects to my interpretation of his words, but he has only himself to blame for giving us words that are capable of such an interpretation. I cannot see how any member of the House could suggest that any one can tell this House, before the committee listens to any evidence with regard to a measure, how that committee is going to report. I think the position will be self-evident to every hon. member. I do not think there is any member of the House other than the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Taylor) himself who would think of asking for such an assurance.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). We have had the great privilege of listening to two addresses on this subject from the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), and at the close of the second address I think that every hon. member is as much in the dark as he was at the first of the debate as to what the policy of the government is in regard to this Bill. We may have learned a great deal about the principle of the eight hour day and about many features of the Bill, but I can state one thing that we have not learned in the course of the debate, and that is the policy of the government. If I understood the question and remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor), what he wanted from the Minister of Labour was a clear statement of the policy of the government with regard to this measure. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Ernest Roy) contends—and, in a measure, rightly contends—that when this House passes the second reading of the Bill, it adopts the principle of the Bill, and he further goes on to explain that the Minister of Labour has endorsed the principle of this Bill. Now if the principle of the Bill is something that can be taken as endorsed by the speech of the Minister of Labour, then I, for one am utterly at a loss to see any principle whatever in the Bill. Throughout the course of his address, the Minister of Labour expressed antagonism to the general principle and to the extended adoption of the principle of the eight hour day.

Mr. KING. Would the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) kindly give to the House any statement of mine from which he can draw such an inference.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. minister (Mr. King) state that he is in favour of the absolute, unequivocal adoption of the eight hour day throughout Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. minister state that he and his government are in favour of the absolute, unequivocal adoption of the eight hour day throughout the country?

Mr. KING. If any member of this House will introduce a measure which will make possible the eight hour day to the advantage of the working people of this country, a Bill which it will be within the jurisdiction of this House to pass——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KING——he will find this government ready to support any measure of that

kind. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the provincial legislatures have the power to enact laws in regard to the hours of labour generally.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister, I can see, was even less successful than he was before. The House will understand one thing, and that is the extreme capaciousness of his ifs in the answer he gave me. Now on various other grounds the Minister of Labour objected to this Bill. He objected to it because it would extend the principle of the doctrine of an eight hour day into fields into which it was never intended to move at all, it would extend the principle of an eight hour day into factories where it could not be universally adopted. The ingenuity of the minister was taxed to the extreme to find objections to this Bill, but all the while he was engaged in pious affirmations of what is known vaguely as the principle of the Bill. While the Minister of Labour succeeded, with the support of his followers behind him, in talking this Bill to that bourne, to that graveyard, from which few if any travellers return, he certainly succeeded in talking the principle of the Bill into a black and hopeless eternity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) as opposed to the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), that I am not impressed very much with the sincerity exhibited so far in this House by the Minister of Labour. It seems to me that, instead of living up to the expectations of this country in regard to sincerity, he has rather invaded the field of the Minister of Public Works, and will soon share with him the unenviable reputation of being the arch jollier of this generation. So far as I am concerned, and I think those on this side of the House will coincide with me, I would like another speech from the Minister of Labour, and I would like him definitely to answer the question put to him by the member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor), and let us know once and for all where the government stand on the question of whether they are prepared to adopt an eight hour day for labour on government works.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question? I do not think this amended motion is drawn in the way it should be.

Mr. VERVILLE. I wish it to read as follows:

That Bill (No. 21) be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Mackenzie King, Smith (Nanaimo), Macdonell, Prouse, Staples, Marshall and Miller, said committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to swear witnesses, to examine them under oath, and to report from time to time.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KING.

ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 22) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Before the second reading of the Bill is carried, I would like to point out exactly what it proposes to do. It is in two respects an entire reversal of what has been the practice under our Dominion Elections Act for several years. The first proposition of the Bill is to repeal three sections of the present law, which require the making of a deposit of $200 by every candidate. That, of course, is simply a question of policy, of expediency. For myself, I think the present law has worked well, and that it would be a great pity to change it. The requirement of a deposit of $200 was introduced into our Election Act some years ago to meet a difficulty which I am sure every one who has followed the history of elections in this country must have seen, either in his own constituency, or in other well known instances in different parts of the country. Continually men were being nominated who had no sort of chance of being elected, who frequently had some ulterior motive rather than any real intention of going to the polls, or any hope of being elected. Perhaps it was to prevent an election by acclamation; perhaps it was to embarrass, to keep at home, the candidate who was undoubtedly likely to be returned, but who, for some reason, it was thought had better not be free to go anywhere outside his own constituency. Now, I do not mean to say for a moment that the requirement of making a deposit of $200 will prevent that sort of thing, or put an end to it; but I do think it exercises a useful check, and that it would be a decidedly retrograde step to return to the old order of things, when any one who could get the necessary signatures to his nomination paper, could put the country to the expense of an election. An election is an expensive thing, not only to the candidate, as I fancy every one of us knows to his cost, but it is an expensive thing to the country; and in many cases, I think, if we had more elections by acclamation the parliament of Canada and the Dominion of Canada would be none the worse off. As I have said, men were, under the old condition of things, frequently nominated for some purpose of embarrassing the opposite candidate, or preventing an election by acclamation. All sorts of reasons for it existed. I am old enough to remember, what I have no doubt my hon. friend who introduced this Bill cannot remember, but I remember very well a distinguished gentleman in the city of Toronto, some 30 odd years ago, who, whenever there was

an election, a general election or a by-election anywhere in that section, managed to obtain a nomination for himself. He did not generally receive more than a dozen or 20 votes in the whole constituency, and it was a standing joke which nobody could understand. But I have heard that this gentleman had the fortune to have some wealthy relatives in the old country, and the nomination regularly at each election was an admirable excuse to elicit their sympathies and their financial aid. Now, while the necessity for a deposit of $200 may not prevent that sort of thing altogether, it certainly acts as a wholesome check, and I should be for my part entirely opposed to returning to the old order of things when there was no check.

Now the other proposition in this Bill —there are just the two—is again to reverse our present law absolutely and go the full length in the other direction. Under our present law, when the seventh day after nomination day would fall on a statutory holiday, the voting is to take place, not on that holiday, but on the following day. The present law negatively declares that the voting is not to take place on the holiday. This Bill proposes to repeal this provision of the present law and declare affirmatively that the day on which the poll is taken shall be a public holiday throughout Canada. My hon. friend does not explain on the face of this Bill what he would do in the case of a by-election. I do not know if he has thought of that. He does not say whether he would have the voting day a public holiday anywhere else than in the riding or not. But, upon principle, my idea is that the present condition of things is much better than the new condition which my hon. friend would bring about by this Bill. The reason for the present law, postponing the voting day until the day following if the seventh day would fall upon a general holiday, is, I think, very plain. It is in the interest of the preservation of peace and good order at an election. Every one knows that a holiday is very likely to lend itself to other purposes than those of peace and good order, and what necessity there is for the change, I cannot understand. It is an ancient principle, crystallized in the shape of a hymn that I used to be familiar with, that Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do, and I am well satisfied that if we had the voting day throughout the country a general holiday we should only have dozens and dozens of people upon the streets who otherwise would be at their work, and go a long way toward getting back to the old order of things when election day would be a day of riot, mischief making, noise and disturbance in every direction instead of an election being the peaceful, orderly business-like proceeding that it has come to be in Canada. With all respect I would say to my hon. friend that I think that both of these propositions would be mistakes and that this House ought not to give the Bill its second reading.

Mr. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I had better have spoken before the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) so as to explain my reasons for introducing this Bill. If I had done so I might possibly have made it unnecessary to go into the matter even at the comparatively short length that he did go into it. My idea in introducing this Bill is to keep in touch with what I believe to be the democratic spirit of the day. I will deal with the two amendments as they appear in the Bill and, firstly, with the question of the deposit, because the Minister of Jusctice has not quite correctly interpreted the effect of the Bill as I had intended it. In regard to the deposit, dealing with the matter historically, I find that the first consolidation and revision of the Election Act after confederation, as far as I have been able to ascertain, took place in the year 1874. On that occasion the question of the deposit by candidates was considered and the law then was that the candidates should deposit $50. The statute of 1874, chap. 7, sec. 19, provides that:

A sum of fifty dollars to be paid to the returning officer at the time the nomination paper shall be filed with him.

That continued to be the law until the next revision and consolidation of the Election Act which took place in 1882. On that occasion the matter was very much debated in the House of Commons and there were several propositions before the House. One was to keep the deposit at $50, another was to eliminate the deposit entirely, and a third was to raise the deposit to $200. On that occasion I find that the Hon. Edward Blake, whose opinion I quote for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, spoke as follows, as will be found at page 264 of the debates of the House of Commons, 1882:

But much may, on the other hand, be said against the proposition to increase that deposit to $200. I have never favoured, much, any deposit at all. I have always thought that we were trenching upon very dangerous ground when we proposed to create impediments in the way of a fair expression of opinion by the people at the polls by bringing forward candidates. . . . But, I must say that I feel personally hostile to the increase of the deposit. I think that we ought not to increase the difficulties in the way of a presentation of as many candidates as five and twenty electors choose to nominate for the consideration of the people at any election.

That was then the number required to sign the nomination paper.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) says that this measure is, in the whole, a measure in case of intending candidates. I do not think

so. I think that the provision of so substantial a deposit as $200 is a provision which will very often prevent contests when it would be hardly desirable that there should be contests. . . . I hope that if the Bill passes this House, the amount of the deposit will be reduced to the old figure.

Mr. GRAHAM. What was the amount of the deposit?

Mr. MACDONELL. It was $50 from 1874 to 1882. In 1882 it was raised by the Bill then presented to $200, and it has stood at that figure ever since. My desire is to make it unnecessary to have any deposit. Long since the property qualification has been removed. No progressive nation requires any property qualification and very few require a deposit at election time. The idea seems to be to remove all barriers as far as possible to entry to the House of Commons of whomsoever the people shall select irrespective of any money consideration. I think that is a fair deduction to take from the words of the Hon. Mr. Blake which I have just read. It seems to me that there should be no impediment placed across the floor of the House of Commons of a financial nature against any person whose nomination paper is signed by the required number of duly qualified electors. The deposit is not a very large matter, it is true, but it is the sum of $200. The Minister of Justice has referred to the danger of a multiplicity of candidates by making it easy for persons to run who are not seriously candidates, but who interject themselves into the campaign without any hope of success. Long since the province of Ontario has abolished any deposit in regard to provincial elections. There is no deposit necessary to be made in Ontario, and yet it has not been found that it has the tendency of increasing the number of candidates who present themselves at the polls. I think there is no greater number presenting themselves at the provincial elections than there is at Dominion elections. There is no occasion for such a thing, it is simply an ancient impediment to entry into parliament. The minister and I apparently cannot agree on the principle of the thing, but I do think I will have his concurrence in the statement that elections fairly won have been upset by some neglect of the mere technicalities surrounding the making of this deposit. I think that the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Thornton) after being duly elected to the House on one occasion would not be allowed to take his seat because the deposit was put up in the shape of a marked cheque instead of legal tender. So far as I have been able to find, I do not think any such financial restriction exists in any other country. A candidate in England is not required to put up a deposit.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Would the hon. gentleman give me any instance in which elections have been set aside in this country for irregularities in connection with the making of the deposit; I do not remember any.

Mr. MACDONELL. I mentioned the case of Durham.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I beg to say that that election was set aside for corrupt practices.

Mr. MACDONELL. No; the Minister of Justice must be referring to an election prior to that.

Mr. SPROULE. It was set aside because a marked cheque was put up for the deposit, instead of cash.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am referring to the election in which there was a question as to the return as between the present member for Durham and his opponent. That election went to trial at Cobourg and the election was voided and a new election ordered on account of a corrupt practice by an agent.

Mr. THORNTON. I beg to say that statement is not correct.

Mr. MACDONELL. I thought I was right.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is fair to the Minister of Justice to say that he says he knows whereof he speaks as he was in the case.

Mr. MACDONELL. There were two Durham cases, one was as the Minister of Justice points out, and one was as the hon. member for Durham has pointed out.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not know whether there is a misunderstanding between the hon. member and myself on the subject, but there was but one election, one voting; there were two petitions with respect to that election and the result of the trial of the two petitions which took place before the same two judges was as I have stated. I appeared as counsel at that time for the petitioner and sought to obtain a new election and a new election was ordered on the proving of a clear case of bribery by an agent. The question as to the regularity of the deposit was not considered by the learned judges and the case was not carried to an appeal but a new election was had.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to know something of the case referred to by the Minister of Justice. I say most emphatically there was not one word in the deliverance of the judges in connection with that case that said the judgment was voided on account of corrupt practices; not one sentence not a single word from beginning to end.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think that bears my statement out. There were two cases,

the Minister of Justice has referred to one, and I am referring to another.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us get it straightened out; would my hon. friend tell us what year it was and we will get the record.

Mr. THORNTON. In the general election of 1900 there were two candidates in the field, myself and my opponent Mr. Beith. I had a clear majority of 42 and the returning officer refused to declare me elected because my deposit was made by a marked cheque instead of in bills as required by law. West Durham was vacant for one whole session of this parliament because of the refusal of the returning officer to declare the candidate having the most votes elected. The question came up in this House time and again. It was declared by the Hon. David Mills (Minister of Justice) that it was the clear duty of the returning officer to declare the candidate having the most votes elected. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the statement on the floor of the House and so did every one else who had any authority to speak on the subject. West Durham was vacant one whole session of this House because the returning officer refused to declare the candidate having the most votes elected. The seat was declared vacant, not because of corrupt practices on the part of the candidate or any of its agents, because in the deliverance of the judges which I have in my possession, there is not one syllable that says that the seat was vacated because of corrupt practices on the part of the candidate or any of his agents, and the statement made by the Minister of Justice is incorrect.

Mr. SPROULE. And the law about the deposit was afterwards amended.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understood the hon. member from Durham stated that the decision of the judges contained nothing with reference to corrupt practices. I beg to say that is an entire mistake; the election was voided solely and only upon the ground that corrupt practices were proven.

Mr. THORNTON. I challenge the Minister of Justice to produce the deliverance of the judges on that occasion and if there is one syllable in the deliverance of the judges on that occasion to the effect that they vacated the seat on account of corrupt practices I will immediately vacate the seat I hold for Durham.

Mr. SPROULE. How could the seat be vacated on account of corrupt practices when the returning officer refused to return any one?

Mr. FIELDING. The records will show; there is evidently a misapprehension somewhere.

Mr. MACDONELL. No member was returned and there could be no unseating. The Minister of Justice must have another occasion in his mind altogether and that is the only way I can explain his lack of memory. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I can find no precedent in the laws of other countries for this deposit. The abolition of this deposit had been asked for by public bodies and by democratic bodies throughout this country. The Minister of Labour will no doubt bear me out that the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada have frequently asked for the removal of this impediment in the way of a free entry into this House of any man who chooses to be a candidate. It is for the members of this House to say whether or not there is to be a barrier placed at the door of the House of Commons to collect a toll of $200 before a man can be a candidate. Is it worth while; what is the reason for it? It is an ancient provision. Originally it went to the returning officer for the election expenses, and now if the candidate does not poll one-half as many votes as the successful candidate it goes to the revenues of the country. I do not think the revenues of the country should be supplemented from any such source as that. Now, with regard to the day of votation being a holiday I do not think the Minister of Justice did me justice or treated me with courtesy in the manner in which he referred to that feature of the Bill. My idea in bringing this amendment to the attention of the House is to prevent corruption and it has nothing to do with making election day a day of jollification.

This Bill does not provide for a holiday in cases of by-elections. It simply provides that the day set apart for a general election throughout Canada shall be a public holiday, which as we know, takes place only once in four or five years. I propose this amendment because I believe the present system, under which the polls are open only from nine to five, produces an immense amount of corruption. The hours of polling are so limited that the man who has the means of engaging vehicles and getting out the vote, gets it out. I believe there would be much less corruption if the whole day were a public holiday. What opportunity have the working people to record their vote between the hours of nine and five? They go to work at six, seven or eight o'clock at the latest, long before the polls are opened, and do not leave their work until after five, so that the only opportunity they have of voting is between twelve and one, and it is that hour that is taken advantage of by the candidate with money and vehicles at his disposal to bring the voters from factories and workshops to the polls. All other countries whose election laws I have been able to examine either make election day a holiday or hold

the election on Sunday. The latter is the case in some European countries. In France, in Germany, and I think in Belgium, the voting takes place on Sunday; in Denmark there is a half-holiday. In the United States 33 of the states make election day a public holiday. In Illinois the polls are open from 5.30 a.m. to 9 p.m. In England they are open, I think, until nine o'clock at night. In other countries they open as early as six or half past six in the morning. In these countries every man is given a chance to poll his vote, whereas in Canada, unless a man is prepared to leave his work and lose his pay for the time he is absent, he has no opportunity to vote unless he can do so at the noon hour; and we know that in large cities it is often impossible for a man to go to the polling place and get back to his work, besides eating his meal, in the hour. If the government object to making election day a holiday, I am willing that the Bill should be amended to provide that the polls shall open earlier in the morning, so as to give the working classes and the people generally a chance to vote; because there are a large number of people not belonging to what are ordinarily called working people, clerks and others, who find it difficult or impossible to leave their employment during the present polling hours. Then, there is sometimes a disposition on the part of certain employers of labour to prevent their employees voting unless they vote as they wish them to. There is a great deal of intimidation of this kind, and I think to make election day a holiday or to have the polls open earlier would afford all people a chance to vote on an independent basis. If it is too much to make the whole day a holiday, let the Bill be modified in some such way as I have suggested. There is nothing very revolutionary in this. The amendments I propose are along the line of giving the men on the street a fair chance with the capitalist and the large employer. I can do no more than bring these matters to the attention of the House. I have done it to the best of my ability consistent with brevity. I hope the Minister of Justice will reverse his decision with regard to these matters, just as I believe he will reverse his opinion when he refers to the record and finds that the hon. member for Durham is correct in what he has said.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. To justify the statement I made a few minutes ago with reference to the Durham election, the election trial in question took place, according to the certificate of the judges, on the 7th and 8th of June, 1901. There were two petitions, one by Charles Jonas Thornton claiming the seat and the other by Charles Burnham against Charles Jonas Thronton to set aside the election and have a new one ordered. The judgment, to be found on the second page of the journals of this House for 1902, states:

The said petition, by reason of certain preliminary objections and an appeal thereon to the Supreme Court of Canada, was never at issue until the 10th day of May, 1901, and was tried before us at the town of Cobourg on the 7th and 8th of June, 1901, whereupon having heard the evidence adduced, and the petitioner having abandoned his claim to have the said Robert Beith declared to have been elected, we determined and adjudged that Wm. L. Gerrie, an agent of the said respondent, Charles Jonas Thornton, at the said election had been guilty of corrupt practices at the said election, but without the knowledge or consent of the said Charles Jonas Thornton; whereupon the said Charles Jonas Thornton, abandoned his claim to be declared to have been elected.

Mr. THORNTON. I made the statement a moment ago, with reference to the deliverance of the judges in that case, Judges Falconbridge and Street, that they did not say that the seat was vacated because of corrupt practices on the part of myself who was a candidate in that election. I repeat that statement, and I will produce to this House, inside of the next week, the deliverance of the judges as certified to by the official stenographer of the court. If my statement be incorrect, I will do what I said I would a few moments ago—vacate my seat, on condition that if it is correct, then the Minister of Justice will vacate his seat.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. In the Durham election, the hon. member, (Mr. Thornton) received the majority of votes legally cast. It was found out that his agent, Robert Loscombe, had placed in a marked cheque instead of the cash as required by law, and on that technicality, Mr. Thornton was denied the right to take the seat which was his by a majority of the votes cast. These are the facts.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I beg to move that the Bill be not read now the second time, but this day six months.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (Montreal St. Anne's). I would like to detain the House just a few minutes to place before it some considerations, which, I think, if the hon. gentlemen will give them thought, will lead them to conclude that this Bill deserves much more serious consideration than has been given it within the last few minutes. It seems to me that the reasons advanced by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) in support of his proposition, ought in themselves to carry conviction; but there are also perhaps larger and wider considerations which might be invoked in its favour.

It seems to me that the two propositions in this Bill deserve the support of this House, not perhaps so much because of what they will themselves effect, if carried

into law, as because they will serve as beginning of improvements to our election system and tend to remove what constitutes in the public mind a very false impression of what really an election should be. There can be no doubt that there is an impression in the public mind that an election is an operation whereby two or more gentlemen, anxious to become members of this House, throw themselves into a struggle in which they are prepared to expend their money, their efforts, their eloquence and arguments for the purpose of attaining positions for themselves. That is an impression entirely the reverse of the conception of what an election ought to be, namely, an operation by which the people calmly and quietly select the men who, in their judgment, are best qualified to represent them and to legislate to the best advantage of this country. That false conception is in a measure due to the very provisions of the law this Bill seeks to amend. What is this requirement of a deposit of $200 but the announcement that an election to this House is something which must cost money to the candidate or which must at all events expose him to the loss of money. In other words, that no man, who is not sufficiently anxious to get into this House, to spend $200 or, at the very least, to be willing to bet $200 that he can get half as many votes as the candidate opposed to him, can under any circumstances be entitled to represent any constituency in this country, and that no body of electors, no matter how anxious they may be that a certain individual should be their representative, shall be entitled to vote for him unless he is sufficiently anxious or has sufficient confidence in the result to bet $200, or unless his electors are sufficiently confident of his election to make themselves the bet of $200. Unless the condition be fulfilled, they shall be debarred from voting for the man of their choice. This put the candidate in a position which, it seems to me, no candidate ever should occupy, of seeking favour at the hands of his electors, seeking something for himself that he is willing to pay or risk his money for; whereas the real fact is, and, it seems to me, ought to be so understood, that the man who comes forward consents to place his services at the disposition of his fellow-citizens and fellow countrymen and does not seek at their hands something for himself. I am compelled to admit that the impression is widespread that every man who is willing to serve his fellow-citizens as a member of this House is out seeking for the position and wanting it for himself. Any thing that can be done to remove that impression, I think, might well be done. And I believe the abolition of this deposit of $200 required of the candidate would be, at all events, a help in doing away with that very false and very erroneous impression.

It is said that the purpose of this deposit is to prevent people who have no possible chance of being elected from presenting themselves and putting the constituency to the trouble and turmoil and the country to the expense of an election, as well as putting the opposing party to such expense as he may incur. But may I humbly suggest that there may be a better method found to protect the country and the constituency against these consequences than this requirement of a deposit of $200. The law now says to every qualified person: If you are anxious enough to have a chance of becoming a member of parliament to put up $200, go ahead and put the constituency and country to the expense and the constituency to the turmoil and agitation of an election contest. In other words, the measure of a man's right to present himself in desperate circumstances is whether his anxiety to get into parliament is great enough to make him risk $200. I would like to suggest that a fairer test, and as effectual a check, would be an increase in the number of persons required to nominate a man for the position of member of this House. It is a very rational proposition that a man should not be entitled to provoke an election where there is a manifest, or, at all events, a strongly presumable, impossibility of his succeeding or even of coming as near to success as polling half the votes of his opponent. But is it a reasonable way to decide whether there is such an impossibility to say: 'If you are willing to risk $200 on it, you may come forward? This makes the right to come forward, as I say, depend upon the anxiety of the individual to have the chance to get in. Why not make the permissibility of a man coming forward and provoking an election contest depend upon whether or not he can produce reasonable evidence of a desire on the part of some considerable portion of the electors that he should be elected? I am not suggesting that we should require a majority or anything approaching a majority. But surely, in a constituency of eight or ten thousand electors, it would be a more reasonable thing to say that a man should not come forward as a candidate unless he can show at least 100, or 150, or 200 electors in that division desiring him to come forward, than to say that he can come forward if he has $200 to bet on the chance of his being elected. This would prove as effective a check to ill-advised candidature, if I may use the word. Surely, the man who will come forward with his nomination signed by, let us say, one per cent of the electors, would be in a better position to say he had reasonable ground for provoking a contest than the man who has no

other reason to advance than that he is willing to bet $200 that he will get at least half as many votes as his opponent. I do not say that it is not desirable to prevent unnecessary contests, but here is a means of preventing unnecessary contests ready to the hand of legislators if they will adopt such a provision as I suggest. It would have another advantage; it would go further in carrying home to the minds of the electors that an election was not an effort of a man to get himself elected, and involving at the very outset, at the behest of the law, his putting up money for the opportunity. Is not the country in a peculiar position in reproaching an individual elector who expects something from the candidate in return for helping him to get elected, when itself says that a man shall not be a candidate unless he takes the chances of paying the country $200? It seems to me the first provision of this Bill merits the most serious consideration, and for my part I have no hesitation in saying that it is a measure, which, in my judgment, would be a distinct improvement on the law as it stands. I think I might fairly call—did I desire to do so—for the support of the hon. member (Mr. Miller) who the other day introduced a Bill for the prohibition of race-track gambling. Why here is an election Act that requires that every candidate should be a gambler. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) the other day gave us a number of instances of acts that amounted to gambling. Can you call it anything else than a bet when a candidate is called upon to put down $200 on the condition that if he gets half as many votes as his opponent he shall receive back his money, but shall forfeit it otherwise? What is the operation but a bet on the part of the candidate that he will get half as many votes as his adversary, the country taking the dignified position of standing up and saying, 'I bet you, you can't do it.'

Now with regard to the second proposition, I think it can be supported by reasons resting on the same basis. The reason we have heard urged against it is the danger that if you create a public holiday the people may use it for purposes other than that which was intended, and may indulge in disorderly practices, upon the principle that Satan finds mischief for idle hands to do. Now that would be rather a dangerous principle to carry to its logical conclusion. What are we going to do with the Sabbath day? What are we going to do with all our statutory holidays? Is there any reason to fear that on this particular holiday Satan will be particularly busy? I would not like to suppose that the experience of the Minister of Justice in elections leads him to the conclusion that it is a day when Satan gets in his finest work. But it seems to me that to say that you do not dare to give the people of this country a public holiday on election day because they would abuse it, is a very weak reason in face of the positive reasons in support of this Bill advanced by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). Now I would like to add one other reason, and it is based on the same general principle which leads me to support the first proposition of this Bill, and that is that the declaration of a public statutory holiday by the governing power would be a measure notifying the whole people that their country looks to them to give one day to the performance of what is the most important civic duty that each one of us owes to his country. Surely, if for nothing else than to bring home to the people their duty in an election, it would be worth while that this government should say to them: We expect you to give that day to the performance of the duty of selecting a man to represent you; you shall not go about your ordinary avocations, you shall not treat your private business as of greater importance than your public duty, you shall not wait until somebody sends a wagon after you, until half a dozen people run after you, and bring you up in state to the polls. No, the election of a member to represent you is a duty you owe to your country, and you shall give this one day to the performance of that duty. It seems to me that such a provision would remove one of the disadvantages under which working men frequently suffer, as has been eloquently pointed out by my hon. friend from South Toronto, and it would furthermore remove an excuse which men frequently offer for abstaining from the performance of that duty. We all know the excuses which men give for refusing to go to the polls. I hardly think it will be denied that, except under very exceptional circumstances, such men are failing to perform a duty which they owe to their country. I would take away from that class of men all excuse, such as their business interest, the necessity of pursuing their daily avocations. This proposition would place those men in a position where they would be forcibly made to understand that they must give up a day to this work, it would deprive them of all excuse of refusing to do their duty by going to the polls. Sir, I think these two propositions, if carried into law, will help the attainment of a far-reaching result, namely, the result of bringing home to the people of this country the conviction that casting a vote in an election is a duty they owe to the country, and of removing the widespread belief that an election is but an opportunity extended to certain persons of aggrandizing themselves by spending their money in deposits or otherwise, to induce people to go and vote. It is because I believe those two propositions carried into law would be steps

in the direction of producing that result, that I shall vote against the amendment, and in favour of the measure proposed by my hon. friend from South Toronto.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). I believe it would be very much to the interest of this country that the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) should be passed into law. I do not propose to speak at length in its favour, inasmuch as my hon. friend from South Toronto and my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Doherty) have very ably presented strong considerations which should induce this House to pass the Bill. I cannot, however, refrain from saying that I believe a refusal on the part of this House to abolish the deposit is really a restraint on the discussion of public issues at elections. There are in every country a great many matters of public interest which, in the first instance, have not many converts; there are many men who wish to advance ideas with which at the moment the general public do not agree. There is no logical reason, in my judgment, why such men, if they have a sufficiently signed petition, should not be permitted to place their names before the public, and to address the public on such issues as they believe of national importance. I believe, therefore, it is in the public interest there should be the fullest opportunity given to men who receive a reasonably signed nomination of expressing their views, and receiving the votes of their fellow-citizens. I do not see that the public are in any way injured. I do not see how any one can reasonably oppose the proposition. I would think that hon. gentlemen opposite would have been moved to a more favourable consideration of this measure when they were reminded that in the province of Ontario they had placed such a law on the statute-book of that province, and when moreover they remember the views of their former distinguished leader, the Hon. Edward Blake. With reference to the second part of the Bill, it seems to me that the argument, if you can call it such, of the Minister of Justice is an insult to the intelligence of this House. To suggest that a public holiday should not be given for the performance of the most important duty that the people have to perform every five years, namely, the election of members of the House of Commons, to suggest that a public holiday should not be given because it might end in riot and drunkenness, is, I affirm, an insult to the intelligence of the people of this country. That might have applied in the old days of open voting, when bars were in full swing, and barrels of beer were all around. But people have advanced during the last forty years, both in temperance and in intelligence. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Doherty) that every opportunity should be given on this particular day for the expression of public opinion, and for every citizen to take part in a national election. We are talking about compulsory voting in this country. We have been making complaints that people do not go to the polls. Surely it would be in the national interest to give the public every opportunity of going to the polls before we try such legislation as compulsory voting. Is not this a measure in the right direction? Is it not a measure in the interest of the people of Canada? It is easy enough for the rich man to go and vote, it is easy enough for a great many members of the community to go and vote, but in the great cities and in the northern districts it is a difficult and expensive matter for poor people and workingmen to go to the polls. I can only say that I believe that if the Bill of my hon. friend from South Toronto became law, it would tend to decent elections, it would tend to greater interest in the elections, and I think the very fact that one day in five years was set aside as a national holiday for the purpose of electing members to this House would be of great public importance and of great advantage to the people of Canada and to Canada itself.

Mr. KING. I rise to ask a question of the hon. member who has introduced this Bill. The Bill proposes that election day should be on a public holiday. Is it intended that employers of labour shall be required to pay their men their wages?

Mr. MACDONELL. My idea would be to declare it a public holiday the same as any other holiday allowing the people to vote and stand by whatever arrangements may be made according to the laws of the different provinces.

Mr. KING. My hon. friend gives no guarantee that wages will be paid on that day?

Mr. BRISTOL. Are wages paid on Labour Day or on a government holiday?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MACDONELL. Workmen would certainly get paid the same as they are paid for Labour Day or Dominion Day or any other public holiday.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The only observations I have to make are in regard to the controversy that took place in the House a few moments ago between the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Thornton). I have made it my business, since that controversy took place, to look up the records and I shall endeavour to state what the facts are simply from the records and absolutely impartially. An election took place in 1900 in West Durham in which the hon.

member for Durham received the larger number of votes. But he was not declared elected by the returning officer on account of the reason which he stated to the House.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker. May I ask if this question is in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a question of relevancy, but if the House is willing that the debate should go on I shall not rule it out of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite recognize that it is scarcely relevant but I thought the House would desire to see the matter cleared up. The returning officer, having refused to declare my hon. friend from Durham elected, he entered an action in the High Court of Justice asking for a mandamus compelling the returning officer to declare him elected. That action is styled Charles Jonas Thornton vs. Thomas Bingham, the returning officer, and the report of the judgment is given at page 3, Votes and Proceedings, 1902. The judgment is given by Mr. Justices Falconbridge and Street. The petition of the hon. member for Durham was dismissed by these justices and they decided that he could not compel the returning officer to have him declared elected by reason of the fact that he had not put up his deposit. No mention whatever is made in the judgment of corrupt practices. Another action was also entered in the courts of justice and I think that possibly my hon. friend from West Durham has had the two confused. Another action was entered by one Charles Burnham, who evidently was a voter, against Charles Jonas Thornton and Thomas Bingham. That action was entered asking that Mr. Thornton's opponent, Mr. Beith, be declared elected on the ground that Mr. Thornton was not legally a candidate, he having put up a marked cheque in place of money with his nomination papers. The petition asked for a mandamus to compel the returning officer to declare Mr. Thornton's opponent elected on this ground. The petitioner went further, however, and alleged the alternative ground, that, if the judges found that Mr. Thornton's nomination papers were in order, his election should be declared void for corrupt practices. The judgment is given at pages 2, Votes and Proceedings, 1902, and in that judgment it was stated that there was no election:

> And we further report that at the said election neither the said Charles Jonas Thornton nor the said Robert Beith was returned as elected, and that the said election was and is void.

But, in the course of the judgment, and this is evidently what the Minister of Justice referred to, corrupt practice was said to have been proved on the part of one W. L. Gerrie but without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Thornton. That election was not declared void on account of corrupt practices, so that I think the Minister of Justice will have to concede that he was wrong in that regard. The corrupt practices are referred to in the judgment as having been committed by one Gerrie, agent of Mr. Thornton, without the latter knowledge or consent. They simply say 'whereupon the said Charles Jonas Thornton abandoned his claim to be declared to have been elected' and then they add that on account of no one having been returned elected the election was null and void. I have stated it as clearly and as fairly as I could.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I see no reasonable objection to this Bill and it seems to me that there is very much to commend it to the judgment of the House and the country as well. In the first place it has been asked for by very respectable classes of the community. The patrons of industry, representing the great agricultural class, have passed resolutions more than once asking the government to make this amendment to do away with any deposit by a candidate when he is running for election. I think that their views ought to be entitled to some consideration. Have the government given us any strong grounds in favour of putting up a deposit of $200 or is there any strong justification why it should be done? But, in addition to the patrons of industry, I notice that the labour unions all over the country have also passed resolutions favouring the abolition of the $200 deposit in elections. Surely the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) can hardly say that it is defensible to give these important elements a slap in the face by moving the six months hoist. It is not very courteous to them to say the least. But, he can reckon with them. It is not my funeral, it is his own and I am quite willing to leave the matter with him. The minister, the other night, gave us a splendid address on gambling and betting. What is the situation here? The hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) made an allusion which was very fair, but if I were to elaborate it a little more I would say that the government become the bookmaker in this respect, and, therefore, are gamblers on a race, the only difference being that this is a human race instead of a horse race. The government, through the Minister of Justice, say: We will bet you $200 that you cannot get half the vote that the successful candidate gets and if you believe that you can and put up the money the government act as the book-maker and stakeholder. The Minister of Justice tells us that if he had the power he would do away with all gambling, but here is evidence that he does not practise what he preaches. I always thought there was another argument in favour of the proposal

to make election day a public holiday and that is that it would result in minimizing the possibility of purchasing votes. The poor man does not want to leave his business on voting day, in the first place because he may offend his employer and in the second place if he leaves his work he will be losing a portion or the whole of his day's wage. It is a very strong temptation to induce that man to take compensation for the time he has lost in going to the polls, which of course is corruption. If you had a public holiday on votation day this temptation would be done away with and at the same time you would give the labouring men of this country an opportunity to exercise their franchise without any personal loss to them. There is a good deal in the argument of my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Doherty) that if election day were a public holiday the citizens of Canada would be likely to appreciate the importance of what they are doing on that day and enter into the election of their representative with more vim and more enthusiasm.

Mr. PROULX. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) think that if you made election day a public holiday a great many people would be disposed to travel on that day instead of staying at home to vote? If you adopt such legislation as that you would have to incorporate with it the principle of compulsory voting.

Mr. SPROULE. There are a great many people who favour compulsory voting, and one of the strongest arguments against it always has been that it would compel a man to lose his day's wage to go to vote.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). I wish to protest against the evident desire of the Minister of Justice to give this Bill the six months hoist. We had before us a Bill at an earlier stage of this day's sitting regarding the eight hour day, which gentlemen on the other side professed to favour in principle, but the details of which they did not agree with, and so the government referred that Bill to a select committee for the purpose of selecting its best features and submitting them for the opinion of the House. Now, there is a good principle in the Bill we are now discussing and why should the government propose to murder it by giving it the six months hoist. There may be details in the Bill which we cannot assent to, but there are certainly good principles in it and why the other Bill should be sent to a special committee and this Bill knifed by the six months hoist, is something that I do not see the logic of. I must confess that my mind is open with regard to the question of the deposit, and I think there is a great deal to be said for and against it, but it does seem to me that the proposal to abolish it deserves more consideration than a cold six months hoist. Then, with regard to the principle that on election day there should be a holiday to give every voter a reasonable opportunity to exercise his franchise, I do not think any man can say that principle is not worthy of acceptance. In the province of British Columbia we keep the polls open until seven o'clock at night in order to give every man who is employed in business or in the mills or in the mines a fair opportunity to exercise his franchise. As was pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) what is the good of our boasting as we do about the sacred right of the franchise and the triumph of democracy, when we do not really try to make it sacred by emphasizing the vital importance to every man of the step he is about to take when he casts his vote. We talk about a holiday, in every truth it would be a holy day, if we could impress upon the mind of every voter the great national importance of electing men who would legislate for the welfare of the country. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has stated that he was willing to have his Bill amended in its details so long as the principle incorporated in it were adopted by parliament, and in view of that I shall be glad to record my vote against the proposal of the Minister of Justice to give this Bill the six months hoist.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). One or two hon. gentlemen seem to think that when we follow the well established rule of the House in moving that a Bill be read six months hence, it is something in the way of an insult to somebody. Why should it be regarded as an insult to any body if the House follows an old established rule in this respect?

Mr. BRISTOL. What I said was that the reasons given by the Minister of Justice were an insult to the intelligence of the people of the country, and I repeat it, because the reason given by the Minister of Justice against having election day a public holiday was that it would result in riot and drink. If the government wishes to shelve the consideration of this measure by moving the six months hoist I do not consider that would be an insult to any body and I did not say it was.

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing easier than to answer an argument of your opponent by saying it is an insult to the intelligence of the House. But I never found there was much argument in a statement of that character and I do find that those who use it are generally those who are not noted for advancing a sensible argument. I have listened with pleasure as I always do to the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) who gave us a moderate, and from his point of view, a well reasoned speech

on this subject. With all that he said as to the desirability of establishing a higher conception of the relations between the candidate and the electorate I am most heartily in sympathy. It is a misfortune that at times many of the electors fail to realize what is the true position of the candidate and that the candidate is treated as one who has some personal gain to serve. If I thought there was anything in this Bill to bring about that higher and better conception in the mind of the electorate of the position of a public man, I should most heartily give it my approval, but I have not been able to see that my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) made his point good with reference to that particular phase of the question. One hon. gentleman has stated that the principle of this Bill is all right and that the details can be fixed up in committee. There are just two principles in this Bill and it so happens that both of them are regarded as objectionable by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side. The first principle is the abolition of the deposit, and you could not fix that up in committee. It is a question of whether or not it is right or wrong to have a deposit. I am afraid I am growing a little Conservative. I am afraid I am beginning to have more regard for the thing that is. I said the other day that there was a time when I used to think there were a thousand and one things which should not be, but as I grow older I am beginning to believe there is a reason for the thing that is established and if we look for that reason closely we are sure to find it. I have no doubt that the men of former days who in this parliament pronounced in favour of the principle of a deposit—not an extravagant deposit—were actuated by the highest sense of propriety and I am inclined to think, after the discussion that has taken place to-day, that their reasons were good then and are good now. It has been said by some that the $200 deposit is a kind of a penalty, but that is not the right way to look at it. It is not a penalty. If a man can get but a very moderate proportion of the votes of the electorate, the $200 is paid back to him, and that as a rule happens. There are but few cases, after all, in which a man loses his deposit. That there should be something to prevent frivolous elections is surely a principle that members on both sides will accept. It is a question of method. The hon. member for St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty) suggests as a substitute that we should require a requisition signed by a small number of voters, say 150 or 200, on the part of a candidate. I would ask my hon. friend to think a little further over that. Take a great constituency like that which he represents; what are 200 votes in proportion to the total electors? And if it turned out that a candidate did not receive any more votes than the 150 or 200 on the requisition, is it reasonable that that great constituency should be put to the trouble and worry and expense of an election merely to gratify the vanity of a man who, it is perfectly clear, has no considerable following in the community? If he has any considerable following, he will have no difficulty in getting the $200. I doubt if there has ever been a case of a bona fide candidate representing any considerable interest in a constituency who failed to get the $200; and in a very few cases in which a man has lost his deposit, I think hon. gentlemen, if they look at each individual case, will say that he was a foolish man to run, that he did not represent any great interest or sentiment, and that there was no need of his butting in and putting the community to the expense and trouble of an election. So I think the $200 deposit is good, and I do not think the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. Anne put so moderately and argued so forcibly, would quite meet the case. Then with regard to the proposal of a holiday on election day, the Minister of Justice ventured to suggest that it might possibly be abused. My hon. friend from Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol) says that is an insult to somebody, and another hon. member says, what about the Sabbath—should it not be a holiday for fear it would be abused? Let us recognize the fact that the average elector is a bit different on election day from what he is on the Sabbath day. The Sabbath does not as a rule excite the average man; but we all know that in the field of party strife a considerable proportion of the electors are stirred up and excited on election day. So I think there is reason for regarding the Sabbath as not a holiday of the same kind. Then, there is the other view, that there are a great many people who do not take the keenest interest in politics, but who love a holiday, and if you gave them a holiday, they would go out of town instead of staying to vote. The hon. member for East Grey says that under the present arrangement a man cannot get away to vote, because if he went he would lose one or two hours. If he cannot afford to take two hours to vote, how could he afford to take a whole holiday? It is not reasonably conceivable that the average employer is going to pay his workmen on that day when they are absent.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they not do it on Labour Day?

Mr. FIELDING. There may be some generous, large-hearted men who do it, but they are not bound to do it, and I do not think the average employer does it. So I think the result would be that the average workman would lose his day's pay and

would have no substantial advantage in return. The hon. member for South Toronto, in his argument, introduced a new feature and one that would commend itself, I think, to members on both sides. He went beyond this Bill and said that the hours of voting were insufficient. If my hon. friend can show that the workingmen of the country are for that reason denied the opportunity of voting, let him introduce a Bill on that subject, and I hope it will find favour in the House.

Mr. MACDONELL. Then, why not let this Bill go to the committee, and there introduce an amendment lengthening the hours of polling instead of making the day a holiday?

Mr. FIELDING. Because this Bill has no relation to the hours of polling. It deals with a holiday, but does not propose to change the hours of polling.

Mr. MACDONELL. That portion of the Bill deals with the opportunity of voting. I ask that a day be set apart as a general holiday for that purpose. If that is not in accord with the views of the government, let the opportunity of voting be given by extending the hours of polling.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not quite see the connection between the two. The holiday is one question, the hours of voting another question, and the deposit another question. The Bill deals with the deposit and the holiday, but it does not touch the question of the hours of voting. I say that if it be found by experience, especially in our larger cities, that the present hours of voting are insufficient, and my hon. friend can show that there is need of some further extension of the time, I for one will be in hearty sympathy with that; and in opposing the Bill in its present form, I would not be understood as being opposed to that part of his speech.

Mr. CROSBY. This Bill is one in which I am interested, but it does not seem to be well understood. The Minister of Finance says we need not have very much sympathy for the man who loses his deposit. We had a case in the county of Cumberland only a few weeks ago, where the Liberals and Conservatives each nominated a candidate and the labour party nominated a candidate. This man polled 1,300 votes, a sufficient number to elect him in many constituencies, but he lost his deposit. Will the Finance Minister say that he should have lost his deposit, after having been solicited to run by a fair number of electors, and having contested a fair and honest election?

Again speaking of a holiday for the purpose of permitting workingmen to poll their votes, there are lots of men who have other men in their employ, and who may be influenced by the political leanings to let a certain portion of them vote and hold others back. But if the election day were declared a public holiday—and as there is only a general election once in four years nobody could be hurt—every man would have an equal chance to poll his vote. All the workingmen are asking for this, and there is no need for our standing up to tell them they do not know what they want. They want to be in a position, when the day comes, to poll their votes independent of their employers. We know, as a general thing, that men who are employing labour to a large extent, will try and influence the votes of their employees; and if they cannot get them to vote as they please, they will keep them at work so as to prevent them from voting at all

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I have a good deal of sympathy with my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) because I had something to do with getting a measure through in the Toronto legislature to give workingmen full opportunity to vote. I am free to admit that in my county I have never found the large employers of labour objecting in the slightest to a man going to cast his ballot. In the manufacturing establishments in the town of Brockville—and there are several large ones—not one man in the last twenty years was ever prevented from voting, no matter what his politics or the politics of his employers. The time has gone by when employers dare interfere in that way and they do not do it, so that I think we are raising a bugaboo when we speak of employers not giving their men time to vote. I have always opposed the principle of a holiday on polling day. We know that in elections there are people who sometimes induce men to get away from a constituency; and if they have a holiday they will be the more easily induced to leave the night before and not return in time to vote. Whereas, if working for their employers, they will not want to lose any time and will hesitate before going away. There is another reason. We close the hotels on polling day for a very good reason, but is it fair to say to all men in business, no matter what kind of business, that they must close because there is an election on. Is it fair to say that on polling day all business must stop in the constituency? Is it fair to proclaim the election day a public holiday and enable the employees to go out and close up the business establishments, no matter what the rush may be? What my hon. friend wants is that every man shall have time to poll his vote, and I think that can be got in a much less drastic way. Let me read the Ontario Act in that respect. I must admit that I am not sure to what

extent this House might have jurisdiction to say to an employer: You must let your employee off certain hours in the day. We could proclaim a general holiday perhaps, but I am not sure that we have jurisdiction to interfere in a contract between employers and employees, but the provincial government surely has. Let me read the Act now in force in the province of Ontario, which I submit works well and accomplishes all my hon. friend from South Toronto desires in the way of giving the men opportunity to vote:

On the day of the polling the voting shall commence at nine o'clock in the forenoon, and shall finish at five in the afternoon of the same day, and the votes shall be given by ballot.

A voter entitled to vote within a city or town shall, on the day of polling, for the purpose of voting, be entitled to absent himself from any service or employment in which he is then engaged or employed, from the hour of noon in the day time to the hour of two of the clock next thereafter, and a voter shall not, because of his so absenting himself, be liable to any penalty, or suffer or incur any reduction from the wages or compensation to which, but for his absence, he would have been entitled; provided that if so required by the person in whose service or employment the voter is so engaged or employed, the voter so absenting himself shall, at some other time during the same or the following week, employ himself in and about such service or employment for one hour or more than the hours of the usual and ordinary day's work or service otherwise required to be performed by him.

This protects the employer and the employee as well, and the workingmen of Ontario have accepted it as a fair arrangement. If my hon. friend will introduce a Bill along these lines, I would endeavour to assist him, so far as the principle is concerned, in putting the measure through the House.

As to the $200 deposit, I adhere to the older custom and law on the statute book, that there should be some substantial deposit before a man places himself in the hands of the public asking for their support. For example, take a seat that becomes vacant, perhaps in this House, through some extraordinary reason. Let me call your attention to one seat which was vacated a few years ago because the hon. gentleman, and he is a most hon. gentleman—I refer to the then member for Hastings (Mr. Corby)—because it was found in some committee that his firm had a contract with the government without his knowledge. On the fact becoming known to him he immediately resigned his seat in a most honourable manner. It would be easy, in such a case, for some mischievous person to put that riding to the whole expense of an election if he were not called on to make a deposit. On the other hand, the deposit does not debar any responsible man from running. Let us take the other view. Hon. gentlemen who are in municipal politics, in which every one can run, will agree that they know of instances where men have been put up to run merely for fun. Men have signed petitions asking men to run who did not vote for them, but simply wanted them to run to annoy some one else. The hon. member for St. Anne thinks that a large number of signatures would meet the case, but can he not recall to mind instances where men have been asked by petition to run even for parliament, and the same men have signed both petitions merely as a friendly act?

Mr. SPROULE. There is no deposit in Ontario politics, were there are more candidates in the local elections in some constituencies than in the Dominion elections, where a deposit of $200 is required?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not prepared to say that there are. Still that would be no reason why we should remove what we consider a safeguard for this House.

Mr. SPROULE. But it would be an example showing that the hon. minister's argument does not hold good in practice.

Mr. GRAHAM. It might be to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) but it is not to me. I say again, the law has worked no hardship to any person. I do not believe there is any man in Canada who ought to run for parliament, whom the people of Canada wish to see run for parliament, who has been debarred from running on account of the deposit. I see many reasons why we should retain this provision of the law.

Now, a word on another line. I do not think that hon. members ought to feel aggrieved because a portion of the House declares that it does not approve the Bill and cannot conscientiously vote for it. This is a world in which we have our differences. In my experience, before coming to this House, I have withdrawn a Bill time after time though I had my heart set on it, because the leader of the government said: You cannot put it through. And I have pressed other Bills and had them defeated. But I did not think I had any grievance merely because the majority did not agree with me on the measures I proposed. In conclusion, let me say that if my hon. friend will introduce a measure to give the workingmen a longer time at noon to vote, especially in the large centres, I shall be heartily in accord with it. But I cannot support this measure, for I have opposed the holiday suggestion in the Ontario legislature for reasons that seem to me good. And I think my reasons are good against doing away with the deposit.

Mr. GEO. GORDON (Nipissing). I am surprised at the attitude of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) on this Bill. For, though I was not here at the time, I understand that he fathered an Act which would lead to the conclusion that he was very much impressed with the requirements of Northern Ontario. The provisions of this Act are admirably adapted to the requirements of Northern Ontario, and I do not see why the hon. minister should not try to have it put through. In the district of Nipissing, as the hon. Minister of Justice well knows, there are a great many camps in which men are working miles away from a polling booth. And I am told that you would not have had the pleasure of listening to me here to-night had it not been that in the last election certain parties held back men from going to the polls to vote. I think the Minister of Justice should allow a chance to be given to New Ontario to send a supporter of his here after the next election. I am not saying that that is the case, but I am told that it is so. If we give a holiday to the electors of Northern Ontario on election day, the vote will be increased by probably from 1,000 to 2,000 men being able to get out to the polls who are not able to get out under present circumstances. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated that if one or two hours longer were required for the purpose of enabling men to turn out and vote, he would be in favour of such a proposition. But I would point out that in the case I refer to, one or two hours would not be of much use; you would require to have the whole day. With regard to the abolition of the deposit, I may say that I am in favour of that also, because it would meet the requirements of New Ontario, as most of us up there find it difficult to get the $200 to put up. We have many intelligent workingmen who would likely enter into the race, and, as I always like to see a free-for-all race, I would like to see all given an opportunity to enter. And, if you will abolish the deposit next time, you will see a different kind of race from those we have ever had.

Mr. WM. THOBURN (North Lanark). I have been wonderfully impressed by the remarks of hon. members on both sides. But I have to acknowledge that I am not convinced by the arguments made by most of the hon. members on this side in reference to the Bill. The case was very clearly put by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in relation to municipal elections. I have had a good deal of experience in municipal elections, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the law were such that candidates in such elections had to put up a deposit, we should have better councils, not only in the province of Ontario but in the whole Dominion, than we have to-day. I have known many cases of men being put up, as the Minister of Railways says, just for fun, and put up so often that the best men in the municipalities would not allow themselves to be offered in opposition to such men in the municipal elections. For that reason, I perfectly agree that the deposit should be put up by candidates in parliamentary elections. In fact, when the thing was mentioned here to-night, I said that instead of abolishing the deposit, I would be in favour of increasing it.

Now, as to the public holiday: it is just a question in my mind whether the great working classes of this country would be in favour of such a Bill, for it means that the working class must lose a day's wages. According to my experience, a great majority would be in favour of earning a day's wages rather than make it a public holiday. I have heard it stated here tonight that the Trades and Labour Council demanded that election day should be made a holiday. I am not aware of it. In the town in which I have the honour to live, I have never heard such a thing as the men wanting election day declared a public holiday.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Thoburn) misunderstood me. I said that they passed resolutions in favour of doing away with the deposit of $200—both the labour unions and the patrons of industry.

Mr. THOBURN. I think some hon. member said that.

Mr. MACDONELL. Let me point out to the hon. member that at an interview held with the government on the 12th day of January, 1909, at Ottawa, by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, represented by their duly accredited officers, this request was made by them.

Abolition of the $200 deposit in election contests, and proclamation of election day as a compulsory legal holiday.

Mr. THOBURN. Well, I do not know that this government has any right to pass a law making election day a public holiday until we have some greater demand for it by the great working classes of this country. It will entail not only a loss to the labouring classes, but a loss to the employers of labour in all large manufacturing industries. I am perfectly in accord with the idea of lengthening the time for polling; but from my standpoint I do not see the necessity of either the abolition of the deposit or the proclamation of a public holiday for election purposes.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am sorry to have to differ with some of my friends on this side of the House. But I have had some experience with these election deposits, and I would be sorry to see the present law wiped away. On two occasions candidates have been brought up against me. On the

first occasion a petition was hawked around, and a dollar collected here and a dollar there, to enable the candidate to make a deposit. The man just got enough to take the field, and I think he came within a very few votes of losing his deposit. At the last election the same thing happened again. A petition was hawked around the town, and a few dollars were subscribed here, and a few there, to enable the man to take the field against me. To-day I do not know where that man has gone to, I have not heard of him since. But he did save his deposit. As for the second proposition, I have seen a poll standing open for half an hour at a time and no voter cast registering. If the poll was kept open until two o'clock in the morning you would still find a few voters standing around waiting for some one to give them a dollar for their vote.

Mr. MACDONELL. My hon. friend from London who has just addressed the House, according to his own statement, has no grievance against this Bill, because he admits that on each occasion he won the election. He complains that the deposit was raised by men going about the town and collecting a dollar here and a dollar there to enable his opponent to take the field, still my hon. friend admits that he was not hurt. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) agrees with the deposit, and would apply the principle to municipal elections. Now I had hoped to receive some encouragement from the Minister of Railways and Canals, knowing as I do the part he took in the Ontario legislature, and with his knowledge of the statutes of that province, both as regards the extension of hours for voting on election day, and the abolition of the deposit. I can only attribute his changed attitude to the position taken by the Minister of Justice. The government has not attempted to take the strong and drastic stand on this matter which has been suggested by the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Finance let the Minister of Justice down half way, and then the Minister of Railways let him down the whole way. The Minister of Finance referred to the excitement on election day. Now I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice, what he knows, that on election day all the hotels are closed by the law of the province of Ontario. His insinuation that the people would become riotous on that occasion is certainly a reflection on the character of the people of Ontario, and as a member from that province I strongly dissent from his statement that if they were allowed a public holiday they would abuse it. Now I may point out that this request has been made to the government by two strong and influential labour bodies in this country, men who are authorized to speak for the labouring classes. I had hoped that on this occasion the Minister of Labour would have contributed to this debate, and his failure to do so will surely be commented upon, both inside and outside this House. My sole object in bringing this matter to the attention of the House was to improve the election law, to simplify it, to remove the obstacle of the deposit, which to my mind is the last relic of a financial qualification to parliament. I have endeavoured to do away with it, and the responsibility for its maintenance must rest upon the government and the Minister of Justice.

Mr. GRAHAM. And several friends of my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONELL. Well, the government are moving in the matter and it is their motion that we are now going to vote on. I had hoped that something better would come out of it. The Minister of Railways offers some small means of encouragement but I do not know whether he was in the House when I made my few opening remarks. What I said then and what I say now is that I merely suggest a public holiday for the purpose of having the election day purified, and, as far as possible, to remove corruption. I expressed my willingness then and I repeat it now to make any reasonable amendment to this Bill. I would be willing to adopt the Ontario system setting apart two hours for voting or to adopt any other reasonable plan by which the public can obtain a better opportunity of polling their votes on election day. However, with the government must rest the responsibility for the decapitation of this Bill. If the government are serious in their desire to facilitate voting on election day then let the Bill go to the committee and make the amendment that the Minister of Railways was kind enough to say that he would vote for. That, however, does not appear to be the intention of the government.

Amendment (Mr. Aylesworth), agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 23) to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907. He said: The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) has some amendments to consider in connection with the Industrial Disputes Act which may conveniently be considered at the same time with the amendments which are contained in this Bill and as I am anxious to advance the Bill to the committee stage I move the second reading with the understanding that it shall be allowed to stand until the Minister of Labour is prepared to consider this Bill and his own amendments.

Mr. KING. The hon. gentleman has correctly stated the position, and I am entirely agreeable to what he proposes.

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

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 24) to amend the Railway Act—Mr. Macdonell.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) will take up the Water Carriage Bill and if the opportunity comes the House will be moved into supply, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) beginning his estimates, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), if further opportunity presents itself, will follow.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the Minister of Finance be kind enough to state whether he proposes to deal with the Budget on Tuesday?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is our expectation that the Budget will come on Tuesday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a. m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 10, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the imperial defence conference. with additional papers relating to Australia and New Zealand.—Mr. Brodeur. He said: This is the same document as the one that was brought down a few days ago, except the reports of the proceedings of the conference of Australia and New Zealand with the admiralty, which were not included, but which were asked for by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Samuel S. Sharpe), and the hon. member for North Toronto (Hon. Geo. E. Foster).

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66), to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I wish to introduce is almost identical with the Bill which I introduced last year, with this exception, that I have added a clause providing that all railways doing business in Canada after the first of July, 1910, shall report to the Dominion government the names and employment of all men in their employ who work over 12 hours on any day, or an aggregate of 84 hours in any week. The Bill provides that this clause shall apply only to trainmen, despatchers, operators, and any others who have anything to do with the management or running of trains. The object of this—and I believe it will be welcomed by the railways—is to assist in the prevention of a great many accidents which are due to the lengthy hours despatchers and others are sometimes employed. I have had a number of complaints from different men of the long hours they have to work: but you can readily understand that if these complaints were looked into by the railway authorities, the men who make the complaints might be militated against by their employers, whereas if the railways are obliged to make a report, that is public property. I feel much more strongly than I did last year, that there should be a public official representing the people of Canada, not the railway corporations or the municipalities, but the man of moderate means who has a grievance which he wishes to lay before the Railway Commission and is not in a position to do so on his own behalf. Since I introduced the Bill of last year, a number of cases have been brought to my attention in which an official of that kind would have been of great service to the people of Canada. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will hand into 'Hansard' the remarks which I made in introducing the Bill of last session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that will be exceeding the custom of the House.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, with your permission, I will refer hon. members to the page of 'Hansard' in which those remarks appear, so that any who desire to read the facts which I laid before the House last year may do so. They are on page 3362, on March 26, 1909.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, the 17th instant, it stands adjourned to Wednesday, the 12th January next.

Motion agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a special committee of seven members be appointed, with instructions to carefully examine the rules of the House, to report what changes in their opinion might be adopted with the view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business; and that the said committee be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Pugsley, Mr. McKenzie, Mr. Borden, Mr. Haggart (Lanark), and Mr. Taylor (Leeds).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman allow that to stand until Monday as I had not noticed it in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion allowed to stand.

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved second reading of Bill (No. 25) respecting the water carriage of goods. He said: The most important feature of the Bill is that concerning a clause which is to be found in many Bills of lading, providing that the ship owners will not be liable in cases of fault or negligence on their part. This contracting out of liability seems to me absolutely contrary to the principles of our laws. Some years ago we passed legislation preventing railway companies from doing this and declaring that any such clause would be considered illegal. I may say that similar legislation to the one we are now introducing has been passed in Australia and is also in force in the United States, and the present Bill is taken mostly from the provisions of that passed by the Australian parliament. Some of its provisions are also in conformity with those of the Bill passed in the United States. True no such legislation exists in England, but the tendency at least in this country has been to disregard as much as possible the clauses in Bills of lading I have referred to. It ought not to be necessary for me to dwell at any length on the principle of the Bill. It is one which certainly ought to commend itself to the favourable consideration of this House. Let me draw attention to one of the clauses in the Bill of lading of a prominent shipping line:—

It is further expressly agreed that the goods named herein are shipped and carried at the sole risk of the shipper or owner thereof, and that the ship owner shall in no case be responsible for any loss or damage thereof, or in any wise relating thereto, whether such loss and damage arise, defects or insufficiency, either before or after shipment, in the hull of the said steamer, or in her machinery, or boilers or refrigerating chambers, machinery or in any part of the refrigerating apparatus, or in any material, or the supply or use thereof used in the process of refrigeration, and whether such loss or damage however arising, be caused by the negligence, default, error of judgment of the pilot, master, officers, engineers, mariners, refrigerating engineers, or other servants of the ship owner or persons for whom they are responsible or by negligence in stowage.

Here is another clause:—

Hook marks or injury from hooks, stowage or contact with or smell or evaporation from any other goods or from live stock or their excretion, however caused. * * * *

In this case it is provided also that there shall be no liability. It is provided also that if the goods should be delivered to some other person than the ones mentioned as being those to whose order the goods should be delivered, there will be no liability. I may say, however, to the credit of the ship owners as a rule that they do not take advantage of those extraordinary provisions. But possibly in some cases some companies, not quite so reputable, might not fail to take advantage of them. And it is possible that a company, who would be absolutely responsible in ordinary cases for the negligence of its officers and servants, might contract itself out of any liability arising from such negligence. Therefore it seems to me that we should provide that such clauses in a Bill of lading should be absolute illegal. This is the law which exists in Australia and the United States. I might add that in the province of Quebec, there is in its Civil Code a proviso almost similar to the one I am now introducing. That provision has been working satisfactorily and is in accord also with section 284 of the Railway Act. That section says:—

The company, shall, according to its powers: (b) Furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for the carrying, unloading and delivering of such traffic.

And subsection 7 of the same section says:

Every person aggrieved by any neglect or refusal of the company to comply with the requirements of this section, shall, subject to this Act, have an action therefor against the company, from which action the company shall not be relieved by any notice, condition or declaration, if the damage arises from any negligence or omission of the company or of its servants.

Current jurisprudence also tends to declare that the responsibility for accidents, not only when negligence is established against the shipowner or carrier, but in other cases also is upon the carrier. That is, the onus probandi in such cases rests upon the person against whom the action in damages is taken. The general principle of law is that one is not responsible unless it be proven that the accident or damage is due to his thought, fault or negligence. But, while this principle may

have been not only sound but applicable before the present industrial development, yet, under present conditions, as shown by cases recently decided by the Supreme Court, the onus probandi rests upon the person using the appliances which are the cause of the accident. For it is extremely difficult in ordinary cases for the person aggrieved to prove that the accident is due to the negligence of the carrier. The courts have been giving to that disposition of the law the most liberal interpretation and have held the carrier responsible, not only when negligence has been proven, but when the presumption of negligence has been more or less well established. Thus the tendency of the law is more and more in favour of holding responsible the persons or companies to whose care goods are entrusted for transportation. But, in the case of shipowners, the carriers go so far as to contract themselves out of their liability even for damages due to their own negligence or fault. This is certainly a step contrary to the ordinary principles of the law, or, at least, of the jurisprudence that is now being established in this country. It seems necessary to guard against such contracts and to enact a provision to make it impossible for these parties to contract themselves out of these liabilities, and for that purpose to declare such conditions of the contract to be illegal. That is the main object of this Bill. I may say that a measure on this subject was introduced in the Senate two years ago and was fully discussed there. An opportunity was given for interested parties, shipowners and others, to be heard. The result of the Senate's deliberations was a Bill which is almost word for word the one now before the House. Last year this Bill was passed again by the Senate, but, unfortunately, it reached this House too late to be considered. I believe it came to us just at the end of the session, and, as some objection was taken to it, it could not be passed. This year, I thought I would take charge of the Bill and submit it to the favourable consideration of this House. I entirely agree with the work done by the Senate, and I am very glad to say that the work is a good guide for us in this case, and we could not do better than follow the principles which they accepted last year, and which I am sure they will accept this year also. The other day we received in the department a letter from a shipowner who asked to be heard on the subject of this Bill. I think it is only fair that an opportunity for hearing should be afforded to those interested, and with that view, if the Bill passes its second reading, I intend to propose that it be referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

SUPPLY—FISHERIES COMMISSION.

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

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). I would like to know when the report presented by the Fisheries Commission that sat in Manitoba and the Northwest a little while ago will be brought before the House. I placed a question on the Order Paper, and in answer to that question the minister said that the report would be brought down as soon as it came into his hands. I understand that the report was placed in his hands about ten days ago, and I am anxious to see it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I received that report last week and gave instructions to have it sent to the printers at once to be printed, in order to lay it before the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When may we expect it?

Mr. BRODEUR. In a few days, I hope. As soon as it is printed, I will bring it down.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—RESIGNATION OF MR. LUMSDEN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to direct the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the very great delay in having the documents connected with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden laid before the House in printed form, and so made available for all the members. I repeat what I have already said in that regard—that, considering the importance of these documents, considering that they relate to a matter connected with the expenditure of $150,000,000, and $200,000,000, the government ought to have laid these documents in printed form upon the table of the House on the very first day of the session. Instead of that, there was delay until they could be moved for, and since they were moved for there has been the additional unnecessary delay of waiting for them to be printed while the House is sitting. I moved for the papers at once, and they were ordered to be printed almost as soon as they were brought down. It is now a little more than four weeks since the session opened, and these papers are not yet available. The answer of the Prime Minister to representations on

this subject has been that the printing of these papers is within the power and control of this House. The House does not do its own printing, but resorts to a department of the government to have its printing done. The House has done all it could do in connection with the matter by ordering that the papers shall be printed. Yet most extraordinary and unusual delay has taken place so that we shall not have these documents available for any intelligent work until two months after the opening of the session. I think that that is a very regrettable state of affairs. If delays of this kind unnecessarily prolong the session upon which we have entered, I desire to say in advance that it is not the fault of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but it is the fault of those who are responsible for the administration of affairs, and who have lamentably failed in their duty in that regard.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—IMPURE WATER ON PASSENGER TRAINS.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to the quality of the water supplied to the Intercolonial railway at Montreal, which is dangerous to the life and health of passengers travelling on its trains. Montreal is suffering from a very severe epidemic of typhoid fever, and the water supply of the city is without doubt, and is acknowledged to be, a source of danger. The milk of that city is also said to be contaminated, and the contamination may properly be traced to the water. In travelling on that train I made inquiries in the dining car, where the water came from, and I was told by those in charge that the water tank was filled from the water service of the city of Montreal. Now, if the citizens of Montreal are willing to put up with a municipal council that quenches their thirst on poisonous fluid, that is no reason why an innocent traveller on the Intercolonial should suffer in his health or in his life from this contaminated water. I am not talking of unrealities, but of a sad and actual reality. Many cases of typhoid have been contracted in this way from the impure water served to travellers. The Intercolonial is not the only railway that has been asked to supply its passengers with harmless water, and there has been more than one case where an order to give pure water has not been fully complied with, and when it has been found—I am not now referring to the Intercolonial—that the dining cars were furnished with pure water, while the ordinary passengers' lavatories and washrooms were supplied with impure water. Now it is as dangerous for a man to clean his teeth with water loaded with typhoid bacillus as it is to drink typhoid water. Many a man is carried to his death by merely having cleaned his teeth by water full of typhoid bacillus. A case of typhoid contracted on a railway between Montreal and Quebec or between Montreal and Hamilton may not develop for a week or two, perhaps in Cape Breton or perhaps in Vancouver, and the victim wonders where he contracted the typhoid. To show that I am not an alarmist, I want to read a quotation from Thursday's Montreal 'Star':

> The typhoid situation is now serious.
>
> Hospitals are too full to accommodate all fever patients who apply.
>
> The following is the record of cases at the leading hospitals to-day:—
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Royal Victoria Hospital.. .. .. .. | 66 |
> | General Hospital.. .. .. | 40 |
> | Western Hospital.. .. .. | 20 |
> | Notre Dame.. .. .. | 22 |

Since this was published I find by the 'Star' of yesterday and the 'Star' of to-day that the epidemic is growing worse and worse. People are told to boil the water. Well, that is a straw in catching at which many a man drowns. Drinking boiled water is safe, but eating off dishes and with spoons, knives and forks that have been washed with unboiled water, though the water may be warm, still renders one liable to contract the disease. I am not here pleading for the citizens of Montreal, they have put up with contaminated water for many years; but I am pleading for the unsuspecting traveller who, when he sees the innocent looking water supplied in the dining car, thinks he is drinking the pure fluid, whereas he is frequently drinking disease and in many cases death. This is an easy thing to remedy, and it is only a just thing to ask; and I am sure it will only be necessary to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to this matter to have the danger removed so far as the Intercolonial is concerned. But I am sure a complete remedy will not be found unless there is a thorough investigation made and a thorough remedy applied, because the average railway servant and the average individual do not comprehend the danger of drinking typhoid water. I do not know that I have any right to complain on behalf of other railways, but there is no harm in drawing their attention to the fact that many of them are filling their tanks to supply their passengers with the vile water supply of Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House is certainly a very important one, particularly as travellers on the Intercolonial are only allowed to drink water. On the other railways they can dilute the water if they like, and perhaps destroy the

microbes. I thank my hon. friend for having called my attention to this matter, and I will immediately make an investigation.

REPRESENTATION OF QUEBEC EAST AND OTTAWA.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). I desire to offer for the consideration of the House an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. The amendment only affirms a principle laid down in the rules of the House which the House has followed in the past, and which it is well to conserve for future use. It will be remembered that on the first of the present month I called the attention of the hon. the First Minister to the position that he then and still holds in occupying the two seats of Quebec East and the city of Ottawa. I asked at that time for your ruling as to whether the right hon. gentleman, in continuing to hold the dual position as representative of these two seats, was committing a breach of the rules of the House. The following day you ruled that the right hon. the First Minister was not committing such a breach of privilege. I am quite prepared to admit, as I do by the amendment in my hand, that so far as your ruling on that point is concerned, the House can not question it. I have no recourse and consequently I do not purpose by this amendment to reverse the ruling which was given by Mr. Speaker on the 2nd of December last. I desire, however, that my words in that regard shall not be misconstrued. I wish to state that I admit only that we are bound by the conclusion reached by Mr. Speaker in relation to this particular case. I do not wish to be understood as saying that we are any further bound. We have concluded in the present case that the right hon. the First Minister is not committing a breach of privilege and therefore, by reason of the fact that we are so concluded by the rule of the House, I cannot now and do not now challenge that ruling. But, Sir, in the course of the reasoning by which you arrived at that conclusion, certain principles were stated which I think were erroneously stated, and which I think it is to the advantage of the House to reaffirm. In the course of that ruling it was stated, among other things, that sessional orders of the House of Commons of Great Britain and Ireland such as were in force on the 1st day of July, 1867, were not within the meaning of the word 'rules' as used in Rule 1 of the House of Commons of Canada. That, I think, was an error and, to reaffirm what I said before, while we are concluded as to the application, correctly or incorrectly, of that rule in the present instance, we are in no way precluded from the use and enjoyment of the rule in time to come. That is to say, while it may or may not be misconstrued in an individual case, it still is of use in this House and its reaffirmation under the present circumstances is advisable. I therefore feel that before going any further I should offer to the House the amendment to the motion for Supply which I propose to move. It is as follows:

That in the judgment of this House, sessional orders of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the first day of July, 1867, are within the meaning of the words 'rules, usages and forms of proceedings,' as contained in rule 1 of the rules of the House of Commons of Canada.

In supporting that amendment, I desire first of all to refer to the use of the word 'rules' and the word 'orders' in the standard authority of this House, Sir John Bourinot's work on parliamentary procedure. It will be found by a reference to Bourinot at pages 303-4-5-6 and 7, that the words 'rule' and 'order' are used practically interchangeably; no distinction is drawn between them, sometimes the word 'rule' is used, sometimes the word 'order,' each in reference to the same subject, each in denomination of the same distinctive idea. There is no distinction drawn, the one means the other, and the other means the one, in so far as they both are used to refer to regulations and proceedings in the House of Commons. I do not think it necessary to quote individual sentences from Bourinot. A reference to the pages I have cited will clearly show any member that no distinction is drawn between the two words.

Now then, is there any distinction under the English practice? I desire in this case to be more specific, because fortunately the English authorities on this question are very clear, and I affirm that it is absolutely impossible for any hon. gentleman, approaching this subject in a reasonable attitude, to come to any other conclusion than that sessional orders and all orders that form the basis of procedure, or the regulation of procedure, are included within the meaning of the word 'rules.' I refer now to Redlich on the procedure of the House of Commons, volume 2, at page 5, and I regret that in order to make myself perfectly clear it will be necessary for me to read a considerable part of what that authority says on this subject. Perhaps, that it may be grasped more clearly, I should indicate the course of his reasoning. He urges that there are three classes of orders, all embraced within the meaning of the word 'rule.' There are, first of all, standing orders; secondly, sessional orders, and thirdly, another class which are not denominated correctly by either of the other terms and which are not given in their

promulgation in the first instance, either short or long duration. This third class of orders, it will be seen, are embraced within the meaning of the word 'rule.' In the opening of that argument Redlich draws a distinction between the word 'order' as used in the specific instance in reference to a specific case and the word 'order' as properly termed, a regulation which has an abstract reference. He says the word 'order' is used in two senses. It might mean a concrete direction as to what is to be done in a particular case or it might describe an abstract formulation of a rule as to the business of the House. In the first sense, an order is the commonest act of the House of Commons, the motive power of all its actual, positive work. We have nothing to do with orders of the House in this sense, we are only concerned with orders which are abstract regulations. As to what orders are abstract regulations, he says:

The mark which distinguishes orders of the second kind is their laying down general rules which are conceived as more or less permanent. Such orders, each of which is at first quite independent and revocable at any moment, after the ground they cover has reached a certain extent, constitute a connected body of formulated law upon matters of procedure. As we have already seen, from the beginning of the 17th century the House of Commons has shown considerable activity in this kind of autonomous legislation. In the course of time the constant repetition of certain well-tried orders, as opposed to special, temporary regulations, has led to the recognition of standing orders as a separate class of rules. Standing orders are regulations which have been expressly declared to be intended to bind all future parliaments, although the right is reserved of repealing them at any future time by a simple decision of the House.

In addition to the standing orders of a second category of procedure rules known as sessional orders has grown up.

I wish to repeat that sentence, and when I do so every member will see that it settles the whole point in controversy.

In addition to the standing orders a second category of procedure rules known as sessional orders has grown up.

So how are sessional orders to be anything else than procedure rules?

These comprise regulations which the House expressly renews at the beginning of each session, making the principles contained in them binding for the duration of its currency. The number of sessional orders has never been large, and several of them by constant repetition, session after session, have practically become standing orders. There are also a number of rules not belonging to either of the foregoing classes, never expressly endowed with either short or long duration, which by virtue of continuous practice, have acquired the force of customary law. For more than 50 years it has been usual for the procedure, regulations and forms of all three kinds to be collected from time to time in a hand-book under the editorship of the Clerk of the House for the time being; it is laid by the Speaker on the table of the House, and may, therefore, be regarded as an official statement.

So that these three classes of procedure rules, standing orders, sessional orders and the other class of orders, constitute themselves with nothing else the procedure rules of the House of Commons of England. One class is just as much a portion of the procedure rules as another. They are all embodied in what is known as the official statement binding on the House of Commons of England. Now, I ask the hon. members of this House, by what authority we can dismember that official statement and say that one class only is a procedure rule and the other is not? By what authority can we tear limb from limb what is expressly laid down as the basis, and the comprehensive precise basis of the procedure rules of the House of Commons of England? It is a matter of some importance that we get the whole benefit of our rules; that we be not robbed at any time of the real benefit of the rules of our House. If it is to be laid down that sessional orders are not included in the word 'rules' it may be a more serious matter for this House than perhaps we would at first anticipate. By the simple means of passing rule I of the rules of this House the Commons of Canada gained by one stroke the whole advantage of centuries of experience of the British House of Commons. They acquired the advantage of all the rules that that House had got together throughout centuries of the hardest experience, just such experience as we otherwise would have had to undergo. It is therefore I conceive, of great importance that we should not lightly throw away the benefit of any of our rules, more particularly that salutary rule I of this House. Now, Sir, what would result if this House were to lose the benefit of rule I? What would be the result if this House for all time were to be guided by the rule that sessional orders were not rules of the British House. I would like any hon. gentleman in this House to show me by what authority for nine years in the House of Commons strangers were kept out of this House at the instance of Mr. Speaker, if not by virtue of a sessional order of the House of Commons of England. I would like any hon. member to show me by what authority even up to the present day strangers can be kept from blocking the thoroughfares to this House if not by the authority of a sessional order of the House of Commons of England. I would like also any hon. gentleman to tell me by what regulations we are governed in the printing of our Votes and Proceedings if we do not

have the benefit of sessional orders that were in force in England on the 1st of July, 1867. And the most distinct and the most apparent loss we suffer is in respect to the very dilemma that we are placed in as to which I put the question to Mr. Speaker on December 1st last—the situation that by virtue of having lost sessional orders we find ourselves in the absurd position of being made to say for all time any hon. member may sit for one, for two or for twenty seats, throughout the whole period of a parliament in this country. I do not need to go any further. I only purpose making such remarks as I conceive to be absolutely necessary to make clear that we must reaffirm what I think was misconstrued in the course of the reasoning by which the decision of December 2nd was arrived at. I regret it was so arrived at but we are bound by it and I bow with respect to that decision. However, let us not be bound by the reasoning that led to it; let us not lose the benefit of the salutary position that this House has always enjoyed, let us reaffirm it to-day. I therefore beg to move seconded by Mr. Marshall:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, but that it be resolved—

That in the judgment of this House sessional orders of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the 1st day of July, 1867, are within the meaning of the words 'rules, usages, and forms of proceeding' as contained in rule I of the rules of the House of Commons of Canada.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice.) Mr. Speaker, the question which has been raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) is one which properly would have been brought up upon the pronouncing of your ruling of a week ago if an appeal had thereupon been taken from the chair and the question had been presented whether or no the chair should be sustained. For some reason that course was not taken. I cannot undertake to guess why that was not done. One would have supposed that to be the ordinary, the proper and the regular course to have taken under such circumstances. But the whole manner in which this question is presented to the House for consideration seems of unusual character. It will be remembered that it was brought up originally as a question of privilege and that in spite of your ruling that it did not properly so arise, the hon. gentleman persisted in pressing the point and discussing it as a matter of privilege.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Excuse me. If the Minister of Justice will refer to 'Hansard' he will find that Mr. Speaker made no such ruling as he has now stated to the House the Speaker did make.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If the hon. gentleman refers to 'Hansard' I think he will find that my statement is absolutely and literally correct, but whether or no that is the case is of little consequence. The matter was brought up in the manner I have described, and the hon. the Speaker took time to consider his ruling in regard to it, and whatever may have been the form in which the question was presented for his consideration he considered it upon its merits and he pronounced his best judgment in regard to it. That judgment stands unquestioned; there was no challenge of it whatever. It was received in the silence and by the acquiescence of this House, and the House upon its being pronounced proceeded at once to other business. Now, the question is renewed in the form of an amendment to the motion to go into supply, and it is so renewed notwithstanding that upon the Order Paper there is a government notice of a motion for a committee to examine carefully the rules of the House and to report what changes in their opinion might be adopted with a view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business, and notwithstanding the fact also that legislation to deal with this very subject has been introduced to this House and stands in the shape of Bill (No. 60) upon the Public Bills and Orders. And if any one wished to take exception to the course which has been pursued in making this motion to-day I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that one so objecting would have been entitled to your ruling in his favour if he took the position that the course which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) has taken to-day was entirely out of order, because it deals solely and only with the subject matter of a Bill already upon the Order Paper and standing for consideration. But however irregular the course may be, which is taken to bring forward this question, the question might quite as well be dealt with now as at any time; and I venture to submit, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling you pronounced on this subject on the 2nd of December is in every respect correct and is one which ought to be supported and not overturned by the action of this House. The whole question is within a very narrow limit. I cannot pretend, and I do not want any one to suppose that I pretend, to think myself in the least degree a parliamentary authority, or to speak in the light of experience or of knowledge other than any one can have from reading our rules on the subject; and I want to speak of the matter solely and entirely in view of the language of that rule. I start from the position which I suppose is common ground that this is a case not expressly provided for in our parliamentary rules on the subject. Unless that common ground exists there is no room for

discussion at all. But assuming it to be a case not provided for in our existing rules, the question then narrows itself to whether or not the practice followed in England on the subject is introduced into this country by the first of our general rules, which provides for such cases as are not expressly mentioned here. That rule prescribes that in cases not provided for the rules, usages and forms of proceeding of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom which were in force on the first day of July, 1867, shall be followed.'

Now, the first thing that any one would think of, it seems to me, in entering upon an inquiry upon this subject would be whether or not there was in force on the first of July, 1867, a rule of this character in England. You called attention, Sir, to that feature of the case in the considered ruling which you delivered on the 2nd of December inst. I understood the reference which you made in that ruling to the question whether or not the imperial parliament was then in session to be by way of illustrating the temporary character of the sessional orders which were under discussion by you. In some quarters I have seen during the last week criticisms of the ruling which you then pronounced upon the ground that is was based on that technical consideration. I certainly did not so understand it; and, reading it, I fail to see how any one could think that the consideration of whether or not the sessional order in England was in force on the first of July, 1867, was in any degree the foundation of Mr. Speaker's decision in this House a week ago. But the fact that that inquiry necessarily falls to be made is of the utmost significance. It shows at once that the sessional order which is passed at the beginning of the session and which expires with the session is of temporary character, and is not at all on the same footing as a general parliamentary rule which endures from session to session and from parliament to parliament until it is revoked or varied. Our own rule calls attention in the most distinct manner to that very difference. In its opening statement that 'in all cases not provided for hereinafter or by sessional or other orders,' three different things are collated: provided for hereinafter is one; provided for by sessional orders is another; provided for by other orders is a third. Those three different things are put in marked contra-distinction to the 'rules, usages and forms of proceeding' which immediately afterwards are mentioned. The very wording of our general rule No. 1 points in the most distinct manner to the fact that there is some difference between a general rule, usage, or form of proceeding; and a sessional order. If one looks at Bourinot on the subject, one finds immediately what is the distinctive and essential character of a sessional order. At page 309, paragraph 4, he deals with sessional orders and resolutions, and he says, to read three sentences:

> The House passes, in the course of every session, certain orders or resolutions, which are intended to have only a temporary effect on its proceedings, or to regulate the business of the session. These orders generally relate to the times of adjournment, the arrangement of business, or the internal economy of the House, or to the presentation of certain papers in subsequent sessions. Up to the session of 1876, certain resolutions relative to the offer of money were formally proposed and agreed to at the commencement of every session, but when the rules were revised that year, these resolutions were placed among the permanent orders.

Does not every word of that mark the distinction between a mere sessional order, a temporary thing that may or may not apply to any subsequent session, and something which takes the place of a general rule or parliamentary practice which continues in force by reason of its own strength until it is either revoked, amended or in some way got rid of? The sessional order expires with the session. For instance, the resolution which from time to time we see passed as to the order of business on a Wednesday or on a Monday, as the session goes on towards its end; the resolution that the House shall have forenoon sessions or that it shall sit on Saturday—things of that sort are of an ephemeral character, I might almost say —are mere orders or resolutions for the doing of business in that particular session, and unless repeated have of course no force or effect in any subsequent session. And so, Mr. Speaker, I venture to think that your reference to the fact that it had not been made to appear to you whether or not the British House of Commons was in session on the first of July, 1867, was a very significant and pregnant reference. If the House was not in session on that day, the whole question falls to the ground without more ado. There could not be any sessional order in force on that day, and there is no need to inquire further. If the House was in session on that day, the matter could not be quite disposed of on that ground, and accordingly you did not propose to dispose of it on that ground; but you faced the question squarely on the assumption that the House of Commons was in session on the first of July, 1867, and you proceeded to inquire whether or not on that assumption a sessional order of the House of Commons which may have been passed for the session of 1867 could be held to have been introduced into this country by our rules.

Assuming then that a sessional order upon the subject of a member entitled to one or the other of two or more seats, being required within any limit of time to select which of those seats he would

hold—assuming that a sessional order upon that subject was passed by the British House of Commons in the session of 1867, and that the British House of Commons was in fact in session upon the 1st of July, 1867, the question is simply whether or not, under the language of our general rule, such a sessional, temporary, evanescent order was introduced into the practice of this parliament. What is the language of rule 1? According to it, the things which were introduced into the present practice of this parliament are not the sessional orders, but the rules, usages and forms of proceeding of the English House of Commons as they stood on the 1st of July, 1867. Under which one of these three heads does a sessional order fall? Is it a rule, a usage or a form of proceeding? I confess that I awaited with considerable interest the discussion of this matter by the hon. gentleman, to know under which of those three heads he would contend a sessional order was included. He could scarcely argue that it was a mere form of proceeding. The term 'form of proceeding' surely means something entirely different. I had thought that possibly his argument would have been that it was included under the word 'usage'. That word is, perhaps, of somewhat elastic meaning, but I should suppose it includes something which was not put into any form of words, some such thing as the ancient traditional usage or custom which every member of the House of Commons in this country or in England exercises, if he pleases, to sit in his seat with his hat on notwithstanding that the House is in session and the Speaker in the chair, or the usage which exists in England, but not here, of taking a particular point of order seated and with the hat on. Usages of that kind, which rest on custom or tradition, cannot be described in any set form of words. It is not urged, however, that this question is governed by the introduction into this parliament of the usages of the British parliament, but the argument is that it falls under the phrase rules of the English House of Commons. But take the language of our rule 1 itself, and you will find the clearest and most distinct line of opposition and contrast drawn between the rules which are introduced and the sessional or other orders which are mentioned in the line before as things which govern cases not provided for expressly. The contrast is marked. The nature, the substance of the thing itself demonstrates that a sessional order is, as Bourinot points out, something very different from a permanent rule of the House which does not expire at prorogation but continues from session to session and from parliament to parliament. I certainly could not, in such light as I have on the subject, come to the conclusion that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, given a week ago, was erroneous.

Mr. MADDIN. I wish to say with regard to this question that so eminent an authority on parliamentary procedure as Redlich says, in Vol. 2, page 6, referring to rules of parliamentary procedure:

> In addition to the standing orders, a second category of procedure rules, known as sessional orders, has grown up.

Can there be any doubt, in view of this high authority, that a sessional order is a parliamentary rule? The ordinary rules of the House and sessional orders are all rules of parliamentary procedure according to this eminent authority.

> These comprise regulations which the House expressly renews at the beginning of each session, making the principles contained in them binding for the duration of its currency. The number of sessional orders has never been large, and several of them, by constant repetition, session after session, have practically become standing orders.

In a foot note which indicate those referred to are the following:

> (1) Double election returns; (2) exclusion of peers from voting; (3) prohibition against interference of peers in elections; (4) bribery at elections; (5) tampering with witnesses; (6) false evidence given to the House or one of its committees; (7) direction to the police to keep the passages to the House clear; (8) regulations as to printing the votes and proceedings; (9) regulations as to printing the journal.

I wish to point out that if rule 1 of our orders were not so construed as to include the sessional and standing orders, this House has no authority to patrol and police its corridors. The only authority for our doing this is the sessional orders which were in force in England on the 1st day of July, 1867. We have followed those orders with regard to other matters heretofore, and it was only within recent years that we made rules regarding the printing of the Votes and Proceedings and regulations regarding the printing of the Journals. And it was only in recent years that we passed an Act dealing with false evidence given the House or one of its committees. Up to that time we had absolutely no authority in those matters except the sessional and standing orders in force in the British House of Commons on the 1st of July, 1867, and I submit, with all due deference to so eminent an authority as the Minister of Justice, that the sessional and standing orders enforced in England on the 1st of July, 1867, are rules to which this House, under rule 1, is subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have very little to add to what has been said on this subject. The argument of my hon. friend the

Minister of Justice amounts simply to this, that in determining whether or not a rule of the British House of Commons is a rule within the meaning of the statute and of our standing orders, you must look, not to the language of the rule, but to the probable length of its duration. That is the test fixed by my hon. friend. The Minister of Justice contends that it is not the character of the order that determines whether or not it is a rule, but the question whether or not it shall remain in force one, two or three sessions, or indefinitely. I need not appeal to lawyers, I appeal to every layman as to whether that is common sense. Every one will realize that it is not. Neither, in my humble opinion, is it common law. Why, every one of the rules, every one of the standing orders of the imperial House or our House, with very few exceptions, might be put into the form of sessional orders and the business of that House carried on exactly as it is to-day. Yet the Minister of Justice, in that case, would stand in this House and seriously declare that the British House of Commons had no rules—for that would be the direct result of the argument he has addressed to the House this afternoon. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice this: If these sessional orders, so-called, were limited in their duration, not by one session but by three, four or five sessions, would he still contend that they were not rules? I must confess that I am unable to apprehend the argument of the hon. gentleman. To say that the character of a rule is to be determined, not by its nature, but by the limit of its duration—well, if I might be permitted to use a common expression, I would say that that was the limit itself.

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Justice realize that some of the most important legislation in Great Britain to-day, the most vital, that in connection with the all-important subject of the defence of the empire, is passed every session? And if any man asks him what the law of Great Britain, is, for example, with regard to mutiny, would he tell that man that Great Britain has no law at all on that subject, because the Mutiny Act is limited in its duration and is passed every year? Yet that was exactly the argument of the hon. minister this afternoon. The Minister of Justice says that in his opinion the subject is not open to argument. I agree with him entirely, but in a sense absolutely the contrary of that which he had in mind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have been a good many years in parliament, and I have realized by long experience that the law of parliament is far more difficult and far more intricate than my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) seem to think. The law of parliament is full of difficulty; it is a maze in which it is very easy to lose one's way. Parliamentary authorities vary very much in their interpretation of the rules. It is a matter of notoriety that, in England, the best minds in parliament, the most eminent men who have ever sat there, have been found arguing on one side and on the other of questions that have arisen in connection with these matters. The whole law of parliament is, in its origin, the arbitrary regulations of the House of Commons—and I use that word 'arbitrary' in no offensive sense, rules which have been established from time to time. Some of these rules are temporary in their nature, while some are permanent. I confess that it is difficult not to realize that there is a distinction between a temporary and a permanent rule. The very names are different—some are called rules and others are called by other names, as usages, sessional orders, and so on. I apprehend that the average member of the House will have some difficulty in coming to the conclusion that Mr. Speaker, who gave to this question the best judgment he could bring to bear upon it, was wrong. But it would be difficult for the average member to say that the Minister of Justice, an authority in law, was wrong. And I may say that it would be difficult for any one to say that the hon. leader of the opposition, in his view of the matter, is wrong—he is a good lawyer. All this only shows the difficulty of coming to a conclusion on such a question. When this matter was brought to his attention, Mr. Speaker gave to it his best consideration and judgment. He reviewed the facts and authorities and came to the conclusion that there was no such rule of the House as was contended for by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie. I dare say it is difficult to say who was right and who was wrong. The ruling of Mr. Speaker may be right or it may be wrong. In fact, Mr. Speaker himself did not pretend to say finally that he was right, but intimated that the subject was full of difficulties and suggested what he thought would be the proper course for the House to follow. Let me call the attention of the House again to the ruling of Mr. Speaker:

> My ruling is, therefore, that there is nothing in the rule of this House requiring a member who has been returned for more than one constituency to elect within any prescribed time for which of such constituencies he will sit. But, in my opinion, it is eminently desirable that some definite rule and practice on the subject should be established.

And he went on to say:

> The House has a Standing Committee for the purpose of considering such questions—the Committee on Privileges and Elections—and I will suggest that at an early date the

matter should be considered by the House, or by the committee, with a view to the fixing of a definite period within which such election is to be made.

Now, I would ask hon. members on either side, is not that a most common sense dealing with such a question? Who is the member, on that side or on this, who will undertake to say that the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was wrong, or will undertake to say that the argument of the leader of the opposition was wrong, or that the ruling of Mr. Speaker was wrong? It seems to me that, under the circumstances, the suggestion made by Mr. Speaker was the right one—that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is composed of leading members of the House, those who are supposed to have the best knowledge of these questions, should deal with the subject. I think that every member will have no hesitation in saying that he would rather not take it upon himself to assert that Mr. Speaker was wrong in his ruling, and that the rule spoken of by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was actually in existence. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) not to press his motion to a division. I have placed on the Order Paper a notice of motion for a committee of the House to revise the rules of the House, and of course the subject now under discussion will be one of the matters to be looked into by this committee, should it be appointed.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). The question now before the House is certainly a most interesting one from at least two standpoints. If we consider for the moment the party, politically speaking, who have proposed the question, and the party, politically speaking, who oppose the question, we must surely think that the party in power have travelled a tremendously long distance since they prided themselves on being 'democrats to the hilt.' One would hardly believe it possible, even in this western hemisphere, with all the enterprise and progress that we claim, that the Reform party would be the party found questioning the right of the people to secure representation in parliament. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has referred to some matters on which we might agree. I suppose it will be admitted that we can agree on this, that no member sits in this House as the representative of Ottawa, or as the representative of Quebec, or any other locality, but that under our parliamentary system, inasmuch as all the people cannot assemble within the halls of parliament, the country is divided into certain districts, each one of which sends a representative to Ottawa to represent, not that district, but the whole people of Canada. Therefore, if this be true—and I hesitate not to say will not be questioned as a matter of law—it follows that every person in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is deprived of his proper representation in this House when, although the law says that there shall be 221 representatives, the Prime Minister says there shall be only 220. Now, we come to consider this case thoroughly understanding that, from some cause or other, the people of this country are being deprived of one representative, and as it has not been alleged, even by the Prime Minister, that the rights depend not on a member holding two seats as against his holding three or more, then the principle which is being contended for by the Minister of Justice and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is that, if the government in power were able to carry all the seats in the country by running a few men to hold a number of seats each, they might sit here as a House of Commons although they might be only a half or a quarter the number provided by the law, and they might sit for a full term of five years and the people would have no remedy or redress—nay, Sir, they would not even have ground of complaint concerning what some would think an outrage on their rights.

It would be bad enough in all conscience if the old Tory party had been thus endeavouring to trample on the rights of the people, but for the Reform party, a Reform party of the most progressive continent and the most progressive country in that continent, to endeavour thus to trample on the rights of the people, is indeed somewhat remarkable. I was pleased to see that the right hon. gentleman who leads this House did not himself endeavour to support the argument of the Minister of Justice. The right hon. gentleman, although he is occupying these seats during the whole of last session and so far this session, has no other justification than to put a motion on the Order Paper appointing a committee of the most eminent men selected from both sides of the House, to revise the rules, and the implication comes in that in terms surely there must be something wrong in the rules. Now, if everything was right and proper, if everything was satisfactory, why should these need to revise the rules? Do they intend to improve them on the ground that they are not quite right and proper? But if one is to understand the right hon. gentleman, as I think he may fairly be understood, his whole remarks were to this effect: A lamentable state of affairs existed, and I am in possession of —I won't say stolen goods—but if any hon. gentleman can suggest any way within a reasonable time, without any inconvenience, by which I can get rid of part of the goods, I am prepared to bow to their decision. Now when we look at this matter

as a question in which the government party is depriving a part of the people of their proper representation, I think we may go a step further and see on what grounds they claim so to deprive the people. When this matter first came before the House and the point was raised the Speaker, after first reading the rule, said:

> In the imperial parliament the matter under consideration is dealt with by sessional orders which are renewed by the House of Commons from session to session, and which expire at prorogation.

Now here is the point:

> The sessional order on the subject which was, presumably, passed by the Imperial House in 1867 may or may not have been in force on the 1st day of July in that year, depending on whether the House was then in session or had been prorogued before that date.

There is no doubt in the world, nobody will dispute, that if the imperial House was not in force on the 1st of July, 1867, then this rule would not apply, and could not be invoked. But one would have thought that the Minister of Justice, in referring to this matter, might have given the case sufficient attention to find out whether the imperial House was in session at that date. Surely it is not a difficult matter to visit the library, which is near at hand, where he could have found volumes to show whether it was in session or not. He could have found the 'Hansards' of the imperial House of that date, and the Journals of the House, which would have supplied him with the necessary information. So, unless we are deceived by the books placed in our hands in the parliamentary library, the imperial House was in session on that date; and if it was, why lose so much time in discussing this simple question? Then, Sir, the next point the Minister of Justice makes, in reading this rule, is that the sessional orders are different from all other orders. Of course they are different; a pink apple is different from a green apple and yet one may be just as much an apple as the other. A sessional order is different from a permanent order, and I sincerely trust the Minister of Justice was enlightening his own side of the House, and not pretending that he was enlightening the members on this side of the House. But the point is not whether there is a difference between a sessional order and a permanent order, but the point is, when you come to read the rule, what is the meaning of certain words in that rule? If we can agree on what is meant by one of our own rules, then we need not bother about the difference between a sessional order and a permanent order. No one will differ from me in this reading of the rule. Now I propose to read the rule, eliminating the various words that have no reference at all to the question before us, and I fancy that no one will say that I am not reading the rule fairly, it being understood that I am eliminating no material words:

> In all cases not provided for hereinafter by sessional orders, the rules of proceeding——

Now what is the meaning of the phrase 'rules of proceeding'? Because if provision is made by sessional orders, and if we are dealing with rules of proceeding, then the argument of the Minister of Justice falls to the ground. Now what is the meaning of the words 'rules of proceeding'? It is true that this clause reads: 'The rules, usages and forms of proceeding'. But I imagine nobody will dispute the grammatical meaning of the words as I read them at first. Now when we come to find out the meaning of the words 'rules of proceeding', let us look at Redlich, than whom no higher authority exists. We are trying to find out the meaning of the words 'rules of proceeding'. Redlich says:

> In addition to the standing orders, a second category of procedure rules known as sessional orders, has grown up.

Now we go a step further. We have on the one hand the Minister of Justice trying to interpret the rules of proceeding, and on the other hand we have the procedure rules. He did not pretend to distinguish between rules of proceeding and procedure rules; and if they meant one and the same thing, as surely they do, then Redlich will say that procedure rules are known as sessional orders, and if procedure rules are known as sessional orders, it cannot be monstrously absurd to call sessional orders procedure rules. And if procedure rules mean the same as rules of proceeding, then they comply with the very words of the rule we are discussing as one of the rules and orders of this House. Now look at another authority, May, perhaps no better authority could be found, and I read on page 148:

> At the commencement of each session both Houses agree to orders and resolutions, which are renewed from year to year.
>
> The operation of orders or resolutions of either House of which the duration is undetermined, is not settled upon any certain principle. By the custom of parliament they would be concluded by a prorogation; but many of them are, as part of the settled practice of parliament, observed in succeeding sessions, and by different parliaments, without any formal renewal or repetition.

So, Sir, we find that not only are sessional orders within the meaning of the rule particularly, but we find that sessional orders are in many cases observed as being part of the settled practice of parliament, and observed in succeeding sessions and by different parliaments, and without any formal renewal or repetition. Now when we get that far we begin to find

that the difference between sessional orders and other orders may not by any means be the same as the Minister of Justice imagines. And I am sure, Sir, the members on this side of the House, if they cannot agree with all the Minister of Justice has said, at least will be quite ready to agree with his introductory remark that he did not pretend to have any familiarity with constitutional law or the procedure of houses of parliament.

In this same work, May, at page 148, is an illustration of what I have just read, of sessional orders becoming practically permanent orders and being held to be binding, not only in successive sessions, but in successive parliaments without any re-enactment. Some 15 or 20 examples of this occurring in England are given. Take, for example, the rule that the Speaker cannot take the chair if 40 members are not present. That rule came into existence on the 6th of January, 1640, and was the law in England up to the date of the publication of this 11th edition of May's Parliamentary Practice, in the year 1906. I shall not take up the time of the House in reading other examples. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie has shown this House that under English procedure the right hon. gentleman who leads this House is wrongfully depriving the people of Canada of one of the seats to which they are entitled. I know that some of the representatives of the smaller provinces would not consider it a grievance if the seat which to him is so contemptibly insignificant should be given to one of these provinces. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island would rejoice if the seat were allotted to them. I trust the right hon. gentleman will see that in setting such an example as this, a blow is being struck not merely at the parliamentary reputation of the people, not merely at the rights of the people, but at the position, at the dignity of this House. We hear it said continually that our courts and judges are entitled to the most profound respect, and a man either in this House or elsewhere will always feel a tremendous sense of responsibility in attacking our judiciary; but the same men who speak in this way of our judges will say that the highest court in the land is the court of parliament. If one of our judges should go wrong—and it is the proud boast of Canada that we have never yet had the necessity of impeaching a judge—it would be considered a national disgrace by every Canadian. Then what are we to think if in the highest court of Canada, composed of those who make the laws for others who thus observe them, we find that by the right hon. gentleman who by such an overwhelming majority leads and governs that House, the law of the land is broken.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (North Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the question before us is a ruling of yours the other day in which you laid down certain principles and rules in reference to the interpretation of rule 1 of our House. The statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the wording of your ruling, I consider to be an invitation to the members of this House to express their opinions as you were not very decided in your ruling. That is a sufficient justification of the action of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in bringing up the motion. Look at the absurd position we would be in if we followed the interpretation of the Minister of Justice in reference to this question. He says that sessional orders which were in force in England in 1867 are not in force in Canada unless they are incorporated in an Act of parliament. Are we to pass an Act of parliament bringing into force every sessional order which is in force in the British House of Commons in order to amend our own rules? The rules of the House of Commons of Canada, as I have always heard them interpreted here, are the practice, the procedure and the sessional orders which were in force in England in 1867. These were the governing principles, these were the rules to govern us, yet according to the Minister of Justice, unless we re-enacted these rules, placing them on our statute-book, they would not be in force here. We have always gone on the assumption that they were in force in Canada. The hon. minister says that Mr. Speaker might have ruled out this motion as there is a notice on the Order Paper of a Bill for a committee to amend the rules of the House, and that so we are debarred from discussing the rules. Did you ever hear of a more absurd thing than that? The rules of procedure of parliament are not to be discussed because some member puts upon the Order Paper a Bill to amend the procedure of the House! In this way any hon. member could prevent discussion of any subject by placing a notice on the Order Paper in reference to it, and so having premature discussion ruled out of order. The question before us is one of exceeding importance. The reputation of the people in the House of Commons is a matter which we must guard in the strictest manner. Why does not the right hon. gentleman select his seat? It has been the practice ever since parliament was constituted, from 1867 down to the present day, when there was a judgment of the court, that the party should select his seat within a certain time. Is it possible that there is no law or rule governing us here in reference to that particular question? I have been associated with the committees having charge of the revision of the rules of

the House for a long time, and if the opinion of the Minister of Justice is correct we have been sadly derelict in our duty, for we have made no provision for this case. The Prime Minister must be of the same opinion, because he could not so neglect his duty if he thought that we were not relying on these English sessional orders and privileges to guide and rule this House as I think they do until the present moment.

We are not attacking your opinion or ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this question. As the Prime Minister said, you were a little doubtful in reference to the matter and would like to be advised by the House. You suggested that the question be left to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. When you made that suggestion, why did not the government refer the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? They evidently left the matter to the House. There is no doubt at all that the sessional rules which were in force in England in 1867 are the rules which govern the procedure in this House.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It has been the custom in the past that any proposal to amend the rules of this House should be properly examined into by a committee, and that is a very salutary procedure. If there is any doubt about the rule now in question before the House, it seems to me that the proper procedure would have been for my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) to ask for a special committee for the purpose of revising the rules in the line of his contention. The right hon. the leader of the government has given notice of a motion for a special committee to revise the rules of the House, and it seems to me that it would have been well for my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) to bring before that committee the interpretation which he seeks to put on rule 1. It would appear to me, however, that the question which the hon. gentleman raises is in reality a question of privilege. We have a statute which regulates who shall sit as a member of this House and who shall not. It is not left to a rule of procedure to say who shall sit in this House, it is a statutory matter.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was a sessional order which said that two men could not sit for the same seat, would not that rule determine the question without any statute?

Mr. BRODEUR. In my judgment the question of the qualification of a member to sit in this House is a statutory matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why don't they have such a statute in England? In England that question is regulated by a sessional order and not by statute.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not adopted the same procedure in Canada with regard to that matter, and my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) understanding the principle which guides us has introduced a Bill declaring what shall be done by those that have been elected by more than one constituency.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the hon. minister then say that my method is better than the method suggested by the Speaker in his ruling?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not say that the amendment proposed in the Bill of the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) is a good one, but I say that in introducing such a Bill he has followed the proper procedure. Such a question is to be determined, not by a rule of the House, but by the statute concerning the House of Commons. That statute provides, when the members come to take their seats in the House of Commons, whether they have a right to sit here or not, and the rules of the House are intended to determine the manner of our proceedings after the members have established their right to sit. My hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), in the procedure adopted by him in introducing his Bill, has shown a knowledge of correct procedure which commends itself to those who have studied the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does not the hon. minister realize that the affirmation of this resolution covers all the sessional orders that were in force in England on the 1st of July, 1867, and that the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) only refers to one of them?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am dealing now with the form of procedure. The question of the standing orders of this House is a most important one, and one which should be dealt with after it has been considered by a committee of this House which can give it mature judgment and deliberation. There is no standing rule as to the manner in which we should make our rules, but Bourinot and May and all the parliamentary authorities lay it down that no rules of the House should be amended until they have been considered in committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am not asking for any amendment to the rules of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. But, my hon. friend is seeking to put an interpretation upon a rule of the House, and whether he is right or wrong in his view, it should first have full and mature consideration by a committee of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. minister aware that the most important change ever made in the rules of the British

House of Commons was made without any reference whatever to a committee?

Mr. BRODEUR. To what does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring to the first closure resolutions which were moved in the House by Mr. Gladstone and which were not referred to a committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is right in that respect. It was passed by the House almost unanimously and without any great debate; but he must admit that the procedure we have followed in this House, when we have made or amended any of our rules, has been to refer those rules to a committee to be fully considered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not criticising that practice at all. I was simply saying that it was something departed from, and I did not consider this to be a proposal to amend the rule.

Mr. BRODEUR. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Allow me to make myself clear. Suppose, for example, that there had been an inadvertent decision denying the right of a man to move an amendment on going into Supply, and on the day alter some hon. member should declare that according to the rules and usages of the British House of Commons or of this House no hon. member has the right to move an amendment to Supply. This is precisely of the same nature.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot admit that. The interpretation which my hon. friend wants to put upon the first of our rules is a most important one, and before the House passes judgment upon it, I think it should be fully considered by a committee of this House or by the full House in committee. That has been our procedure in the past. Let us consider for a moment what the declaration is which we are called upon to make:

> That in the judgment of this House the sessional orders of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the first day of July, 1867, are within the meaning of the words, 'rules, usages and forms of proceeding,' as contained in rule 1 of the rules of the House of Commons of Canada.

I say this is a most serious declaration. What are we asked to embody in it? We are asked to embody rules which for forty years this parliament has not been supposed to put in force. I think, before we incorporate in our rules the important declaration made in this motion, we should inquire a little to find out how far we would be going by such a declaration. My hon. friend may be right in his interpretation of the law; but at the same time is it advisable to adopt a sweeping declaration of that kind without having a committee of this House to investigate fully how far it would carry us? I may say that I do not think the procedure which my hon. friend is following is the proper procedure, and for this reason. My hon. friend knows that when a decision has been rendered by the Speaker, that decision stands as final unless there is an appeal from it. Rule 18 says:

> The Speaker may permit debate of the point of order before rendering his decision, but such debate must be strictly relevant to the point of order taken. The Speaker shall decide upon the point of order, which decision shall be subject to appeal to the House, but without debate. If there be no appeal, the decision of the Chair shall be final.

If I remember rightly, my hon. friend himself raised the question the other day, and appealed to the Speaker for a decision. A decision was rendered by the Speaker, and that was final unless an appeal was taken from it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the point of order Mr. Speaker decided?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that my hon. friend brought before Mr. Speaker the point that a member of this House had no right to sit for two seats—that he had to make a declaration within a certain period, according to the rule that was in existence in the House of Commons of England in 1867.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend think that was a point of order within the meaning of the rule?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend called the Speaker's attention to that, and the Speaker decided that that rule was not in force; and I say that when the Speaker puts an interpretation upon a rule of this House and there is no appeal to the House from his decision, that becomes the judgment of the House. In this case my hon. friend is asking us to make a most important declaration, embodying in our rules all the sessional orders of the parliament of the United Kingdom that were in force on the first of July, 1867.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not even that. It is only those which deal with matters not expresssly provided for in our own rules.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course our rules are not very extensive, they are not nearly as extensive as those existing in England. At all events, my hon. friend is asking us to declare that all the rules and sessional orders passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom from 1801 to 1867 should form part of our rules of procedure. This is a most important declaration; we do not know where it would land us; and before

deciding such a question, I think it should be referred to a committee of the House to investigate how far it would take us.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister say whether standing orders are within the meaning of the rule?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does not his argument apply equally to those, and would not a committee of this House be equally necessary to decide what a standing order would lead to?

Mr. BRODEUR. I must say to my hon. friend that I have not given that question very much consideration. I do not claim to know everything about that. While I have given some study to the rules of the House, I must admit that I do not know them all and am liable to make mistakes. At the same time I would not be prepared to declare offhand whether a sessional order did or did not form part of the rules of this House. I should make considerable distinction between standing orders and sessional orders. My own opinion is that although the standing rules of the British House of Commons form part of our rules, their sessional orders must not be applied in the same way. Possibly after studying the matter more carefully, I may come to a different conclusion; but for the time being I am strongly of the opinion that the sessional orders of the British House of Commons in force on the 1st of July, 1867, do not form a part of our standing orders.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Has the hon. minister any authority which says that a sessional order is not a rule?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say that the sessional orders of the British House of Commons should not be considered as part of our rule No. 1, because what is there contemplated is, not the rules which were in existence in England one, two or three sessions, but the standing rules which had been in existence for years and which were considered almost as important as the privileges themselves. That is the construction I would put upon rule No. 1. When my hon. friend asks us to declare that all the sessional orders of the British House of Commons form part of our rules, he is embarking on very dangerous ground and may find himself, after giving the matter more consideration, entirely mistaken. He may find that such a decision would incorporate in our procedure, rules which parliament never intended to form part of our standing rules. That is my view and I am sure the hon. gentleman will be well advised, under the circumstances, not to press his motion.

Mr. CROTHERS. If I understand rightly the argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they contend that there is no law, order or precedents in this country requiring a man who has been elected for more than one constituency to resign one of these seats at any time during the parliament for which he was elected. That in itself would strike the people, it seems to me, as a very startling proposition. It simply amounts to this, that a man might be returned for two or three or ten constituencies and sit for them all during a whole parliament, and that there is no law, constitution, order or rule requiring him to resign all but the one seat. I have here Bourinot's parliamentary procedure, a work which is accepted generally as indisputable authority in matters of this kind. Just listen for one moment to what he says on page 245:

> In case a member is returned for two constituencies, he must make his election for which of the places he will serve by formally resigning his seat when the House is in session. This election may be made by a member from his place in the House or in the usual legal communication to the Speaker.

If that authority be good (and as such it is quoted by you, Mr. Speaker, almost daily), the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is erroneous, and by inference the sessional order of the British House of Commons, in force on the 1st of July, 1867, are included in the words 'rules, usages and forms of procedure' mentioned in rule 1. Otherwise there is no ground for Bourinot's statement that a member elected for several constituencies must select one and resign the others. If the sessional orders of the British House of Commons, as they existed on the 1st of July, 1867, do not govern this case and are not included in our rule No. 1, then Bourinot had no ground for making the statement I have just read.

Further in section 1 of chapter 41 of the Statutes of Canada, 1907, it is provided that the House of Commons shall consist of 221 members. But if one member may represent two seats, then the House does not consist of 221 members but only of 220, and the right hon. gentleman who should be the last man to violate the constitution, has been representing two seats in this House in defiance of section 1 of chapter 41 Statutes of Canada, 1907.

There is a provision that where a member's seat is contested, he cannot resign until the suit is disposed of. But the protest against the right hon. gentleman for one of the seats in Ottawa was disposed of in June last. It is perfectly clear what the duty of the right hon. gentleman then was. Can there be any doubt about it? Is there any layman or lawyer who would not say that it was the duty of the right hon. gentleman, when that case was

disposed of, to elect whether he should sit for one of the seats in Ottawa or for Quebec East, for both of which he had been elected. So that since the month of June last the right hon. the Prime Minister has been violating the constitution of this country. This House should by law consist of 221 members, but we are short of that number because the right hon. gentleman is occupying two seats, and all this trouble has arisen simply because he has failed to do his duty. In fact we seem to have reached the stage when no right of the people in this country is too sacred to be sacrificed to the necessities of political exigencies by the party now in power.

I submit that there is no getting away from the statement I started out with, if Bourinot is right in saying that a man elected for more than one seat must select one and resign from the other, then the sessional orders in force in England on the 1st of July, 1867, must be applicable here.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Meighen).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Lortie,
Arthurs,	Maddin,
Barker,	Magrath,
Barnard,	Marshall,
Blain,	Meighen,
Blondin,	Middlebro,
Borden (Halifax),	Nantel,
Boyce,	Northrup,
Bristol,	Paquet,
Burrell,	Perley,
Campbell,	Price,
Chisholm (Huron),	Roche,
Cowan,	Schaffner,
Crosby,	Sexsmith,
Crocket,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Crothers,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Currie (Simcoe),	Sproule,
Daniel,	Stanfield,
Donnelly,	Staples,
Edwards,	Stewart,
Elson,	Taylor (Leeds),
Goodeve,	Taylor (New
Haggart (Lanark),	Westminster),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thornton,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Herron,	White (Renfrew),
Hughes,	Wilcox (Essex),
Kidd,	Wilson (Lennox &
Lake,	Addington),
Lalor,	Worthington,
Lancaster,	Wright.—61.
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth,	McKenzie,
Beauparlant,	McLean (Huron),
Béland,	Major,
Black,	Marcile (Bagot),
Borden (Sir F.),	Martin (Montreal,
Boyer,	Ste. Mary's),
Brodeur,	Martin (Regina),
Brown,	Martin (Wellington),
Bureau,	Mayrand,
Cash,	Michaud,
Champagne,	Miller,
Chew,	Molloy,
Chisholm	Murphy,
(Antigonish),	Neely,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Oliver,
Clark (Red Deer),	Papineau,
Currie	Parent,
(Prince Edward),	Paterson,
Delisle,	Pickup,
Demers,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Prowse,
Dubeau,	Rankin,
Ecrément,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Robb,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Middlesex),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Roy (Dorchester),
Graham,	Roy (Montmagny),
Hodgins,	Schell,
Hunt,	Sealey,
King,	Smith (Middlesex),
Knowles,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Kyte,	Smith (Stormont),
Lachance,	Talbot,
Lafortune,	Templeman,
Laurier	Todd,
(Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
Lavergne,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Law,	Turcotte
LeBlanc,	(Quebec County),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Macdonald,	Turriff,
MacNutt,	Warburton,
McAllister,	White
McCoig,	(Victoria, Alta.),
McGiverin,	Wilson (Laval).—90.

PAIRS:

Ministerial,	Opposition.
Fielding,	Foster,
Fisher,	Osler,
Pugsley,	Porter,
Lemieux,	Forget,
Low,	Smyth,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Sinclair,	Clare,
McColl,	Macdonell,
Rutan,	Monk,
Douglas,	McCarthy,
Ethier,	Broder,
Harris,	Beattie,
Lovell,	Russell,
McMillan,	Doherty,
Sifton,	Reid (Grenville),
Bickerdike,	Ames,
Guthrie,	Owen,
Nesbitt,	Lewis,
Pardee,	Thoburn,
Clarke (Essex),	McCall,
Carvell,	Rhodes,
Gervais,	Bradbury,
Gordon (Kent),	Jamieson,
Harty,	Fraser,
Conmee,	Maclean (York),

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Excise—salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending on the results of excise examinations, $439,000.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The total increase in the excise branch of the department is $4,599.95, due to increases in the salaries of officers and inspectors, with probably some slight additions to the staff, and to the increase of the amount for extra duty at distilleries. The increases total $14,599.95. As against these, there are decreases of $10,000, making a nett increase, as stated, of $4,599.95.

Mr. BLAIN. How many new officers?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think we have the list of the new officers, but as the country develops, and the work of the department increases, additions to the staff are necessary. The number of officials in the outside service is steadily increasing with the increase of business and of the revenue.

For extra duty at large distilleries and other factories, $12,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many men are employed under this vote?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is an increase of $2,000 in this vote, required in connection with new distilleries which, the department believes, are likely to be established during the coming year. This is for overtime for our officers at the distilleries.

Mr. BOYCE. Where are the new distilleries to be established?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have heard that one is likely to be established at Montreal. There was also some discussion about the establishment of a distillery at Winnipeg. Provision has to be made by this extra vote so that, if these new establishments do come into existence, we shall have money to pay the officers who must be appointed in connection with their operation.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. As I understand it, this item is for extra labour at distilleries that have not yet been established and which are not certain to be established. Does not the minister think that a hazy item to ask the House to vote?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The vote is for $12,000, which is $2,000 of an increase over the current year. The whole of the $10,000 voted last session has been expended in paying officers at distilleries for overtime. We have reason to believe that the number of distilleries may be increased. We are simply taking provision for the payment of officers in that case.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The item last year was voted for the same purpose?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Are there any new distilleries established since last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And a vote was given last year by this House for extra time for officers in the minister's department in case that they should need to be employed in a new distillery, and as I understand, $10,000 was taken up. Is not this another method of getting around the law, and adding additional money to the salaries of officials in the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, this is not an attempt to get money to increase the salaries of our officials. These salaries are determined by the Civil Service Act, and we could not increase them in this way if we desired to. I have a memorandum before me explaining this duty pay:

This duty pay was established by order in council of December 20, 1880, and was granted on the ground that the high rates of duty charged have increased the responsibilities of the officers, that the straight salaries paid them were obviously less than the qualifications necessary for the effective performance of such duties should command.

This duty pay is not to be considered as an addition to the officer's salary, as it pertains to the survey, not to the man. Officers receiving such duty pay are subject to removal to other surveys wherever the exigencies of the service so require. Their hours are likewise long, being from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. The duty pay is given under authority of the schedule to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that none of this extra money voted last year was expended at all? I thought he said they established no new distilleries.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend did not understand me to say that, I said that the $10,000 voted last year had been expended. It is for the probable increase of work in the coming year that we are asking for this vote.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. Donnelly.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Saint Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Mayrand.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Excise—for extra duty at large distilleries and other factories, $12,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I see in the Auditor General's Report at page J—18 an item of $1,448.66 paid to 14 special officers of this department. I assume that these men were paid about $100 per annum each for special services at Windsor, Ontario. I would like to ask the minister what duties these men performed, at whose recommendation they were appointed, and what special qualifications they have for such duties.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is the expenditure under this vote. These officers are our regular supervising excise officers, who are assigned to special services largely or altogether in connection with distilleries. Their duties are very exacting, very important and their hours very long. Each officer in charge of a distillery has to be on duty from seven o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening. Their long hours and their responsible duties entitle them to some consideration over and above their regular salaries, which are fixed by the Civil Service Act, and therefore for these extra services they are paid the duty pay which has been paid by the department for 35 years. It is because this work is increasing somewhat that we are asking for $2,000 more this year than we asked for last year.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation are these officers appointed, do they undergo any examination, and have they any special qualifications for this kind of work?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. All the officers of my department have to undergo the Civil Service examination before they can be appointed permanently. If an officer is put in temporarily, it is only with the understanding that he will pass the examination at the first available opportunity. All these excise officers who are in charge of distilleries and receive this extra duty pay have passed up from one grade to another and have passed the examination for promotion required by the department. They are nearly all very old officials.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know whether the doctrine laid down by the Finance Minister so clearly the other evening is applied to my hon. friend's department, and whether these are political rewards to these men. The Finance Minister stated that the policy of the government was to give offices to their own political supporters.

Mr. FIELDING. Not exactly. What I said was that if they did, I did not see why my hon. friend should complain.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept the explanation, but what I want to know is whether, in the appointment of officers of this kind, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, applies the policy laid down by the Finance Minister, namely, that where an office is vacant and he can find a supporter of the government to fill it, it will go to him in preference to a Conservative, no matter what may be the qualifications of the latter.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Department of Inland Revenue does not follow the practise my hon. friend has mentioned, that is, if a vacancy occurs in the position of a first or second-class excise officer, a new man will not be put directly in that position. In the Inland Revenue Department that would be impossible. Our special class officers, our first or second-class officers, are all men who have risen from the ranks after long service and who have passed, not only the original entrance examination, but the promotion examinations as well. They must have a knowledge of the details and the workings of the office, and I cannot remember any new men having been appointed to such office under my tenure of that department. Take for instance in the case of distilleries, the officer must be competent to see that the revenue of the government is properly safe-guarded, and to do that he must have had some experience in a lower branch, so that new men are not put in these positions at all.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the new men appointed?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They are appointed to the lower grades at $500 a year and are very seldom given an appointment to a higher grade.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has answered many unasked questions, but he has failed to measure up the question I put to him. What I want to know is whether, when my hon. friend makes an appoint-

ment in his department, whether it be to a minor or a more important grade, he follows the policy laid down by the Finance Minister, that to the victor belong the spoils or, in other words, that these new men must be supporters of the party.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As regards the appointment of new officials, we accept men who are qualified to fill these lower vacancies, and other things being equal we give the preference, of course, to our political friends. The appointments are very few indeed, and those are to the lower grades, and the offices in such grades are hardly worthy of acceptance, as $500 per year is not a great inducement to outsiders to take them. We do not put new appointees over the heads of officers in the department, but where a man is recommended to me by a political friend, and we have the assurance that he is competent, we most unquestionably give him the preference.

Mr. BLAIN. How are the recommendations made?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Personally, verbally, in writing and in many ways by members of parliament and others. There is no particular system, but I generally satisfy myself that the applicant is fit for the position. I have very frequently indeed sent the name of the party recommended to the collector of Inland Revenue in that particular district and asked him to advise me confidentially if the applicant is fit to be appointed to the service.

Mr. BLAIN. That is very frank, and I wish to compliment the Minister of Finance upon his influence in the cabinet. That influence seems to reach out to all these departments. His colleague has been very frank in admitting that these new appointments he has mentioned are given to party supporters and that no Conservative need apply. That is the policy of the government clearly announced. I was afraid there might be some disagreement in the cabinet, but all the ministers seem to think alike on that subject, and the country will understand that this government, which came into office with so many professions of a higher standard of politics, has reached the point that no new appointments can be made to his department except to a government supporter.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has been here all these years, and if he has only made that discovery now, he is somewhat duller than I took him to be. The only exception I take to his remarks is where he attributed to me the phrase 'to the victor belongs the spoils.' I never used the words in that particular sense which he applies to them, and in which they are understood by our friends across the border where they mean a great deal more than the meaning I would give them. The question to determine is, first, what these spoils are. I would not consider that an office already held by a respectable Conservative was a spoils that must be got rid of. But if a vacancy occurred in the public service and there was a good Liberal capable of filling the place, and if we passed him over and gave the place to one of my hon. friend's friends, then we ought to be turned out.

Duty pay to officers serving longer hours at other than special survey, $1,500.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is on the line of the last vote. It is to enable the department to pay duty pay to deserving officers engaged at other than special survey on account of their long hours and attendance, and in some cases the character of their work. These officers serve from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., and this vote is paid to officers in the bonded manufactories.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. This service is a technical service to a large extent. Have any men been appointed to this service since the minister took office who have not passed the Civil Service examination, and if so, how many?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There have been appointments made to deputy collectorships where the appointees have not passed the examination, the law not requiring that they should. All temporary appointees are expected to pass an examination, and they are not put on permanently and do not receive the annual increment of five per cent of salary until they do pass. It is quite true that in the outside service quite a number of men in the lower ranks have not yet passed the examination. Almost every time an examination is held a large number of our officers go up and try; some pass, and some fail and try again; some of them probably will never pass the examination. Some of them are very good officers and trustworthy men. I think perhaps out of 300 or 400 officers, 50 or 60 have not passed the examination.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does this item cover those men in the service supervising what is known as the blending of liquors?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This item has no reference to what my hon. friend mentions. It refers to duty pay to officers in charge of bonded manufacturing establishments, for the manufacture of vinegar for instance, where officials have to be present from early in the morning till late at night. It is responsible work, and this extra pay is for services rendered. It attaches to the

office rather than to the man, it is not a portion of his salary at all.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have heard that repeated several times. But I want to ask the minister if he has not special officers in charge of the manufacture of blended liquors, and what are the regulations in his department in that respect?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no such thing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What machinery has the minister got for enforcing the statute that covers the case of blending and the licensing of blenders?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I suppose my hon. friend is referring to the compounding of liquors?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is nearly the same thing. There are licenses issued to a number of firms to compound liquors. As my hon. friend knows, all this liquor is duty paid before they can compound it. The only interest the department has is to collect the revenue.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand they use liquor in vinegar factories.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is not compounded.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am well aware it is not compounded, but it is used in some instances. A vinegar manufacturer can purchase his alcohol duty paid and manufacture vinegar from it. I suppose the department has seen fit to place officers in charge of these factories to see that that law is not violated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In a bonded manufacture such as a vinegar factory we have officers. They manufacture in bond. Of course, the alcohol is converted into vinegar, and our officers see that the revenue is safeguarded. But that is a different thing altogether from the compounding of alcohol. In that case the liquor is duty paid beforehand, so that the revenue could not possibly be defrauded.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to delay the minister; but I understand that there is a great deal of fraud committed in connection with the blending of liquor under licenses issued by the department. I understand that blenders buy cheap alcohol, that they mix all kinds of material with it, and manufacture so-called corn liquors which they sell throughout the country. For instance, a large quantity of what they call Scotch whisky is sold in this country, which is really manufactured by these people; also Egremont Mint and Benedictine are sold as foreign liquors, though they are manufactured by our Canadian vendors out of alcohol and other specific mixtures. They have brands upon them of firms supposed to be located in France, and Portugal, and in Scotland. Now that really constitutes a fraud on the public, a greater fraud even than the sale of unlicensed liquor. If a manufacturer wishes to put up Canadian whisky in bottles, he must place a seal on it, and of course that is done in bond. But have any steps been taken by the department to look into this matter, and have any representations been made to them on that question? We see reports in the newspapers of men dying from the effects of partaking of liquor which contains chloral hydrate and other drugs. No doubt the hon. minister saw the item in the papers with regard to Fort William and the northwest section of Ontario generally. Does not the minister think that some steps should be taken to meet cases of this kind, prevent adulteration and put a stop to the fraudulent marking of liquors with the names of manufacturers, or alleged manufacturers, in other countries?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am inclined to think that the fraudulent marking of alcoholic beverages would come under the Criminal Code. It has nothing to do with the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If a man were to put on goods manufactured in Canada the label of, let us say, Lea and Perrin, I suppose that would be a fraud. But if he were to put on the name of some suppositious manufacturer in Glasgow or Birmingham, would that be a fraud?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It would not be an offence against the Inland Revenue Act, but it might be against the Criminal Code. I am not familiar enough with the penalties under the Criminal Code in relation to false markings to say whether misrepresentation of that kind would be counted a fraud or not, but I assume it would be. With regard to the purity of whisky, it is a fact that during last summer the Department of Inland Revenue made large collections of liquors as sold over the bar in many places in Ontario and even in Manitoba where statements were made that impure or poisonous stuff was sold over the bar. Analyses were made, and in almost every instance the report of our chemist was that nothing of a deleterious nature —nothing more deleterious than the whisky itself; nothing of a poisonous character —was added. Rarely anything more than alcohol or water was found to have been contained in any of the samples. For myself, I have very grave doubts about these reports concerning poisonous liquors

being sold. I read the despatch in the newspapers relating to what happened at Fort William or Port Arthur. The offence of adulteration there referred to does not come under the Inland Revenue law. It may be possible that some foolish saloon man, thinking he could make cheap beverages, would try to doctor it up with noxious drugs. But we cannot be held responsible for that. The offence would be punishable no doubt, under the Criminal Code. The purity of liquor, if it is ever going to be dealt with, I suppose will have to be determined by standard to be decided upon by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department in connection with the standards for foods, upon which, as a matter of fact, the department is at present engaged.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have looked over the returns published by the department in connection with this collection of liquors to which the minister has referred, and I notice that there is an absence of deleterious products ; but I notice also that there is a pretty constant addition of twenty-five per cent of water to the liquor sold throughout the country. Does not it occur to the minister that it would be wise, in the interest of his department and for the increase of the revenue, if some method were devised by which the sellers of liquors of that description could be punished? It would appear that it is possible to secure twenty-five per cent more revenue which now the hotelkeeper and middle-man are taking.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The department cannot be defrauded in that way. Our excise duty is based on the measured proof gallon, and this must be paid when it leaves the bonding warehouse after being purchased by private parties, of course they can put in what they like. They may sell it at proof, or at fifty per cent under proof—just as weak as they can deceive the public into taking. But there is something in the point that the hon. member (Mr. Currie) makes. I suppose there should be a standard of strength for whisky. If we establish a standard providing that there should be so much alcohol and so much water, then if there be more water, that would be a violation of the law and punishable as such. The question is, what can we do? The temperance men will say that the lower you put the standard the better—the more water there is in the whisky the less harm it will do. But we are grappling with the question of fixing a standard for foodstuffs of all kinds and for drinks, including alcoholic drinks, and we hope, before many weeks, to be able to submit a set of standards under which the Adulteration of Foods Act may be better enforced. That is, of course, an enlargement of the subject actually under discussion. But I hope to fix standards for foodstuffs and liquors.

M. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to delay the committee, but I would like to ask another question. There is an impression abroad in this country that the Scotch whisky sold here is the product of the old pot still. It is sent into this country by Scotch distillers and sold as Scotch whisky. Now, the minister is aware that there has been considerable agitation and, in fact, litigation, in the old country over the question of what constitutes Scotch whisky. But it has been shown, apart altogether from the question of whether all Scotch whisky is the product of the pot still or of the fractional still, that there is such a thing as real Scotch whisky which is the product of the Scotch still which was known before the fractional or silent still was brought into use. All the whisky made in Canada is the product of the silent still, and the distilleries here are required to mature their product, I understand, for three years before it is sold to the public. But here is where the trouble comes in: A distiller in Scotland or England who manufactures with the silent still turns out exactly the same product as our own distillers, and, by simply reducing the strength of that spirit, putting in some flavouring matter, to give it the flavour of Scotch whisky—such as wine or a touch of pyrogallic acid to give it a smoky smell and taste—he is allowed to ship that stuff into Canada and sell it in this country within thirty days of the time it leaves the still. Whilst the very same product manufactured in Canada by the very same process, without the addition of these flavouring extracts, is required to be held in bond three years. Would it not be fair that some steps should be taken by the Excise Department to stop the importation of any hard spirits such as whiskies which have not been matured for the same length of time in bond in this country as Canadian made spirits are matured? This liquor is manufactured abroad, by men who run these silent stills, from refuse of all kinds, beet root refuse, potatoes and everything of that kind, while in Canada we compel the distiller to adopt a very high standard. The foreign distiller has an advantage any way because he can manufacture cheaper than the Canadian, and the very fact that his liquor is imported gives it an additional value, the consumer paying the duty. Will the minister investigate this, and may we expect any reform in the immediate future?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The importation of Scotch or any other whisky does not come within the province of the Inland Revenue Department. The Customs Department deals with it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. You should not allow the Minister of Customs to encroach on you, to run in his stuff in opposition to yours.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is quite true that the alcohol made in Canada is matured for two years before it is permitted to be sold. That regulation was made many years ago, I believe at the request of the manufacturers of alcohol in Canada. I do not know the motive in making it; it may improve the quality of the whisky. This requirement is maintained because the distillery men wish it, not because the department is particularly anxious to continue the two year period of maturing. We have no control over the manufacture of whisky in Scotland. There would, however, appear to be an unfair competition when liquor a month old from Scotland competes with Canadian liquor kept in bond for two years to mature. I do not know whether the Canadian is any better than the other; although I have sampled both, I am not a judge. I freely admit that there is an apparent hardship upon the Canadian distillers, but they have never made any representations to the department in that regard. Within the last month or two the compounders have made certain representations regarding labelling and mixing. Certain features of the question are now under consideration of the department. My hon. friend will see that the Excise Department has nothing whatever to do with imposing any conditions upon liquor imported into Canada.

Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., $90,000.

Mr. COWAN. Is the matter of fixing a standard for milk under the consideration of the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I think it is practically ready.

Mr. COWAN. What would you mean by a standard?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I presume we would lay down a percentage of butter fat, solids, &c., below which no cream or milk could be sold.

Mr. COWAN. How soon do you expect that standard to be ready?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The chief chemist of the Inland Revenue Department has been working on this question for many months because there are many articles to be considered. He is at present in consultation with two other expert chemists from Toronto and Montreal, in order to arrive at a standard in each case. I understand that the standards are very nearly completed and will be ready for approval by the government within a month or two.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much of this vote was for travelling expenses and how are the travelling expenses made up?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Auditor General's Report will state the amount of travelling expenses. The travelling expenses, of course, are the expenses of our district inspectors in the first place. We have some six or seven district inspectors, each of whom travels over his district four times a year. Then, the collector of each collecting district inspects all the subdivisions within his district and the travelling expenses of these officials accounts for the larger part of the expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have an item of $60 for car tickets in Ottawa. Do these high salaried officials at Ottawa get street car tickets as well?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is customary to allow street car tickets to the departmental officials who have to travel considerable distances to warehouses. For instance, the officers go over to Hull and it is thought to be more economical to give them street car tickets than to establish an office there.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobaccos, $85,000.

Mr. GOODEVE. From whom are these stamps obtained?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These stamps are all printed in the bank note establishment on Wellington street under a contract made by the Finance Department for the printing of postage stamps and all stamps used by the government.

Mr. GOODEVE. Are tenders called annually for this work?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the contract runs for a number of years.

Mr. GOODEVE. Does the minister know if a contract has been let by tender during the last 10 or 15 years?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I know it does not go back 15 years.

Mr. HENDERSON. There has been a change within 15 years because prior to the present government coming into power it was a Canadian firm that had the manufacturing of the stamps. It is only since the present government came into power that an American firm has been given the work.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand they got the contract because their tender was the lowest, but that matter is in the Finance Department. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is the government considering the question of having an establishment for printing stamps in connection with the mint?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, and if they take my advice they wont consider it for

one moment. The idea of connecting the mint with the printing of stamps is rather a curious combination of industry. The work done by the Wellington street firm is very excellent and very superior and in my opinion no better bank note printing is done on the continent of America or anywhere else in the world. I think it would be a great pity if the government undertook to do work of that kind. It is done much better and much cheaper than the government could do it.

Mr. GOODEVE. Does the minister not know that the government of the United States took away the contract from this very same company, and that they are now printing their stamps in connection with their mint and saving a very large sum of money thereby.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think the printing of stamps can be done in connection with the United States mint although it probably may be done by the government printing establishment in Washington.

L. A. Frechette, for special translation, $100.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is the same vote every year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What do we get for it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are circulars issued by the department and Mr. Frechette has done the work of translating them.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is he an officer of the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. He was the French translator of the House of Commons. I understand that he has been superannuated, and therefore I will move that the name be struck out of the vote.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. My hon. friend had better strike the item out. Surely he has in his department clerks who understand French and can translate these circulars.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have in the department several French clerks who are very excellent clerks; but my hon. friend knows that to be a good translator a man requires to be pretty highly educated in both languages, and I do not know that any of these clerks are highly enough educated to do this work.

Mr. TALBOT. I think it is high time the Minister of Inland Revenue appointed a few French Canadians in his department to do this work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it the policy of the government to superannuate men who can still work, or men who have done service and cannot work any longer? If this gentleman has been superannuated, how is it that he is not left to spend the rest of his days in rest, but is to be employed in doing this work?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is not a vote for superannuating any person. It is for paying for a small amount of translation required by the department.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not objecting to the amount, but to the principle of employing to do work a man who has been superannuated on the ground that he is past work.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that Mr. Fréchette has been superannuated since these estimates were printed, and for that reason I have moved to strike out his name so that the money can be paid to any one.

Provisional allowance of not more than $150 each to officers in Manitoba and provinces west thereof whose salaries from any government service do not exceed $1,000, $5,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is a vote we have taken for several years to pay these officers something extra on account of the greater cost of living in the west.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much was paid out on this account last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. $4,178.75.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is this sum voted to the minister so that he can pick out his political friends and donate $150 to each of them, and leave the poor Tories to go dry, or does he give it to all the officers?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. All the officers in the four western provinces, without regard to politics, receive from this vote a small amount, ranging from $25 to $100 according to salary. The smaller the salary a man receives the larger the sum he gets out of this vote.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by them, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c., $50,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Last year the amount expended for this purpose was about $40,000. This year we are reducing the vote by $10,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I see that $3,305 was paid to J. P. Wiser & Sons of Prescott, for non-potable spirits. Are these methylated spirits?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is precisely what this vote is for. We purchase non-potable grain alcohol from all the distillers, but principally, I think, from the Gooderhams, of Toronto. With this we mix wood alcohol to produce the methylated spirits sold by the department, and we get the money back with a slight profit.

Adulteration of food and the administration of the Act respecting fertilizers, fraudulent marking and commercial feeding stuff, $30,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is the usual vote.

Mr. COWAN. How much is expended in British Columbia for salaries of inspectors and others?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The amount is very little indeed. The inspectors of foods are officers of the department, who are appointed at very small sums, ranging from $100 to $200 and in some cases $300. They perform certain services when requisitioned, such as purchasing samples for the analyst. There is one in Vancouver and another in Victoria. In addition the provincial health officer has a retaining fee from the department of $400 as public analyst.

Mr. COWAN. Is one inspector in Vancouver sufficient?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One might do for the whole province.

Mr. COWAN. Is the minister aware that the amount of milk alone sold in the city of Vancouver would require the services of five inspectors? Does he know anything about the prosecutions for the adulteration of milk in Vancouver?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Department of Inland Revenue, under the Adulteration of Foods Act, has nothing to do with the prosecution of people for the selling of impure milk. That is a municipal matter. There is scarcely a city in the Dominion which has not by-laws in that connection and inspectors, and the department does not infringe upon municipal jurisdiction.

Mr. COWAN. Where do the municipalities get their power to pass their by-laws with regard to the adulteration of milk?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the Adulteration of Foods Act.

Mr. COWAN. In what section?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot say offhand but my hon. friend is a lawyer and must know. Every municipality has the power to appoint inspectors, and many have done it.

Mr. COWAN. I would have thought that as the subject has been dealt with here, the jurisdiction would be vested in this parliament.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Under clause 10 of the Adulteration of Foods Act, municipalities may appoint inspectors, but even in addition to that, if I remember rightly, the municipalities can protect themselves. They have jurisdiction with regard to hygienic conditions in dairy establishments and stables and that sort of thing, and I am inclined to think that, under the provincial law, the municipalities can be delegated that power. However, I would not care to enter into a legal controversy with my hon. friend who for years has been the solicitor for the municipality of the city of Vancouver. I would refer him also to section 13 of the Adulteration of Foods Act, which gives further power of the same kind.

Mr. COWAN. I do not seek to enter into a legal discussion with the minister, but am merely drawing his attention to the fact that the machinery of the Act is exceedingly cumbersome. Not only is the substantive part of the Act insufficient to protect the public, but the machinery is inadequate and complicated. I was going to suggest that it would be desirable to fix a standard for milk and that the machinery of the Act should be improved, because at present it is impossible to get a conviction under it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend that the Act can be improved, and I think that the first thing to do is to provide a standard. If we had a fixed standard for all food stuffs, we could enforce the Act much more effectively. That is a matter the department has under consideration.

Mr. COWAN. I am suggesting not only that the department should fix the standard, but that it should improve the machinery of the Act. For instance, the public, in order to reach the halls of justice, must go through the portals of your inspectors.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister comes before us this year, as in other years, and asks for money which, as at present used, is wasted or worse than wasted. He pays his inspectors to go about the country and buy samples of various articles. These samples are sent to Ottawa and analysed, and the results are published in a bulletin. The bulletin shows that three-quarters of these articles are adulterated. Yet no body is prosecuted, because there is no standard and the minister will not fix a standard. Practically every family in this country is using adulterated foods which are sold in the stores generally. The minister knows this, for the facts are before

him in his own bulletin. But it is the same old story—they have not fixed the standard and we cannot enforce the Act. I hold that we should not vote another dollar for this service until the minister says that any man who sells adulterated food will be prosecuted by the officers of the department.

Mr. COWAN. There are two things absolutely necessary in order to make that Act workable; one is the fixing of a standard and the other is the taking away from the inspectors of the power to shelter the guilty. I am not charging that they actually shelter the guilty, but what I do say is that the public cannot go directly into the courts and secure the enforcement of the Act except under onerous conditions. If these were changed, the machinery would be more workable.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think the results of the analyses of the collection made all over the country and the publication of the results have been good. The publicity thus given to the facts and also the prosecutions that have taken place and the imposition of penalties, so far as they have been imposed, have had a very good effect upon the purity of food-stuffs actually sold in Canada. I have here a memorandum showing the percentage of adulteration for ten years past, and in every case there is a considerable reduction in the percentage. For instance, in maple sugar the percentage of adulteration went down from 45 per cent in 1905 to 13 per cent in 1908; in maple syrup from 82 per cent to 13 per cent in the same period. In milk, the percentage below standard in 1890 was 22 per cent. It has varied year by year, going down as low as three or four per cent, but last year it was ten per cent. I have another memorandum showing the results of the analysis of a number of samples covering a very large variety of articles. I will not weary the House by reading it, but I may say that the result is exceedingly encouraging indeed, there being a far less percentage of adulteration in all lines to-day than there was even five years ago. I think this good result is, in a measure at all events, due to the enforcement of the Adulteration of Foods Act through the collection of samples and the publication of the bulletins.

Mr. G. TAYLOR.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister repeat what he said about prosecution; I did not hear it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Last year, a large number of prosecutions were entered against parties found guilty of adulteration or of having sold adulterated goods. These are the samples referred to in the bulletin.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many prosecutions were there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know how many actions, but I have here a statement of the amount paid in. This is what we have done: Where a dealer sold goods not up to a standard, we submitted to him that he should pay the cost of the analysis of the sample. In most cases, we found that the party with the adulterated goods in his possession was not the guilty party, but probably an innocent trader. And that, by the way, is one of the defects of the Act—we do not at all times reach the men who are guilty of the adulteration. So, in the case of adulteration of goods bought at a grocery store, for instance, we have said to the dealer: If you pay the costs the department has incurred up to the present time, we will not prosecute.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the minister prosecuted any?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In cases which I have before me, arising all over the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, sums of from $12 to $19 were paid by some thirty or forty different people. There were a great many other prosecutions.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. While the hon. member has the papers before him, will he read the names of the parties prosecuted?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I will hand my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) the list.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These are not the names of one-quarter of those against whom actions were entered, and who paid penalties of from $12 and, in one case, up to $66——

ADULTERATION OF FOOD—PENALTIES COLLECTED.

Year.	Name.	Place.	Sample.	Fine.
				$ cts.
1907-08	J. Lamoreau	Montreal	Jam	5 00
1907-08.	H. Delorme.	"	Butter	17 00
1907-08.	Geo. Bertrand	"	"	17 00
1908-09.	A. McIntyre	Stratford	Iodine	12 00
1908-09.	W. A. Cameron	Perth	"	12 00
1908-09.	M. Patterson	"	"	12 00
1908-09.	S. T. Emery	Montreal	"	12 00
1908-09.	Woodward Dept. Store	Vancouver	"	12 00
1908-09.	G. E. Hughes	Charlottetown	"	12 00
1908-09.	H. Skinner	Kingston	"	12 00
1908-09.	L. T. Best	"	"	12 00
1908-09.	A. P. Chowne	"	"	12 00
1908-09.	A. Thompson Co	Toronto	"	12 00
1908-09.	A. E. Drewery	Hamilton	"	12 00
1908-09.	D. W. C. Stevens	St. John, N.B.	"	12 00
1908-09.	S. Moisan	Montreal	"	12 00
1908-09.	W. F. Forgues	Montreal	"	12 00
1908-09.	G. F. & J. Galt	Calgary	Olive oil	25 00
1908-09.	The Geo. Matthews Co	Ottawa	Lard	62 00
1908-09.	U. Ethier	Quebec	Maple syrup	9 00
1908-09.	R. B. Dakin	Halifax	C. of tartar	5 00
1908-09.	A. Desbrisay		Maple syrup	12 50
1909-10.	Miss A. A. Drinkwater	London	Coffee	14 00
1909-10.	McLarty Bros	Owen Sound	"	19 00
1909-10.	H. Shay	Kingston	"	19 00
			25	372 00

These amounts are the amounts that the department offered to accept in lieu of prosecuting. We thought then and think still that the penalty then imposed was quite sufficient. There is still in the Justice Department a large number of cases for prosecution.

Mr. COWAN. That is the mystery of the case, why these amounts were paid. A man is guilty of selling adulterated food, that is, he has committed an offence, not against the department but against the public, and an analysis is made at the expense of the government inspector. The accused is brought up; some times he is brought before the man who has the patronage in the district, and sometimes to the inspector; he is brought up, and that is all. He is told: Now, if you pay the analyst so much, and the lawyer that is engaged in the matter so much, we will hush it up. Now, the minister has failed to show any cases of conviction. Again, if the minister wishes to make that Act useful, let him call on his department to do away with the machinery which puts the guilty man in the power of the inspector. I am not charging that any particular inspector has abused that power, but I come very near it, and I say that the figures the minister has read out show that these men, guilty of a crime against the public, are brought, not into the courts of justice—the only place where justice can be done to the public in case of an offence against the public—but into the office of some good Liberal lawyer, or bad Liberal lawyer, if you will; and he is told that if he will fork out $5, say to the analyst, and something to the lawyer, and something for somebody else, amounting perhaps to $82, as the minister says in one case, why, he can go scot free. The crime is condoned in the lawyer's office, not in court, for he never gets there. That is our experience all over Canada, at least on the coast, that this Act is not workable. The inspector has to shove his face into the prosecution, he is charged with the duty of enforcing the Act, and instead of chasing the guilty man into court, he chases into some private office and settles with him. I submit again that the minister has proven by his own figures that the machinery of that Act is in bad need of amendment. I would ask the minister if he has any cases of conviction?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, lots of them. I think my hon. friend is not as familiar with the mode of procedure under the Adulteration of Food Act as he ought to be. The inspector, who has been roundly abused by my hon. friend as shielding the guilty, has little or nothing to do with the enforcement of the Adulteration of Food Act. As a matter of fact, I have always thought that the title of inspector

of food is a misnomer. Under the Adulteration of Food Act the inspector is simply a clerk in the excise office, and receives from us a small salary, $100 or $200 a year in addition to his regular salary for the purpose of collecting samples, when he is advised by the chief chemist. He goes to a grocery store, or any other place, and he buys a sample, and divides it into three parts. He seals these in the presence of the dealer, leaves one sample with the dealer, and sends another to the head office in Ottawa. That is all he has to do; he is a witness, therefore, that that particular article was bought from that particular grocer. He puts his seal on it; and the sample sent here is analysed. Now, the inspector disappears altogether from the scene until there is a prosecution, when he is a witness to this fact only, that this is the sample of the butter, it may be, or the pepper, or whatever article that he bought from that particular dealer; that is all he has to do. He does not initiate proceedings, he has nothing to do with the prosecution, he has nothing to do with the settlement. The department in Ottawa, after these samples are analysed and adulteration is found to exist, places the matter in the hands of the Justice Department, and from that time until a settlement is reached the Inland Revenue Department has nothing more to do with the matter. My hon. friend has been unfair in his reflections upon the inspectors. They are our agents simply for the purpose of collecting samples for analysis. I am free to admit that the Adulteration of Food Act needs improvement, and I hope we will improve it. Certainly the first thing to do is to provide a standard of food, so we will not fail. One reason why in the last few years we have not prosecuted to a finish as much as we formerly tried to do, and why we accept the payment of the expenses of the department rather than go on and prosecute, is because in a prosecution, I think in the city of Montreal, the judge refused to convict because there was no standard. I imagine that another judge would follow that precedent and refuse to convict where there was no standard. I do not know that there is any more information I can give my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). I have said frankly that I think the Adulteration of Food Act ought to be improved, and I trust will be improved this session.

Mr. COWAN. Will the minister go further and admit that it is not a desirable mode of enforcing that Act that I, for instance, who might wish to prosecute for an offence under the Act, would have to go to the inspector and make a deposit of $25.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend cannot do that under the present Act. The inspector has nothing to do with that and never received a deposit, as far as I am aware.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. A deposit is required in certain cases under the Act before a private individual can prosecute.

Mr. COWAN. The Act provides that if upon analysis an article is found to be adulterated the person at whose instance the analysis is made may prosecute the offender upon making a deposit of $25 with the collector of Inland Revenue.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is not the inspector.

Mr. COWAN. It is the same thing, you have said that the officers of your department are your inspectors. It works out in the same way; I cannot get a prosecution unless I put up security. But if you commit a common law offence, an assault, I can lay an information and prosecute you. why is the distinction made?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The clause referred to is a provision whereby any person can prosecute, and I think that the provision requiring a deposit is very proper. Where there is adulteration the department carries on prosecutions and has done so to a very large extent, but there is also that provision that if a private individual desires to prosecute by making the deposit, I presume to cover the preliminary expenses, he is privileged to do so. While the provision is a proper one, I do not think it has been taken advantage of by any person.

Mr. COWAN. I take issue with the minister there, any man who has to do with the actual business of prosecuting offenders would disagree with him. As that Act is framed it is in the mind of the public that they have nothing to do with the enforcement of the Act. It is in the hands of the government and the local heelers are quick to catch on to that and get out of it whatever fees they can, so that there is a settlement and no conviction. I doubt if there could be a conviction because there is no fixed standard, but even if you had a standard the prosecution would lose its way in some government office and the case would never reach the court under that provision because there is an embargo placed on the public prosecuting under that Act.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. There may be something in what the hon. member has said about the framing of this Act in relation to prosecutions. I have had some experi-

ence as an attorney in the city of Montreal. The hon. member has asked for cases of conviction. In 1906 or 1907 when the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) held the portfolio of Inland Revenue, I was charged by this government to prosecute in five cases of adulteration, three of maple syrup, and two of butter. In the maple syrup prosecutions I secured three convictions and the defendants were fined $20. There was doubt in the mind of the magistrate about the working of the Act, especially in the absence of a Canadian standard. We acted upon an American standard and another provision of the Act under which we had to refer to a pharmacopeia, French or British, I do not remember exactly. Mr. Small, who was prosecuted, appealed to the Court of Appeal, criminal side. The case was argued before Mr. Justice Trenholme, who kept it en deliberè for a year; the appeal was allowed, the conviction quashed and a report made to the government to that effect. If I remember the argument advanced by Mr. Cotton, a very able lawyer for the defence, he objected to the provision of the law that the certificate of the analysis is prima facie evidence that has to be rebutted by the person accused. He also based his argument on the absence of a standard. After consultation with the gentleman who was acting as chief analyst in Ottawa just after the death of Mr. Macfarlane, we came to the conclusion that in order to do justice to the people of our community, many samples of maple syrup would have to be gathered from different points. In order to make it uniform or perhaps have different standards according to the different soil, land, or maple trees in the different provinces. The other two cases in which I was engaged were cases of the sale of oleomargarine. Both of the accused were found guilty and fined $20 and costs. So I am glad to be in a position to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) that convictions were secured. I think the department concluded that some amendment should be brought into force which would make the Act more workable.

As to the adulteration of milk, my hon. friend is aware that we have special legislation in Quebec which empowers the different towns and cities to pass by-laws on this question. The city of Montreal, for instance, has passed a by-law and almost daily in the report of the recorder's court you read items in the campaign against these offenders, against any Act, federal, provincial or municipal. They are very severely prosecuted and I do not see any reason to complain of the working of this Act. My impression is that the clause quoted by my hon. friend which enables the municipalities to take advantage of this Act, offers to those communities which are not populous enough to have a city charter an opportunity to pass by-laws for the proper inspection of the articles of food that are sold to the public.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) cannot cite a single case in which a private individual has been prosecuted to conviction, and he admits that in the absence of a fixed standard the Act is practically ineffective. The fact is that the Dominion government is playing dog in the manger. This statute does not fix the standard and should the provincial government legislate along the same lines and a prosecution be entered under the Dominion statute then the courts would say that the federal parliament having already exercised jurisdiction the provincial Act is ultra vires. This proves beyond doubt that the fixing of a standard by Dominion statute is an absolute necessity.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Does this item cover the expense of the analysis of the samples of food and of the fertilizers sent in for registration under the Act of last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When samples are sent in for registration they have already been analysed by the manufacturers, but this will cover the expense of the samples sent in by the people to be analysed at the laboratory.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What progress is being made in the registration under the Act of last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Very good progress. I think most of the manufacturers are registered now and the Act will go into force by the first of the year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister told us that when these samples are analysed and found adulterated he hands the case over to the Department of Justice. It seems to me that that is the end of it. I would like to know any manufacturer who has been prosecuted in connection with these adulterated food stuffs that are bought in the grocery stores.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When the chemist finishes his analysis and adulterations are found the case is sent to the Department of Justice as the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And that is apparently the end of it, because I have never heard of a case where the manufacturer or the seller of adulterated food has been prosecuted. It is time that the law should be put in force. It is all nonsense to hand the case over to the Department of Justice and let it remain hung up there when the proper course would be to institute these prosecutions at once and stop the sale of these adulterated articles.

Salaries, weights and measures inspection, $76,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. What revenue is received from the inspection of weights and measures?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. $8,000.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Sometimes people complain that they are charged too much for this inspection. What charges have the inspectors a right to make?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is a fixed tariff established by order in council.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the self-computing scales now so generally in use subject to the inspection of the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. All scales that are used for buying and selling must be inspected.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is the inspector allowed to charge for the cartage of the weights from the store to the station or wherever he is going to make the test and back again?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We pay all transportation charges, but the cartage charges from one store to another are borne pro rata by the different parties whose scales are inspected.

Mr. BLAIN. I am informed that there are a great many self-computing scales in use in the country that have not been inspected by the department. I assume that a specially trained officer would be required to make a proper inspection of scales of that kind.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have no reason to suppose that there are any scales anywhere in the country used for weighing products that are sold that are not regularly inspected. I am advised that the mechanical work of inspecting one scale is pretty much the same as that of inspecting another. Instructions are sent out by circular from the department to the inspectors informing them fully as to the best method of inspecting.

Salaries of gas and electric light inspectors, $40,000

Mr. STANFIELD. I understand that the law is that if you own the meter you have to pay for the inspection, but if you rent the meter the company that rents it to you pays for the inspection. Is that so?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would suggest that the law be changed to make the company pay for all the inspections.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is the owner of the meter, whether a company or a private individual, who pays for the inspection.

Mr. G. TAYLOR.

Mr. STANFIELD. That is not fair to the consumer, because he buys the meter from the company.

Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for gas and electric light inspection and the purchase and repairs of instruments, $25,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is an increase of $4,000, due to the increasing number of plants all over the country. Every small town now is having its own electric light, and the expense of inspection has increased considerably. We employ only qualified electricians as inspectors.

Inspection of export of electric power, $1,500.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The chief electric inspector has to proceed to places where electric power is generated and make an inspection and report. He made an inspection, for instance, and spent considerable time at Fort Francis and also at Niagara Falls.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Do we get any revenue from this?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The only revenue we get is the $50 license paid by the companies that export electricity.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why should the government look after the export of electrical power without getting some profit?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have had the Act several years and do not get any profit out of it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. These are private companies engaged in the business, and we should charge them sufficient license to cover the expense of administering the law.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I imagine that the object of the Act is, if deemed advisable, to restrict the export of elecric power or at all events to regulate it. We have it within our power to give permission to export or refuse that permission, as we think best in the public interest. It is necessary that our chief inspector should visit the different places and see what power is being developed and how much exported. We have to administer the Act and pay the expenses of adminisetering it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We ought to charge a higher license so that the Act will be self-sustaining and not be a drag on the country. These private companies are making money, and we certainly should make them pay a sufficient license to meet expenses. How often has the inspector to visit these places where the power is exported?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. At least once a year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And does that cost $1,500?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, we did not spend quite a thousand dollars last year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why then ask for $1,500?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The expense next year may be a little more than last.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Did it cost $1,000 to send an inspector once to these two places, Fort Francis and Niagara Falls?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. And New Brunswick.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How long was he at each place? Did each of these three visits cost $300?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am told that it took about a month altogether to make the trips.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He is paid a salary as well, and this is for expenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, purely expenses.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And that officer spends $900 on travelling expenses in one month?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The deputy minister informs me that he made a trip to London, England, to attend the international convention of electricians, and the expenses of that trip were charged to this item.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What right had the minister to send an inspector to England and charge his expenses against this item? He should ask for a special vote or take it out of miscellaneous expenses. In any event there is no need to vote $1,500 this year unless the minister contemplates giving him another trip to the old country.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We could get along with $1,000 if it were worth while changing the estimate.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the minister took a sum of money and gave an officer a trip to England unauthorized by parliament, we ought not to trust him with $1,500. If we deduct the trip to England, $100 each should pay the expenses to these three places.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The chief electrical engineer who attended the convention in London, was authorized to do so by order in council. It was a very important convention for the purpose of fixing the standard electrical union.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It was all right to send him there for information, but he was not sent there in connection with the export of electrical power and his expenses should be charged to some other vote. The minister admits that his expenses will cost some $200 or $300 and is asking $1,500. The item should be reduced to $500. That surely should pay the cost of visiting three places in the year, one trip to each place. He is asking for money which he does not know how to spend unless by giving some officer a trip to England and charging the expenses to this vote. The council had no right to authorize this man to go to England and charge his expenses to a vote when the House did not agree to it. I move that the item be reduced to $500.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I frankly admit that after the explanation given me by the deputy minister and the chief electrical engineer, $1,000 will do.

Inland Revenue Department—minor revenues, $500

Interior Department — ordnance lands — salaries and expenses, $1,655.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These minor revenues are collections, such as administering the Ferries Act, advertising for tenders for ferries, and printing law stamps to be used in the Yukon. The other item does not concern the Inland Revenue Department, that is revenue collected by the Interior Department.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why are these two items mixed up?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot explain as to the Interior Department, it is only one of the minor revenues.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Minister of the Interior should make an explanation of this item. I do not see why the items should be mixed in this way, charging part of the expenditure of the Interior Department to the Inland Revenue Department. We had better separate them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This vote has been taken for years, these items have been bracketted together, and I do not think either of them was ever discussed before.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We would like to know what this money was spent for, and the Minister of the Interior is not here to tell us.

Mr. PATERSON. Then we will have to let it stand.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,875,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Now I appeal to the Minister of Finance, we have done a good day's work, and it is time to adjourn. Both the leader of the opposition and the ex-minister of finance are absent, and there are very few members in the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the absence of these gentlemen indicates that they were content to let things run.

Mr. PATERSON. This is an increase—

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I appeal to the Minister of Finance that it is time to adjourn.

Mr. PATERSON. When my hon. friend is present, nothing will go through that should not go through. We have our officers here now, and it would be very inconvenient to if we were obliged to bring them here another day.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We have done a fair day's work, and owing to the absence of the leader of the opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance who is out of the country, I do not think that we should be asked to vote this large sum.

Mr. PATERSON. If these items don't go through to-night they will have to wait until January.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. You don't require this money until after the 31st of March. I again appeal to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Labour has advocated an eight hour day for the government service, and we have already passed the limit.

Mr. PATERSON. We have only passed three items to-day. But if the hon. gentleman will say that the leader of the opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance wish to be present why of course we shall have to wait.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I say that the ex-Minister of Finance wants to be present for all the items.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, if my hon. friend is determined not to go on with the public business, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

First annual report of the Civil Service Commission.—Mr. Murphy.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If we get through private members business on Monday, will the government go on with the estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue with the ministers who were on the programme this evening for estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 13, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67), respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—Mr. Worthington.

Bill (No. 68), respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 69), respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Bill (No. 70), to incorporate the Toronto Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Harris.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 71) respecting assaults and offences against the person. He said: The purpose of this Bill is explained by its title. I have added to it the provision of the Bill which I introduced last year relating to homicide by hunters in the woods. I cannot explain this clause more clearly than by using the words of an editorial in the Ottawa 'Citizen':

> Hunting is a sport. Homicide is a crime. When a keen or careless sportsman in the bush sees something that he thinks is a deer, he fires at it, and subsequently discovers that he has killed a man. If he had seen his target properly he would have known beyond doubt whether it was a deer or a man. Not seeing it properly, he is not sure which it is, but he deliberately takes the chance of killing a man rather than miss shooting a deer. In other words, he does not give the human being the benefit of the doubt. If he gave the deer the benefit of the doubt, and it got away, he would lose about ten dollars' worth of venison. If he gave the man the benefit of the doubt, the life of a human being would be saved. Any hunter who will run the risk of killing a human being rather than risk losing ten dollars' worth of venison deserves to be in the penitentiary. Therefore, the 'Citizen' thinks that the Bill of Mr. Lewis, M.P., to amend the Criminal Code should pass.

The other clauses of the Bill refer to assaults upon women and to punishment of tramps. I have here small items from newspapers from many parts of Canada. I may just mention some of them: A despatch from Barrie, 'Young farmer committed on charge of criminal assault'; from Stratford, 'Stratford girl attacked; Cries frightened the man and he fled;' from London, 'Frightened to death by a tramp;' from Winnipeg, 'Another brute;' from Winnipeg, 'Tinsmith arrested; charged with criminal assault upon a child;' from Vancouver, 'Fiendish murder of a

seven-year-old.' This Bill proposes heavier punishment for such offences. How often, when a man is arrested for stealing—even if he has only stolen something to eat—the offender gets from three to five or even ten years. I have before me a newspaper item about a man getting fifteen years for breaking into a car in the city of Victoria. Here is another about a man who got three years for sending indecent post cards. But the man who assaults a child of five years gets only three months. This Bill proposes to punish the wrong doer in such cases in such a way as to prevent the recurrence of such crimes.

Another clause has to do with what may be called a custom in this country which leads more to crimes by tramps than any other. In Ontario, at least, it is quite common for a magistrate before whom a prisoner is brought for having no visible means of support, to allow the man to go on the condition that he moves to another county. And in how many cases is that productive of crime? Take the case of the horrible murder committed in the city of Stratford, for which the criminal has just paid the last penalty; within the three weeks before that crime was committed that man had been arrested four times and had been allowed to go on condition of going into another county. The Bill empowers the magistrate, in the case of a man arrested the second time as a vagrant, to send him into confinement under indeterminate sentence as a dangerous character to be at large.

And, Mr. Speaker, in view of the information contained in the newspapers to some items of which I have already referred, and many others which I have collected, I would ask your permission to say to the government that, in my opinion this Bill and others relating to criminal law should be referred to a committee for consideration. It is twenty years since the Criminal Code was really revised. I would suggest that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is a large committee with little to do, a committee composed of lawyers, experts in the enforcement of the criminal law, should have its power enlarged so that it may take into consideration this question of our Criminal Code and the amendments proposed thereto. In accordance with this purpose, it might be called the Committee on Privileges, Elections and the Criminal Law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAVING OF DAYLIGHT.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 72) respecting the saving of daylight. He said : This is the Bill which I introduced last year, and which was considered and favourably reported by a committee of this House. I wish to say that of all the replies we have received, from one end of the country to the other, by boards of trade and by councils, we have had only one objection advanced against the provision of this Bill. When the Bill was first brought up in the imperial House it was laughed at; but it was brought up again, and on the second occasion the House saw fit to appoint a committee of nine members to examine the Bill, and that committee reported absolutely in its favour It has come before the imperial House again, and the imperial House has found one or two reasons, on the eve of an election, why it would not be suitable for England. But those reasons do not apply to this country, and in England they are only thought to apply to the city of London and other large cities, in so far as it might affect theatres and the milk trade. Now, Sir, I contend that if this Bill were passed by this House it would operate one of the most beneficent revolutions in Canada, and after the people had tried it three months it would be absolutely impossible to repeal it. Millions of dollars would be saved to the people now expended on artificial light, and the benefit to public health would be incalculable. The heads of the great railways of this country, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk, are of the opinion that this Bill would be an incalculable benefit to them; because, if you take the records of the railways themselves, you will find that many, many thousands of dollars loss and many fatal accidents occur which would not occur if the trains were run to a larger extent by daylight, and they would be able to finish their journeys almost entirely by daylight. Now, Sir, I ask the government to appoint a committee to examine this Bill, and I think I may venture to say that there is not an hon. gentleman within the sound of my voice, who has examined and clearly understands this Bill, who is not entirely in favour of it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTEREST ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. MILLER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 73) to amend the Interest Act. He said: This Bill is substantially the same as the Bill I introduced a short time ago.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDWARDS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: The Bill which I am asking the permission of this House to introduce is identically the same as the

Bill I introduced last session. It is designed to do away with the discrimination which at present exists against Ontario vessel owners, and it seeks to amend the Canada Shipping Act by introducing the word 'Ontario'.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. HARRIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The object of this amendment is to make it a specific offence for a chauffeur, or any one else other than the owner of an automobile, to use said automobile without the consent or permission of the owner. This is a practice which is becoming altogether too common in Canada, and during the past season many instances of this kind have occurred, causing danger to life and property. In New York state they have passed an amendment similar to this, and I think the Bill I am introducing will commend itself to all the members of this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HARLAND AND WOLFF, SHIP BUILDERS.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government if they have any information about a report of Mr. Clark, an expert sent out to this country by Harland and Wolff to investigate the conditions of ship building. According to some of the newspapers, he has made a report, and it has been brought to the knowledge of the government. If so, I think it very desirable that the House of Commons should see it, and I would ask the government to let us have that report upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his seat to-day. I do not know if he has received such a report; so far as my information goes, no such report has been received by him. The minister will be here the day after to-morrow, and I will ask him about it.

COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to inquire of the government when they intend to introduce the Bill mentioned in the speech from the Throne rendering more effective the present legislation respecting combinations which unduly enhance prices?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give any information to-day. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before you leave the Chair, I rise to a question of privilege. I see in an article in the 'Standard' of December 11, that I have criticised the hon. the Minister of Agriculture for neglecting the duties of his department. I criticised him to some extent. I suggested to the House that it should look into the possibilities of this department in assisting the farmer. I criticised the hon. gentleman to this extent that I thought he had not done enough for the farmers, that he had allowed the money of Canada to be expended, for the Militia Department, for instance, that ought to have been expended for the Department of Agriculture. This article goes on to say that the Department of the Minister of Agriculture is one department that had never been criticised for jobbery or anything of that kind. Now, I will make the charge against the Minister of Agriculture that there is no department in the government where, in certain seasons, so much grafting exists as in his department.

OTTAWA NORTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 34) respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

On section 1: time for construction of railway extended.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, you will remember that at the last sitting of the committee the amendment that was made to this Bill by the Railway Committee went wrong in redrafting. The amendment made by the committee has now been drafted in accordance with the motion of the committee, and I think you will find it quite clear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The clause as proposed reads as follows:

The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company may, within two years after the passing of this Act, construct and complete the railway extensions and branches authorized to be constructed by section 1 of chapter 84 of the statutes of 1899, and by section 1 of chapter 72 of the statutes of 1900, and shall within the said two years expend thereon, including the expenditure already made, an amount equal to 15 per cent of its capital stock, and if the said railway extensions and branches are not so commenced and the said expenditure is not so made, or if the railway extensions and branches are not completed and in operation within five years after the passing of this Act, then the powers of construction conferred upon the said company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway, extensions and branches as then remain uncompleted.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is not the amendment that passed the Railway Committee. In the amendment that passed the Railway Committee the 15 per cent was to be new expenditure.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, after full discussion, it was understood that the 15 per cent was not to be new expenditure. The committee decided to put in a clause which we inserted in a couple of Bills last year, providing that they shall expend an amount equal at least to 15 per cent of the capital stock, including the expenditure already made.

Mr. TURRIFF. All I can say is that if we decided in the committee to adopt a clause that was not read, but which had been adopted upon one or two previous occasions, many of those did not understand it in that way, because the matter was discussed in the committee and it was decided that in renewing the charter they were to begin operations within two years and 15 per cent of the capital stock of the company was to be expended during that time, not including what had already been expended. If you include what already has been expended you might as well not pass this clause at all, for the simple reason that many years ago a considerable portion of the railway was built and that would cover the 15 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. The clause passed the committee just as it has been read, because I remember distinctly calling attention to the fact that they commenced the railway long ago and that the expenditure then made would cover the proposed new expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. I understood it to pass in the committee just as the minister says. It was very clear to me at the time, and I have no doubt at all that what the minister says is absolutely correct.

Mr. LENNOX. I recollect it as the minister states it. All the same, the contention of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is what a good many of us contended for last year and what I have no doubt will be right. But, as a matter of fact, the other day, after it was discussed, it was determined to have it in the form in which it now is. We would be doing a good deal better if we did follow what we adopted last year on one or two occasions when we inserted a provision in the form now suggested by the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). As he has pointed out, some 80 odd miles of this road have been already built and there only remains about 16 miles to be built; so that, everybody realizes that more than 15 per cent has already been expended on the road.

Mr. GRAHAM. This road consists of a long stretch that is not yet completed. There is one link to connect Pembroke, but that is only a small portion of the uncompleted part of the railway. That is the part that would appeal to the town of Pembroke, but the charter itself covers a very large mileage outside of that link. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Hodgins) pressed very hard to have the committee say that this piece at least should be completed within one year. After a great deal of discussion I made the suggestion that we insert the clause as it now appears before the committee. The promoter of the Bill accepted that and it was passed by the committee.

Mr. HODGINS. Does that apply to all the unconstructed parts of the line?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HODGINS. It is not possible that within two years the Canadian Pacific railway can construct the different branches that their charter calls for. I still feel, as I stated in the committee, that it would be better to confine that 15 per cent to the branch between Waltham and Pembroke. I think that would meet the wishes of the people who are concerned, and that it would also be in the best interests of the country.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 46), to incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. White.

Bill (No. 45), respecting the Phoenix Assurance Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonald.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

How many charters for branch railway lines have been granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company; and how many of said lines are at present under construction, where located, the extent of line built on each and whether operated or not?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

1. (a) 22, 5 on the Eastern division, 17 on the Western division.

(b) Three.

(c) Two, in Saskatchewan. One in Alberta.

(d) Twenty-five miles on one, thirty-five on another, twenty-five on the third.

(e) Three are being operated.

WARSHIPS ON GREAT LAKES.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE:

Referring to the terms of the Rush-Bagot convention of April 29, 1817, and the agreement between Great Britain and the United States (after stating the establishment that would be by each nation in the future maintained there), that all other armed vessels on the lakes should be forthwith dismantled, and that no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed:—

1. Have any representations been made to the imperial government to have this clause modified so that war vessels can be built on the Great Lakes and sent through the canal for armament on the Atlantic coast?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to make such representation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. No representations have been made to the questions.

2. It is not the intention of the government to make any such representations as no condition has yet arisen which would make it desirable to do so.

EXCURSION TRAIN FROM TRURO TO TATAMAGOUCHE.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Did a special excursion train leave Truro for Tatamagouche via Stellarton on September 13, 1909.?

2. If so, what were the total receipts and expenditures of the same, and was there a guarantee put up before the train left Truro? If so, how much, and by whom? If no guarantee was put up, on whose authority did train leave for destination?

3. Has the department collected such guarantee?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. Total receipts were $154.80, expenses, $66.35. The cost of the train was guaranteed by Mr. Pearson and the train authorized by the chairman of the board.

3. The train earnings having exceeded the cost, the guarantee was complied with.

LANDS FOR NAVAL DEFENCE.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

Are there any lands in Canada available for defraying cost of the naval defence? If so, what is the amount and where situated?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. Chapter 58 of the Revised Statutes sets apart certain lands for naval purposes. The list is contained in the statute.

LACHINE CANAL DISMISSALS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the reason for the dismissal of Demers, Bouchard, Tanguay, Crevier, Gariépy, Tellier, Latranche, Pagé, Mayrand, St. Jean, Savard, De Bellefeuille, Drapeau, Larivée, on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien?

2. What were the reasons for the reinstatement of Savard and De Bellefeuille, Drapeau and Larivée?

3. What were the reasons for the dismissal of Savard and De Bellefeuille the second time?

4. How long before the general dismissal of the men above mentioned was Wm. O'Brien promoted to be assistant carpenter?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The necessity of keeping within limits of the appropriation; about 40 other employees, besides the carpenters had to be laid off, at the same time and for the same reason.

2. Some urgent works had to be done at Seignieurs Street Bridge; Savard and De-Bellefeuille were taken on to do it, the work only lasted a few days. Savard left of his own accord, before the work was fully completed, as he found the weather too cold. Drapeau was taken back on the 24th September last. Larivée was not laid off but kept on as spare man to work on locks, bridges and road repairs.

3. The work given them to do was completed.

4. In May, 1907, as handy man with carpenters, and promoted to assistant carpenter, 4 months before laying off the men.

DOUGLAS FIR FOR LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. How many feet of Douglas fir lumber, used for lock doors is now in possession of the department on Lachine canal in a proper state to be used?

2. How many feet that is not proper to be used for new work or repairs is now on hand?

3. Is it the intention of the department to order any more? If so, what will be the quantity and from whom?

4. How many lock doors are to be made during this winter by the department?

5. How many lock doors are to be repaired, and is all this work new and repairs to be done by the department?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 3,980 feet of lock gate timber.

2. None.

3. Some of the material is already ordered for the coming year, as it takes from two to three months to bring it from British Columbia. The J. T. Marchand Lumber Company are supplying this timber, under their contract accepted by the department.

4. The carpenters that have been retained will be employed on one pair of gates, inso far as the balance of the appropriation will permit.

5. None will be repaired until April, 1910. All works on the Lachine canal lock gates are to be done by the repair staff of the canal.

RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Have all the squatters withing the Riding Mountain timber reserve been removed?

2. If not, how many are still residing within the reserve? If any, is it the intention to remove all of them?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. No.
2. (a) One. (b) Yes.

AIRSHIPS FOR MILITARY DEFENCE.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM:

1. Has the government given any consideration to the advisability of developing the construction of aeroplanes or dirigible airships in Canada in connection with military defence?
2. What steps, if any, does the government propose to take for this purpose?
3. Has the government taken into consideration the advisability of granting assistance to persons in Canada who have already made some progress along this line?
4. Generally, what information has the government to give to the House in connection with this subject?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. The matter is being closely followed, but no definite action has been decided upon.

3 and 4. The government is being largely guided by the action of the War Office, in England, in this respect. It is thought that the question has hardly reached the stage that it is desirable for the Dominion government to spend money in assisting inventors, but all reasonable facilities will be afforded to persons, possessing satisfactory credentials, in the way of giving the use of government land for the purpose of experiment.

VICTORIA IMMIGRATION BUILDING.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. What was the total cost of the immigration building at Victoria, British Columbia?
2. What is the annual cost of up-keep?
3. When was the building completed, and what number of immigrants have used the building since completion?
4. What is the nationality of such immigrants?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $84,738.30, including site.
2. It is hardly possible at this stage to give a definite answer to this question, as it depends upon the number of inmates in the building; the building, if occupied to its fullest capacity, would cost, for lighting, about $1,200 per annum and, for heating, about $250 per annum.
3. (a) The building is virtually completed.

3. (b) and 4. To be answered by the Departments of Interior and of Trade and Commerce.

QUEBEC SUPERIOR COURT.

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Before the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, sitting at Montreal, for the district of Montreal, how many cases were standing en délibéré, before the judges of the said court on the 1st day of December, 1909?
2. How many of these cases were en délibéré before each of the said judges, respectively?
3. Outside of the cases above mentioned, how many were there at the date aforesaid of pending cases inscribed, waiting their turn on the roll for the district of Montreal?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. The government has no information on this subject. The matter is entirely within the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities.

WINDSOR BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Is the section of railway from Windsor Junction to Windsor, Nova Scotia, known as the Windsor branch, under lease? If so, to whom, on what terms, and for what length of time?
2. Can the lease be terminated by either party? If so, on what condition?
3. Upon what terms is the Dominion Atlantic railway granted running rights over the International railway from Windsor Junction.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, under agreement dated December 13, 1892, to the Windsor & Annapolis Railway Company. Limited (name changed to Dominion Atlantic Railway company. Canada 1894, chap. 69). The company to have the exclusive use of buildings, appurtenances and other conveniences (not including rolling stock and tools for repairs) in use thereon at the time of the agreement, attached to the branch between Windsor Junction and the junction of such railway with the then Windsor & Annapolis at or near Windsor. The company to employ their own station agents, booking clerks, switchmen and other servants for the management of its traffic. The government maintain the railway and works. The company to pay monthly one-third of the gross earnings from all traffic carried by the company over the branch. Term for 21 years from January 1, 1893.
2. The agreement may be terminated by the government upon failure of the company to operate between Halifax and Annapolis.
3. Under the agreement above mentioned the company to have use to the extent required for its traffic of the railway, appurtenances and other conveniences as lie between terminus at Halifax and Windsor Junction (both inclusive) not including machine shops or other buildings and appliances for repairs of rolling stock, together with any extension into Halifax, to be made after date of agreement. The company to employ their own booking clerks, carting agents, and such other staff as may be necessary for the booking, collecting and handling of the company's own traffic. The company to maintain the railway and its works. The company to pay the government, monthly, one-third of the gross earnings from all traffic carried by the company over the railway.

Term 21 years, from January 1, 1893. Agreement may be terminated by the government upon failure of the company to operate between Halifax and Annapolis.

FRONTENAC COUNTY MILITARY CAMPS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many acres of land in the township of Pittsburg, county of Frontenac, are held by the government for military purposes?

2. Where and from whom were these lands acquired, and what price was paid in each case?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

Situation of Land.	Acreage.	From whom purchased.	Date of acquisition.	Price paid
1. Point Frederick (Old Dockyard) including Royal Military College Grounds.	57·0	Crown Reserve, set aside by letters patent by General Haldimand and Lt. Governor Hamilton.	Sept. 11, 1783 May 22, 1785	Nil.
2. Fort Frederick and adjacent land.	8·5	Crown Reserve, set aside by letters patent by General Haldimand and Lt. Governor Hamilton.	Sept. 11, 1783 May 22, 1785	Nil.
3. Fort Henry and Barriefield common.	556·0	Crown Reserve, set aside by letters patent by General Haldimand and Lt. Governor Hamilton.	Sept. 11, 1783 May 22, 1785	Nil.
4. Cedar Island, tower and glacis .	23·0	Crown Reserve, set aside by letters patent by General Haldimand and Lt. Governor Hamilton.	Sept. 11, 1783 May 22, 1785	Nil.
5. Part of lot 20, western addition of township of Pittsburg.	125·505	Robert McDonald and wife	July 6, 1844	Not known.
6. Part of lot 21, western addition of township of Pittsburg.	102·0	R. D. Cartwright and wife by deed of exchange.	Mar. 20, 1840	Nil.
7. Front part of lot 16, western addition of township of Pittsburg.	4·5	Bought by Admiralty from Richard O'Connor, R.N. (consolidated statutes, cap. 37) ...	Aug. .., 1812	Not known.
8. Addition to rifle range, Kingston .	165·40	Bought from Messrs. Milton, Brooks and Kelly.....	1908 and 1909.	$9,445.
9. " " ..	188·89	Bought from Messrs. T. Sibbett, H. Milton, F. Cammick, Gillespie, R. Baillie .	1909....	Under expropriation.

THE DECENNIAL CENSUS.

Mr. BOYER:

Is it the intention of the government to have the decennial census taken during the present year?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

No. The Census and Statistics Act provides that a census shall be taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and eleven, (on a date in the month of June) to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and every tenth year thereafter.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARMAMENT.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. What is the reason for the re-armament of the whole field artillery, as stated to be the intention of the department in P—94 of the report of the militia council?

2. What kind of guns are being replaced by Q.F. 18 pr. guns?

3. In what particular are the Q.F. 18 pr. guns considered better than the guns they are replacing?

Mr. GRAHAM.

4. How many guns have been replaced, and what use does the government propose to make of the guns so replaced?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. To keep up to date by acquiring a more powerful weapon. The artillery of all field armies is now armed with quick firing guns.

2. 12-pr. B. L. guns.

3. Increased rate of fire, increased range, increased shell power, shields to cover detachments.

4. Thirty-two. The example of the imperial army will be followed by utilizing these guns for positions where rapidity of fire and increased power of projectile are not so essential as in a mobile field army.

The remaining four Q. F. 18-pr. guns have been distributed for instructional purposes.

COBOURG HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. THORNTON:

1. What amount has been expended on Cobourg harbour during each of the years 1907, 1908 and 1909?

2. What contracts have been made by the government for improvements and repairs during the past three years?

3. What amount is involved in each of these contracts?

4. Will the contracts already let finish up all the improvements contemplated by the government?

5. When will the work be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. In 1907-8	$ 25,590 34
1908-9	34,616 84
1909-10	54,669 80
Total	$114,876 98

2 and 3. Dredging was performed during the above-mentioned years, under contract with W. E. Phin, at a total cost of $56,-024.02. A contract, in the sum of $139,000, has been entered into with the Randolph Macdonald Company, Limited, of Toronto, for the construction of two breakwaters.

4. Yes.

5. Construction of breakwaters to be completed on the 18th of August, 1910.

WALKERVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. Does the government contemplate the placing of any appropriation in the supplementary estimates for the erection of a post office at Walkerville?

2. If so, what is the amount of such contemplated appropriation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The matter is under consideration.

NORTHWEST LANDS.

Mr. WALLACE:

Are townships 52, 53 and 54, range 15, west of the 5th principal for sale? If so, what are the terms? If not, are they open for homesteading?

Mr. OLIVER. The above townships are not for sale. They are open for homesteading, with the exception of part of township 54, which is within a timber berth.

DEPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

How many persons have been deported from Canada to their respective countries since the passing of the Act for the deportation of undesirable immigrants and since the passing of the Act 6-7 Edward VII., chapter 19, amending section 2 of the Immigration Act, chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906?

Mr. OLIVER:

Rejected at port of landing	4,896
Deported after admission	3,606
Total	8,502

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

How many children under 16 years of age have been brought before the criminal tribunals of Canada, and condemned, during the five years preceding the 30th day of September, 1909, in the different provinces and territories of the Dominion, but more particularly in the capital of each of the provinces and the city of Montreal?

Mr. FISHER. The government has no information on this subject except in the returns for statistical purposes to the Department of Agriculture. All the returns for the year ended 30th September, 1909, have not yet been received by the department. The figures for the five years previous thereto are as follows, for indictable offences:

—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	Total in 5 Years.
Prince Edward Island	2	2	4	5	5	18
Nova Scotia	66	42	25	48	38	219
New Brunswick	14	16	22	16	28	96
Quebec	124	205	194	230	227	1,029
Ontario	389	431	383	499	661	2,363
Manitoba	81	75	116	148	117	537
Saskatchewan	4	3	1	3	26	51
Alberta			4	1	9	
British Columbia	14	24	33	54	43	168
Yukon	3	3	.....	.....	.....	6
Total of Canada	697	800	782	1,004	1,204	4,487

The returns as to summary convictions group the offenders without regard to age.

Prosecutions for criminal offences are in the hands of the provincial authorities.

SPEEDY TRIAL ACT.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

1. How many cases have been heard and judgment given in the cities of Montreal and

Quebec, respectively, under the Speedy Trial Act, each year from the 30th day of September, 1898, to the 30th day of September, 1909?

2. How many trials by jury have been heard and judgment given by the Court of the King's Bench, criminal jurisdiction, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, respectively, each year during the same period?

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

1. The government has no information on this subject.

2. Prosecutions for criminal offences are in the hands of the provincial authorities.

MILITARY TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

(a) What amount has been expended to date by the Department of Militia and Defence upon topographical work, and (b) what area has been surveyed and mapped out?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

(a) $142,666.25.

(b) Area completely surveyed, 17,000 square miles; area prepared for taking of topography (controlled), 4,565 square miles; area of sheets lithographed and issued 7,276 square miles.

MILITARY CLERKS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the government aware that men are said to be enlisted to be military clerks without having to pass any examination as to their qualifications, and that such clerks are being paid upon enlistment at a rate two hundred and thirty dollars in excess of the minimum rate for subdivision B, third division, in the Civil Service of Canada, appointments to which are only to be had by competitive examination?

2. Is the government aware that such clerks get an increase at a rate of seventy-three dollars per annum after three months' service?

3. If so, why are such high rates paid to military clerks for ordinary clerical work?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would suggest that the words 'said to be' in the first paragraph be struck out, as I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intends to base his question on gossip. If the hon. gentleman consents to that, the answer is as follows:

1. As far as the Militia Department is concerned, the individuals employed in subdivision 'B', 3rd division Civil Service, have not the military knowledge or experience to perform the work carried out by military staff clerks, who are non-commissioned officers with previous military service and special qualifications, and also older men. They have to undergo three months' probationary service before being finally approved. The men of the corps are liable to be drafted wherever their services may be required, and are also available for active service. Each man has to provide himself with uniform, &c., out of the salary he receives. The military staff clerk has not the opportunity of reaching a higher grade than that of sergeant-major, and after twenty years' service would not receive as high a salary as the maximum of 3rd division subdivision 'A' Civil Service.

2. Yes. This is not an increase for three months' service, but is the rate laid down after probationary service has been completed and no further increase can be paid until after three years' service.

3. It is considered that the class of man required could not be obtained for a lower salary, and men frequently leave because they are able to better themselves in civil life.

SUCCESSOR TO THE LATE SENATOR FERGUSON, P.E.I.

Mr. FRASER:

Is it the intention of the government to fill the vacancy in the Senate caused by the death of the late Senator Ferguson, Prince Edward Island, before the end of the present session?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope so.

CANCELLATION OF LAND GRANT TO PEACE RIVER COLONIZATION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the grant of lands in the Northwest by the Crown to the Peace River Colonization and Land Development Company, under order in council of the 27th, July, 1900, as amended by order in council of the 8th July, 1904, been cancelled? If so, when?

2. What were the reasons for said cancellation?

3. Has the said grant of said lands, or any part of them, been renewed in favour of any other grantees?

4. If a new grant of said lands in whole or in part has been made, in favour of whom, at what date, and on what conditions has said new grant been made?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes. by order in council of the 3rd September, 1909.

2. Conditions of the grant were not complied with, as the company did not locate the required number of settlers on the lands reserved within the prescribed time.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

WOOL AND YARNS—EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. What was the quantity of worsted and woollen yarns imported into Canada during each year from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, the number of pounds and the value for each year?

2. What quantity and value of wool was imported into Canada each year from 1900 to 1909, inclusive?

3. What quantity and value of wool was exported from Canada during each year from 1900 to 1909, inclusive?

4. What is the total value and quantity of wool produced in Canada during each year from 1900 to 1909, inclusive?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of woollen and worsted yarns imported into Canada during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

Fiscal Years.	Yarns, woollen or worsted, costing 30 cts. per lb. or over, imported by manufacturers of woollen goods.		Woollen and worsted yarns, n.o.p.		Yarns, woollen or worsted, imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels, &c., and mohair yarn.	
	Lbs.	$	Lbs.	$	Lbs.	$
1900	546,536	257,654	298,971	121,289	63,583	28,368
1901	503,608	240,424	318,817	138,838	102,138	30,602
1902	650,767	283,538	446,969	166,074	238,540	26,292
1903	948,263	435,484	1,006,930	286,142	45,641	19,004
1904	1,155,020	504,708	500,544	187,731	78,218	35,613
1905	1,421,015	639,198	333,287	172,590	66,151	29,359
1906	1,554,524	753,468	285,419	160,102	54,898	26,891
1907 (9 mos.)	1,134,468	579,271	170,969	109,549	42,929	20,987
1908	2,048,857	1,097,648	336,624	183,335	53,949	26,516
1909	1,695,556	878,860	324,507	179,188	36,619	14,841

2. The quantity and value of wool imported into Canada during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

	Wool, not further prepared than washed.	
	Lbs.	$
1900	8,054,669	1,574,834
1901	8,574,605	1,292,895
1902	10,360,738	1,374,054
1903	7,994,704	1,239,998
1904	7,339,369	1,319,735
1905	7,617,211	1,553,431
1906	6,311,837	1,489,268
1907	3,928,791	853,152
1908	6,129,216	1,407,274
1909	5,683,948	1,042,662

3. The quantity and value of wool exported from Canada during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows:

	Lbs.	$
1900	2,213,863	420,776
1901	1,152,661	197,581
1902	1,973,772	302,245
1903	2,527,450	382,935
1904	1,836,566	315,207
1905	2,004,559	425,939
1906	1,505,384	368,679
1907	1,290,130	346,230
1908	1,956,987	473,306
1909	1,137,099	210,614

MILITIA—PAY AND ALLOWANCE REGULATIONS, &c.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are the pay and allowance regulations of the militia so construed as to admit of officers entitled to engineer pay, for the days they are employed on the duties of their corps, drawing the same for Sundays and holidays when they are not so employed?

2. Is engineer pay issued to non-commissioned officers and men for Sundays under the same conditions as issued to officers?

3. Is the issue of artillery pay subject to the same limitations as to employment, leave, and absence on account of illness, as those of engineer pay and corps pay? If so, under what article of the pay regulations? If not, why not?

4. Is corps pay issued to officers of the permanent army service corps and Canadian ordnance corps for Sundays and holidays when not employed on the duties of their corps, and is it issued to non-commissioned officers and men for such days under the same conditions as to officers? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Engineer officers are considered to be employed on Sundays and holidays and they are, therefore, permitted to draw engineer pay continuously, except when absent on leave or sickness in excess of thirty days in the year.

2. No.

3. No. Because the regulations for issue of artillery pay are different to those prescribed for engineer and corps pay. The regulations governing all such rates of pay being made, as far as possible, to conform to the regulations in force in the British army.

4. Corps pay to officers of Canadian permanent army service corps and Canadian ordnance corps is issued under the same regulations as engineer pay. See reply to 1.

The conditions, as regards issue of corps pay to non-commissioned officers and men of these corps, are different to those governing issue to officers, as it is considered desirable, as far as possible, to conform to the regulations in force in the British army.

EXPENDITURES FOR PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF CONTAGIOUS DISEASES.

Mr. MILLER:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the government in each of the

past five years for the prevention and suppression of contagious diseases in horses, cattle, sheep and swine, and what has been the expenditure for each of said classes of animals?

2. What amount of money has the government expended in each of the same years for the prevention and suppression of contagious and other diseases of human beings, including as well as other expenditure the money spent for quarantine, and the annual grant to the Canadian Anti-Tuberculosis Association?

Mr. FISHER:

1. The total expenditure is as follows:

1904-5	$190,253 27
1905-6	421,993 50
1906-7	276,667 99
1907-8	320,538 10
1908-9	325,385 29
	$1,534,838 15

The expenditure consists largely of the salaries and travelling expenses of the inspectors who deal with all classes of animals, and no apportionment among the different classes is made. The compensation, however, for animals slaughtered under 'The Animal Contagious Diseases Act' is as follows:

—	Horses.	Cattle.	Hogs.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1904-5	53,009 39	1,568 00	7,032 73	61,610 12
1905-6	265,114 15	1,632 00	6,531 11	273,277 26
1906-7	119,857 24	.....	1,566 67	121,423 91
1907-8	111,139 58	.....	2,624 00	113,763 58
1908-9	77,405 14	.....	8,307 44	85,712 58
Totals	626,525 50	3,200 00	26,061 95	655,787 45

There has been no compensation for cattle since the fiscal year 1906-7, the department having demonstrated that the Pictou cattle disease, the only disease affecting cattle for which compensation is given, is not a contagious disease.

2. 1904-5 $114,473 65
1905-6 111,754 76
1906-7 86,988 64
1907-8 154,841 52
1908-9 125,935 54
$593,994 11

MAIL CONTRACT WITH CAPT. NOONAN.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has Captain Noonan, of Kingston, a contract for carrying the mail?

2. If so, what post offices are served under his contract, and what pay does he receive for such service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes.

2. Manotick, Kars, Burritt's Rapids, Merrickville, Smith's Falls, Rideau Ferry, Kilmarnock, Portland, Westport, Newboro', Chaffey's Locks, Jones' Falls, Seely's Bay, Brewer's Mills, Washburn, Kingston Mills. $600 per season.

MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN RIVER HEBERT AND MINUDIE N.S.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mail between River Hebert and Minudie, Nova Scotia, and was the contract let by tender? If so, what are the names of the several persons who tendered, the amount of each tender, and what is the term of the contract?

2. Who held the previous contract, what was its time of duration, and what was the contract price?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. William Baird. The contract was let by tender. The contract is for four years from 1st October, 1909.

List of Tenders.

William Baird $290 00 per annum.
L. E. Brien 349 00 " "
Chas. Melanson 375 00 " "

2. Loring E. Brien from 1st November, 1901, to 30th September, 1905, and renewed from 1st October, 1905, for a further period of four years to 30th September, 1909. The contract price was $249 per annum.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of the correspondence exchanged since the 1st of January, 1908, between the medical examiners of immigrants and the Superintendent of Immigration, respecting the inspection of immigrants.—Mr. Paquet.

Copy of all instructions to J. O. Lewis, Indian agent at Selkirk, regarding the delivery of patents to Indians entitled to same, in connection with the surrender of St. Peter's reserve.—Mr. Bradbury.

Return showing a list of the free mail delivery routes which have been established in Canada, including the port of departure and the place of arrival, the length of each, the number of houses on each route, and the number of boxes on each route.—Mr. Armstrong.

Copy of all correspondence had between the Post Office and Public Works Departments, together with all reports and other documents relating to the necessity of providing adequate post office accommodations in the city of Lethbridge.—Mr. Magrath.

PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil) moved:

That in view of the encouraging results which have come from the money already spent in disseminating information regarding tuberculosis and of the interest which the people of Canada are taking in this question, and also in view of the great saving in life which has been brought about in other countries by practical work in this connection, this House is of the opinion that parliament should now take more active steps to further lessen the great suffering and mortality caused by this disease.

He said: My reason for bringing up this question separately from that of general public health, the subject of a resolution introduced in the House last session, is that the disease to which my resolution refers causes more deaths in this Dominion than all of the directly contagious diseases, and also that it is one which it is peculiarly proper that this government and parliament should deal with, inasmuch as it is widespread throughout all the provinces of the Dominion and can only be properly dealt with the Dominion authority. I would therefore ask the kind consideration of all members of this House to this question, and particularly of those who are doctors in medicine, for as a layman I feel considerable difficulty in speaking on this subject. My reason for speaking is that I feel that this is one of the great questions of our day and generation and one in which we can accomplish a great deal of good.

I do not propose to enter into details or any lengthy explanation concerning the nature of this disease. It is too well known amongst us, particularly in its commoner form of consumption of the lungs. We all know that some years ago it was supposed to be hereditary, and also to be practically incurable. We now know that it is not inherited; we also know that many cases, in fact I may say the greater proportion of cases, can be cured if taken at the proper time. We also know that the children of consumptives have not necessarily to have this disease, since it is not inherited, but it may be contracted afterwards. This disease is caused by a living germ, one that is directly contagious and easily communicated. At the same time, fortunately for us, the disease may be prevented by destroying the sputum of the patient. But the great danger at present is from the ignorance of the patient who is at home or on the streets. To-day the great object is to get at the source of the contagion. To show that it is easy to prevent this contagion, we have only to call attention to the fact that it is now stated that the place in which any one is least likely to contract consumption is in a properly organized sanatorium. This disease of tuberculosis is curable to a large extent if taken in time, and there have been many efforts made in this direction of late years. In some countries they have established sanatoria, but in Canada this is properly a subject for the provincial governments to take up. In other countries they use to a large extent the open air treatment in inexpensive shacks, where the cost is not very large, and where very good results have been obtained. We are making progress along those lines in many directions, and we are learning by experience. But although much has been done to relieve suffering and to prevent the spread of this dread destroyer of humanity, and although I am glad to see that a large number of people are taking an interest in this question, at the same time the fight is really only just begun. Dr. Woods Hutchinson, who is a well known writer on bacteriology, has made the following declaration before the Tuberculosis Exhibition held in New York last fall:

> Tuberculosis can be stamped out in New York city within ten years. Ten thousand lives a year can be saved from its ravages. A winning fight can be started within a year.

This is the opinion of an expert, and if this can be done in New York city, how much more easily it can be done in this Canada of ours, where fortunately at the present time we have no such large cities as New York. Conditions here are such that it is very much easier for us to fight the disease than it is in an overgrown city. During the last few years, more and more interest has been taken in the question of fighting this dread disease of tuberculosis, and the great work has been carried on in almost every country in the world. In 1906 an international congress was held at the Hague at which sixteen countries were represented. Last year an international congress was held at Washington in the United States, at which was represented almost every country in the world. An official report of that congress has been made, but it covers many volumes, and I do not propose to quote from it here. There is, however, a magazine published in New York called the 'Charities,' and on its front page it is called a 'Weekly journal of philanthrophy and social advance.' I would like to quote extracts from that magazine to show the nature of the work that was done in Washington last fall, and the good results that have flowed from it. On page 185 of this magazine we read:

> From the opening felicitations of Argentina and Austria Monday morning, to the reluctant farewells of Switzerland and Uruguay on Saturday the Tuberculosis Congress showed an intensity and diversity of interest that it would have been difficult to anticipate.
>
> Official delegations from thirty-three nations; a registration of over six thousand members; an attendance sufficient to throng the corridors of the Congress building, pack the section meetings, and tax the hotels of Washington; an exhibit by 438 contributors; and a million and a half sheets of abstracts of papers, printed in Spanish, German, French and English—are a few suggestive statistical items.

On page 204:

> Of much more practical and popular interest, for instance, was the exhibit of the work being done in Ireland, by the Women's National Health Association, under the direction of the Countess of Aberdeen. Here was shown how, in the incredibly short period of fourteen months, a whole nation had been aroused to the importance of the problem of eradicating tuberculosis, and by means of a campaign of popular education, on the 'Ameri-

can' plan, tremendous strides were being made against the disease.

The keynote of all the American exhibits was 'prevention' rather than statistics or cure. They emphasized the fact that the relief from this plague must come through social and economic progress, as much as through medical agencies. The improvement of living conditions and the popular dissemination of knowledge regarding sanitary and other preventive measures are agencies which strike at the source of the disease, and these are the factors which are emphasized all through the American exhibits. Travelling tuberculosis exhibitions, popular illustrated lectures, and the wide distribution of leaflets of information are effecting a revolution in the popular mind regarding tuberculosis.

You will notice that this extract states again that the key note was prevention. That is what we are advocating here; we are asking this government to give a sufficient sum each year to teach the people how to prevent this dread disease. Again we read in this magazine, on page 172:

In the moving of the exhibit from Washington to New York, figures of impressive size are once more given out. The bulk of the exhibit is measured in carloads, in more than a thousand of packing cases, in hundreds of exhibitors from four continents, and in tons of freight. The tuberculosis exhibit of 1908 equals in bulk the circus of a generation ago, when circuses first moved from town to town by railroad.

Governor Hughes and Mayor McClellan took part in the programme of the opening night and there will be other special programmes for physicians, for the state, for the city and for neighbouring cities in New York and Long Island and New Jersey. The first folder announcing the exhibit will reach 25,000 homes and others following it will, it is planned, penetrate into every tenement in the city. Where thousands saw the exhibit in Washington hundreds of thousands will view it in New York.

So we say it is only reasonable that this government should develop a system of somewhat the same kind, in order to teach the people by travelling exhibits the danger of this disease and the way of combatting it. Now, to show the practical success that has attended this work, and the effect it is having in reducing the number of deaths, and in inspiring us with a hope that we may be able in future to extinguish the disease altogether, I wish to give a few figures. In England, Dr. William Parker, of the Westmoreland Consumptive Sanatorium, gives the following figures of actual results:

Deaths per Ten Thousand.

1851-55..	28·05
1861-65..	25·27
1871-75..	22·18
1881-85..	18·30
1891-95..	14·62
1896-1900...	13·23

Mr. PERLEY.

You will notice how the percentage reduces regularly in each term of five years, and it is estimated that if this decrease continues the disease will have entirely disappeared by 1940. I ask why we cannot expect to accomplish such a result in this country when we consider that such a result has been obtained in other diseases—in the matter of leprosy, which was taken up by the Dominion government many years ago. In Denmark the fight against this disease was begun in 1895. According to Dr. H. T. Bulstrode the mortality rate in Copenhagen was 34·2 per ten thousand in 1870-4, and it fell to 16·6 in 1899-1901. It was less than one-half in 1901 what it was in 1874. In other towns of Denmark it fell from 25·2 per ten thousand to 13·1 per ten thousand. They have made a special effort in Germany to fight this disease and they have a great many ways and methods of doing it. I do not propose to weary the House with many figures concerning it, but I simply wish to put on record the statement of Dr. Moeller regarding the sanatorium at Belzig that he is able to report from 12 to 15 per cent of absolute cures; 30 to 35 per cent of marked improvements, and 35 to 40 per cent of improvements; showing that in that sanatorium nearly 80 per cent have obtained considerable benefit. With regard to the general mortality in Prussia from tuberculosis, we find that in 1876 of every ten thousand persons there 30·95 per cent died of tuberculosis, in 1886 30·14, in 1896, 22·07 and in 1901, 19·54 per ten thousand. So much benefit has been obtained from this treatment that the German insurance societies have, in many cases, taken the matter up and have spent their own good money as they thought it would pay them to do so. According to the reports I find that from 1893 to 1901 they treated 5,814 persons of whom 1,228 died, 3,955 are now earning their own living and 630 could not afterwards be traced. I find that Dr. Saar reported to the Washington congress that in the German army tuberculosis has been diminished by 42 per cent during the last 20 years simply by careful medical inspection and systematic precautions. Last year Dr. Phillip, an eminent authority on this subject, was here from Edinburgh and he stated that the measures taken in Edinburgh to prevent this disease had resulted in a reduction of 42 per cent in deaths in the ten years from 1897 to 1906. We know that right here in Ottawa very good work is being done. We have in this city a local association in which there are many men and women who have given a good deal of their time and money to assist in fighting this disease. What is the result? This association began in the year 1904 and during the last six years the deaths from tuberculosis have been as follows:

1903	142
1904	114
1905	101
1906	104
1907	95
1908	107

In other words they have fallen, in the last six years from 142 to 107. In the same period the city has kept growing, as we all know. It is estimated now that it has a population of about 80,000, whereas, six years ago there were only 60,000. Taking the percentages of deaths we find that the ratio has fallen from 23·67 for every ten thousand people to 13·37. In other words the deaths in this city are proportionately much less than they were six years ago. The number of cases taken care of outside the homes of the patients by this association in 1905 was 17; 1906, 41; 1907, 74; and 1908, 89. I give these figures out of fair play to the society in Ottawa. It has done much good work and one of the reasons why I am pleading with this government to increase its grant to the Canadian association is because the effect of the local work has been so good. This local association in Ottawa has arranged for an excellent system of visits by nurses, and it has also made arrangements for giving free the advice and services of the medical profession at two different places in this city. At the present time it is building a large hospital for advanced cases of tuberculosis out near the experimental farm. This building is nearly finished and we expect to have it open in about a month. I think that the members of the local association would be very glad if members of parliament would take enough interest in it to go out, either by the street car or walking, some afternoon and see the building which has been put up on the outskirts of the city for the care of advanced cases—of those unfortunate people who have hitherto had no place to go and who have been a source of contagion to their families and neighbours. I have here an extract from a report of Dr. Law, the medical health officer for Ottawa for the year ending 31st October, 1908. He says:

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF DR. LAW, MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH, OTTAWA, FOR THE YEAR ENDING OCTOBER 31, 1908.

Six years ago scarlet fever held second place in the list of infectious diseases mortality with 50 deaths. This year it is in last place with but 2 deaths. (Population 6 years ago about 60,000 against 80,000 now).

Tuberculosis still maintains its proud supremacy as a life destroyer, apart from the sorrow and suffering it entails on the bereaved ones, many of whom are brought from comfort to poverty through the loss of the household's provider after a long exhausting and expensive illness.

Contrasting the mortalities from these two diseases and the respective measures for controlling them I do not think it will be denied that, if as efficient measures were provided for the fight against tuberculosis as are provided for scarlet fever and the latter disease were accorded the inadequate provisions meted out for tuberculosis, in 6 years the relative position of these two diseases in the mortality list would be reversed.

I read this as an expression of opinion from the health officer of the city of Ottawa who is an expert on this subject and who states that he has no doubt that tuberculosis could be eradicated from our midst as easily as scarlet fever if the proper precautions were taken. Five years ago I had the honour of bringing this question before this House, and at that time a unanimous resolution was passed regarding it. At the same time it was brought up in the Senate and practically the same resolution was unanimously passed there. Up to that time the Dominion government had given $2,000 per annum to the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis. Some two years ago, after we had brought the matter to the attention of the government in several ways, the annual grant was raised to $5,000 per annum. This money was placed in the hands of the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis and was used by that association for the purpose of educating the people, disseminating information regarding this disease, its prevention and cure, and trying to stir up municipalities and provinces to take their share in this great work.

It has sometimes been said to me that we ought to raise money by private subscription to assist the Canadian association; in fact an important member of this government spoke to me privately about this some time ago. I am anxious to press upon the government that it would be exceedingly unwise for us to attempt to raise funds by private subscription to support the Canadian association. The Canadian association is entirely for the purpose of disseminating information by pamphlets and lectures and in any other way that it can in order to teach the people how they can protect themselves from this disease and how it can be cured. Any one who is willing to give money to help on this fight will give it to his local association. The Canadian association stirs up the people to put up a fight against this enemy. That necessitates the building of sanatoria or the establishment of local associations, a system of nurses, &c., in the different cities, all of which costs a great deal of money, and if the Canadian association arouses the people to the necessity of these steps it is accomplishing what it is established for. I claim that this government ought in all reason to make a grant sufficient to enable the Canadian association to do what is necessary to teach the people how to protect themselves or else

that this government should take hold of the question under the director of public health as a part of the work of that department of government. A good deal has been accomplished by this Canadian association which has now been in existence for several years. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who was last year president of this association, will be able to tell you all about it. As far as I am able to judge, the people are waking up regarding this important question, they are organizing locally in many places in Canada and they are being taught to work to help themselves in preventing this disease and in curing it when it has been contracted. The hospital which is being erected in Ottawa is costing between $45,000 and $50,000. This money has been raised entirely by private subscription. The City of Ottawa has undertaken to maintain this hospital but contributes nothing towards the building or its equipment. A small grant is given by the Ontario government to assist in building such a hospital and of the balance I am proud to say that the ladies of Ottawa have raised quite a sum by a fair which they held in the drill hall a couple of years ago to which all classes of the community contributed and in which the household of the Governor General especially took an interest. The balance of the money which has been contributed by citizens of Ottawa I have had the pleasure and privilege of collecting. Already there is talk in Ottawa of attempting to establish a sanatorium for incipient cases. That will have to be in the country somewhere, but we all hope we will be able to arrange for it after the hospital for the advanced cases is firmly established.

I wish to press on the government that this Canadian association is purely for the purpose of disseminating information by lectures and pamphlets, and also to urge on the provincial governments and municipalities local action in this matter. The association now has a medical lecturer and unless the federal grant is increased we will not be able to keep up the work of sending out pamphlets and also to keep this lecturer on the road all the time as he ought to be. I ask that this government either take the matter in hand themselves or else give a sufficient grant to the Canadian association to enable it, with the greatest economy, to do the necessary work in this direction.

I have laid before you some of the results of this work, I have shown you how the mortality has decreased where proper precautions have been taken and how the work of the Canadian association here has led to the establishment of our hospital in Ottawa

My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) will tell you later on of other things that have been done through the instrumentality of the Canadian association. I ask what possible objection there can be to this government granting sufficient money each year to this association to carry on this work properly. I can see no objection whatever. Five years ago when this matter was brought up, a question was raised as to the propriety of this parliament doing anything, under the British North America Act. Even if that were a valid objection it would remind one of the action of a foolish man who was so careful of the rights of his neighbours that when his house was on fire he refused to jump out of his window because by doing so he would be committing a technical trespass on his neighbour's property. The argument that this would be an encroachment on the British North America Act would be as unreasonable as that. But Sir, fortunately there is nothing in the British North America Act to prevent this parliament from taking action. It is true that under the British North America Act the sanatoria and hospitals are placed under the jurisdiction of the provinces. But public health as such is not mentioned in the British North America Act; in other words, it is under the Dominion and the provinces jointly. I need not go into this question in detail. It was discussed at a considerable length five years ago, when it was shown that in the early years of the Dominion there was on the statute-book a Public Health Act, under which action could be taken by the Dominion government to any extent that it saw fit. That Act was eventually repealed, but not because it was regarded as beyond our jurisdiction. The government has already acknowledged that it has a perfect right to give money for this purpose, by granting $5,000 per annum. If the government can grant $5,000 it can grant $10,000 or $20,000 or whatever sum may be required to assist the fight against this dread disease. The hon. Minister of Agriculture this afternoon gave the amounts expended in protecting the human race from disease as against the amounts expended for protecting cattle and other animals. Where is the authority for this government expending such large sums of money in protecting cattle from disease? I fail to find it mentioned in the British North America Act. I did not catch the figures given by the minister this afternoon; but the expenditure in the four years from 1904 to 1907 inclusive in protecting the health of animals was stated last year, in answer to a question of mine, to have been $1,209,000; and this year the hon. minister of Agriculture has on the Order Paper a Bill entitled An Act to Prevent the Introduction or Spreading of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation, under which he is authorized 'to make regulations for the granting of

compensation for any crop, tree, bush or other vegetation or containers thereof so destroyed'. If this government can take such good care of the vegetable crops of this country, it seems to me that it ought to be able to grant assistance to protect human life from disease.

The humane considerations ought to be quite sufficient to justify action in this matter, and I apologize for suggesting the financial loss to the country resulting from tuberculosis. There are differences of opinion as to the amount of the loss from the death of each person. On this point Dr. Irving Fischer of Yale tells us:

The cost to the United States of every consumptive who dies is $8,000. That does not mean his sickness only and his funeral expenses. It includes the money he would have earned with the average 'expectation of life' in the working years of which he is deprived, and adds to that the support of his family, which usually must be undertaken by some one else. Even conservative estimates rate the deaths from tuberculosis in 1906 at 138,000. A simple calculation, and we find that the United States lost in actual money used up, plus working power destroyed, $1,100,000,000 during that year.

I do not place the actual loss as high as that, yet I must acknowledge that Dr. Irving Fischer knows a great deal more about it than I do. It is estimated that in Canada from 8,000 to 10,000 die annually from this disease. I have statistics only from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which contains about 4,000,000 people, for the year 1907. These show that the total deaths in that vear were: in Ontario, 33,502; in Quebec, 29,007; total, 62,509. Of these the deaths from tuberculosis were: in Ontario, 2,530; in Quebec, 2,884; a total of 5,414 in the two provinces. According to these figures, I estimate that in the Dominion of Canada from 8,000 to 10,000 people die of tuberculosis every year, and of these all the experts are agreed that we ought to be able to save fully half. To say nothing of the misery and suffering and trouble caused by this fell disease, think of the immense money loss which this Dominion suffers thereby. If Canada loses from 8,000 to 10,000 people annually from this disease, there must be in the country from 40,000 to 50,000 people suffering from it. Estimating each life as worth $1,000, a most moderate estimate, and the loss resulting from the inactivity of the patient during the years he is ill at $1,000 more, that makes $2,000 for each life lost from this disease. On this basis this country loses from $16,000,000 to $20,000,000 annually from these deaths. Does this not furnish a strong reason, on the money basis alone, why this government should provide any reasonable amount required for the purpose of teaching the people how to protect themselves from this great annual loss? Why, Sir, ordinary common sense should teach us that such prodigious waste ought to be stopped if at all possible, and I am glad to be able to say that in this case we know that it is possible.

This government spends large sums of money in bringing immigrants into this country. This year we have $915,000 in the estimates for this purpose, and we know that some of this money is wasted. I am not casting any reflection upon the immigrants when I say, what every one knows, that our own people in Canada are of more value to us than the newcomers; and would it not pay us better to spend some money in saving our own people? The expenditure on immigration is supposed to be partly as an advertisement, to show what a fine country we have. I ask, would any advertisement be so good for Canada as to show not only that we have a climate in which we can cope successfully against this fell disease, but that we have a people and a government wise enough to take advantage of their opportunities and to put up a fight against it?

When this question was under discussion five years ago, the hon. Minister of Agriculture remarked that no one had suggested how the government could spend money on this object without trespassing on the rights of the provinces. This is a simple question. The provinces are building sanatoria and hospitals, and this parliament has not only the right but the duty to spend money in fighting this disease in any other way. For instance, this government could promote the dissemination of information by means of pamphlets or lectures. We have already had one lecturer at work a part of the time, but there is room in this broad Dominioin for a man to be at work every day in the year, promoting the formation of local associations to build hospitals and fight this disease in the various cities and towns.

It has been suggested in some quarters that an official physician should be appointed by the Dominion government, to take cognizance of this disease, to keep statistics concerning it, and if considered wise, later to arrange a system of inspection and registration. Of course, this appointment would come under the authority of the Dominion if they saw fit to make it. Then, there is one way in which we could help a great deal in fighting this disease, in a practical every-day way, and that is in connection with railways and steamboats. No steps have been taken, so far as I know, by any authority to try to keep down the contagion in these public conveyances. That is a matter that would naturally come directly under the authority of this government. Then, we have this magazine from which I have read. I wonder if there is any reason why this government should not have such a publi-

cation which could be distributed throughout this Dominion, giving facts and figures with regard to this disease, as well as other matters of a kindred nature in order to teach people something which they ought to know for their own protection. Then a public exhibition such as that concerning which I read as having been held in New York and which was afterwards used as a travelling exhibit in many parts of the United States, is a homely, every-day way of teaching the people how to prevent this disease and how to cure it. That is something that would certainly come absolutely within the authority of the Dominion government, something with which the provinces would have nothing to do. The provinces have plenty to do, and so have the municipalities, but this general work ought to be done by the Dominion government.

I merely mention these things to show that there are many ways in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture can spend money in this good work without even technically violating the British North America Act. I am not wedded to any particular plan or method, but I feel strongly that this government should take prompt and serious action, in whatever direction it thinks best, to help the people to fight this grim enemy. In the session of 1905, a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons brought in a report on this matter indicating what further steps should be taken to suppress tuberculosis in this country. The committee had held several meetings, and on July 13, 1905, I had the honour to present its report in this House. That report was discussed here, and adopted, except that, at the suggestion of the government section 7 was struck out, which section, if I remember well, provided for a grant of money. In this report, as passed, section 8 reads as follows:

> Your committee further suggests that unless the Dominion government feels prepared to take hold of the matter itself, a conference should be held at as early a date as possible between the federal and provincial authorities for the purpose of determining the best action which should be taken in the premises.

That report was passed unanimously. But no conference has been held. And, without finding fault too severely with the government for not carrying out this report, I submit that it would have been wiser had this conference been called. What we want is to get everybody working on this problem. If we have the conference—and I would urge the government to call one—it could not but be productive of good.

I do not wish to weary the House with this matter. I do not think there is a greater or more important question before the country to-day, and I believe that if the people thoroughly understood it this parliament would be forced to spend every cent that was required to put up a good hard fight against this disease. I hope that the discussion of this resolution will help the public to understand this question. I trust that our friends of the press will give it space in their papers, not on my account, but on account of the vitally important interests involved. This is not, in any sense, a local question.. This disease is spread all over the Dominion, and people suffering from it move from one section to another. The number of deaths caused by it is so great that the need of fighting it is imperative. And we must get the help, not only of those individuals who are willing to help, not only of the municipalities, but also the great strength of this Dominion government must be brought to assist if the fight is going to be a success. We know that our climate is as favourable to the cure of this disease as any other, if the disease is taken in time. And I am glad to say that, through the information that has been disseminated throughout the country during the last few years, the people are beginning to understand the question, they are waking up to the difficulties involved, and also they are learning to feel that it is perfectly possible to destroy this disease altogether if we make a united effort. At this time the Dominion government has a large revenue. It is making great expenditures, some of which are criticised by those of us who sit on this side of the House. It seems to me that here is a case in which the government can make a grant which no one will criticise, but with which every one will be satisfied, and which will accomplish much good for the people of the whole Dominion. I do not suggest in any way that this government should take in hand the building of sanatoria or hospitals of any kind, but I do feel that they should spend sufficient money to teach the people of this country how to prevent and cure this disease. I do not think that any practical or theoretical objection would be raised to the spending of this money to protect ourselves and our children. And I say in conclusion that this parliament represents the common sense and wisdom of this Canada of ours, and if we do not put up a proper fight against this scourge of our day and generation, we shall be held responsible before the world of public opinion for neglect of a plain duty.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the question of the prevention and cure of tuberculosis has been considered in this House on several previous occasions. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) alone has already had on the order paper two resolutions in

reference to this matter. My hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) also took the matter up, though in another form, two years ago. However, to my mind, a question such as this cannot be often and too carefully considered, and too great pressure cannot be brought to bear on the government in this connection.

Already, on a previous occasion, I have clearly expressed my views, both as a physician and as a representative of the people, on this very live question. There is too much force and eloquence in the grim and cold facts or statistics submitted by the hon. member to make it necessary that I should dilate at any length on the sufferings brought about by the scourge of tuberculosis. After what has been so clearly and so neatly stated by the mover of the resolution, it only remains for me to approve of the conclusion laid down in regard to the grant in favour of the anti-tuberculosis association.

Indeed it would be regrettable were Canada, a leader in so many branches of industrial and commercial activity, to sadly lag behind when confronted with a social and economical problem of such importance. All civilized countries have realized what enormous losses result from the spread of tuberculosis, and have applied preventive and curative measures of the greatest efficiency.

The Dominion government has made a good beginning, but it behoves all members of this House who like myself belong to the medical profession to make official quarters ring with the necessity, in the country's interest, of preventing the spread of tuberculosis, and particularly of tuberculosis of the lungs.

I am of opinion, as previously stated, that a certain amount should be deducted from the items appropriated directly or indirectly towards forwarding immigration, and an equal amount spent towards the prevention and cure of tuberculous diseases. To my mind, more value should be attached from our country's standpoint, to saving the life of one Canadian snatched from the grip of tuberculosis, than to securing an immigrant from foreign shores, whatever his worth.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a question of the greatest import both from the economical and humanitarian standpoint; and I trust that the government, desirous of forwarding the best interests of the country, will find their way to granting a still larger appropriation to the men who have assumed the task of putting a stop, in this country, to what is sometimes termed the white plague.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). This is a subject that ought to give, and I have no doubt does give, every member of this House both interest and pleasure. It is a question for humanity, one of those subjects in which one side of the House will not disagree with the other, but in which we all unite for humanity's sake. And the pleasantest part is that such an interest and such an initiative is being shown by the laymen. It has not been left to the medical profession alone to do this work, but the laymen, in many instances, have outstripped the medical profession in their earnest work for the protection of the lives of our people against this sad destroyer. I would express my appreciation and gratitude for what this government has done year by year in fighting this disease. I regard this matter in no spirit of fault-finding, complaining or scolding, but rather in a spirit of gratitude for what has been done; and I believe we shall be, in the future, under a still greater debt of gratitude to the government, for I am sure they will respond to the request of the Anti-tuberculosis Association for some greater grant than has been given in the past.

I think it is right, in asking for a greater grant than we have had in the past, to review what has been done with the grants that have been given. Have we been doing good work? Have we been expending this money as it should have been expended? Let us see what has been done. For one thing, literature, in plain language that the unlearned might understand and that all might read, has been scattered broadcast all over Canada. This has been a great means of teaching the people how to protect themselves against this disease. Over and above that, we have a lecturer who goes all over Canada lecturing to the people on this subject. I think this is one of the most interesting and profitable means of combatting this dread disease. At present the travelling lecturer of the association is a medical gentleman of culture, an expert in discussing the prevention of tuberculosis, a man who has the ability to stand on the platform and interest the general public in the question. I believe that up to the present time he has gone over many portions of Canada. Speaking for my own province of what the lecturer has done, I may say that I had the great pleasure of arranging for him a series of meetings from Windsor to Yarmouth, where there were crowded houses at every meeting, where not only the educated, the intelligent and the cultured assembled to listen, but where the common people heard him gladly; and I think that was the most promising part of it. Not alone is information imparted by the lecturer, but in each place that the lecturer visits, an association is formed for the prevention of tuberculosis, and in many cases active working committees are formed for the spread of knowledge how to prevent tuberculosis. More than that, local medical men are giving lectures in their own communities and

in neighbouring communities. There are very few medical men, I hope there are none, who cannot stand up and intelligently instruct an audience in the details for the prevention of this disease, so far as those details are known to-day.

I may say that over and above what has been said in regard to tuberculosis, over and above the spread of knowledge how to prevent this disease, the enlightenment has not ended there, but it has gone beyond the bounds of the object first intended, and the knowledge of the prevention generally of all disease has been spread throughout the country. People have learned, not only how to prevent tuberculosis, but in learning how to prevent that they have also learned a better mode of living. More sunlight is entering the homes of our people, more fresh air is entering their houses, and a more sensible mode of preparing and eating our food is being adopted, while a better knowledge of hygienic laws has been spreading all over the country. Now the question is being asked, if we can prevent tuberculosis, why can we not prevent other diseases? Interest has been awakened all over this continent, and in many parts of Europe, not only in the prevention of tuberculosis, but in the prevention of other diseases as well. This of course is beyond what was intended by the anti-tuberculosis association, but it is a fact that the good work has gone beyond the bounds that were first measured out for it by the society. In the United States the light has spread abroad so much that men of wealth are devoting their means to the prevention, not only of tuberculosis, but of other diseases. We read in the newspapers an announcement that Mrs. Russell Sage has donated a million dollars in aid of the campaign against tuberculosis. That would have been an astonishing thing ten or fifteen years ago, but it shows how public interest is being aroused, and how men of means are turning their attention to this philanthrophic work. We also read that Mr. John D. Rockefeller has promised that he will give a million dollars to combat the hook-worm, which is a very destructive disease in the southern states, and that Mr. Andrew Carnegie will give a like amount towards battling pellagra, which is another disease carrying off many thousands in the southern states. Thus you will see that from the point where the anti-tuberculosis association began, the good work has gone on until it is spreading all over this continent and all over the world.

But this is only a sample of what has been done. Since the anti-tuberculosis societies have got to work the question has been asked over and over again, not only, how can we prevent that disease, but how can we prevent other diseases, how can we save human life? For instance, attention is now turning strongly toward the prevention of the slaughter of the innocents, the alarming and unnecessary deaths of little children, not only from tuberculosis but from ignorant care. There is nothing probably in Canada that is so decimating little children as ignorance in feeding them. The death rate among children in Canada is greater than any other death rate, and we might class the various diseases almost under one head, ignorance in feeding. There are every year over 31,000 deaths of little children under five years of age. According to statistics in Canada, there are more deaths of children under five years of age, that is, more people die under five years of age, than die from the fifth to the fiftieth year. Much is being done through the interest awakened by the anti-tuberculosis association to prevent the enormous destruction of life in little children. In the city of New York a renowned philanthrophist, Mr. Nathan Strauss, has established milk depots to furnish pasteurized milk, in many cases for nothing, in many cases at cost price, to every one who wants it, and the health department of New York claim that he has reduced infant mortality in New York one-half.

I have a clipping here from a Montreal paper of March, 1907. This is just an average statement that I happened to run against. In March, 1907, in Montreal, in one week, there were 114 deaths; of these 114 deaths 103 were of children under five years of age. That is a terrible and unnecessary slaughter. The Guelph, Ontario, health officer reports 110 per thousand children died there against 11 per thousand of total deaths. That is an awful thing, but unfortunately, it is true. In Paris, so anxious have they become to save the lives of children, that they not only send out instructions to mothers how to feed and care for their children, but they have established depots all over the city where poor mothers, those below the poverty line, may go and have all the food they want to eat as many times a day as they please. The only requirement is that she is a mother and is nursing her babe. The French government appreciate the necessity of preserving the lives of their people and they have taken this step amongst the poorest. All over the city of Paris they have established these depots for the feeding of nursing mothers. The same care is being taken in other countries as well.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has any statistics along the line of the free distribution of milk or the distribution of milk at cost price in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. BLACK. No, we have nothing of the kind in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that something of the kind is being done pretty extensively in Toronto now.

Mr. BLACK. I know that Toronto is taking steps in that direction but we have no statistics from that city. I am speaking of these things as the result of the light being spread by the anti-tuberculosis associations of the country. I want to show that they have gone beyond what they first intended, fortunately, and that the whole world is being educated up to the prevention of disease. Prevention, prevention, everywhere! That is something that has been done and it is a grand record. We have to thank our government for what they have assisted us in doing in Canada. Another question would be: Is this a paying investment? The government gave us last year $5,000. Have they got interest for their money? I think, from the local knowledge that many of us have, and judging from the local work done that the government have not only received good interest for their money but have received compound interest. Not only do I believe that they have received compound interest but I believe that the debt of $5,000 has been paid and that the government are deeply indebted to the anti-tuberculosis association of Canada. I want to repeat that I believe that not only has this investment been a good one but I believe that in the matter of dollars and cents, in saving wage earners, in saving people to help to build up this country, the government of Canada—the people of Canada—are indebted to the anti-tuberculosis association for the great work they have done. I hope the government will not only give twice $5,000 this year but that they will increase the grant each year. I think we have shown that a great work has been done and I think we have shown that it is a grand investment for the government. What more should be done? I think that, in consideration of what they have done in checking the spread of tuberculosis, in consideration of the great good they have done not only in the fighting of this disease but in the spreading of knowledge for the prevention of other diseases, the government acknowledge their duty to the country to send out information instructing the people how to protect themselves. It has been stated by the gentleman who moved this motion that the government have expended a great deal of money in preserving the lives of domestic animals. They have and I think every dollar has been well spent. Half a million was spent last year, or the year before, and I do not think any body will find any fault with it or will say that it was not a profitable investment yielding good interest. But, if the government feel the responsibility of protecting and preserving the lives of domestic animals, surely the government must feel their responsibility in preserving the lives of the people, and I think the time has come when the government should, in a more systematic way, take up this question of public health, either by forming a bureau of public health, which, I believe, is the proper course, or by starting in the direction of teaching the people how to preserve the public health. The hon. gentleman who moved this motion laid considerable stress upon the work done in publishing pamphlets and circulating them all over the country. Why not the government appoint a special agent to publish pamphlets on the prevention of other diseases? Why not teach communities that there is no need of having typhoid fever? Why not teach municipalities that it is a disgrace to have typhoid fever? Why not teach the people that small-pox, typhoid fever, measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough and all diseases of that class are unnecessary and preventable? We have fairly driven small-pox out of Canada. We have driven typhoid out of many communities. We have lessened the death rate of all these diseases and no one will gainsay the reasonable possibility of driving out of this country all these preventable diseases if the proper steps were taken. Would it not be money well invested if $5,000 or $10,000 were expended in distributing pamphlets all over Canada instructing the people how to preserve their health and how to prevent these diseases? The day has long gone by when the old verdict 'died by the visitation of God' is indulged in. We know that people die in many instances when there is no necessity of their dying. Of course, all men have to die, but the unnecessary loss of life among the wage earners and producers at the producing time of their life is immense. Would it not pay the government, would it not be a good investment, casting aside all the humanitarianism of it to adopt some systematic mode of teaching the people how to save their own lives? As the previous speaker (Mr. Perley) has said, we expend a lot of money in bringing immigrants into this country and we do that rightly, every one will commend the exertions of the government in bringing people into Canada, for we need them; but how much more sensible, how much better, to save the lives of our own people? Thirty-one thousand infants die every year, one-half of whom, according to expert evidence, might be saved; and I think that is a small proportion, more than one-half might be saved. Add to that the tens of thousands who die of typhoid or other diseases in middle life or earlier manhood. Think of all this enormous loss which is being permitted without an effort on the part of the government to stop it, yet we are spend-

ing money in bringing foreigners in to take the places of those who die.

It is sometimes said that this is the work of the provincial governments. I do not know where that theory has come from. I have looked over the British North America Act and find nothing there to justify it. When that Act was framed, very little progress had been made in state sanitation, in state medicine in public health. I think the first active organized step taken on this continent was a state society or board of health formed in Massachusetts when I was a student in college in 1863. Only two references to public health occur in the British North America Act. One defines what the provinces are to do and the other what is within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. The Dominion has quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals. To the provincial government is allotted the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, eleemosynary institutions in and for the province other than marine hospitals. There is no further reference to public health. In the United States form of government anything that is not expressed as belonging to the federal government goes to the state government. In Canada the exact opposite prevails, what is not mentioned as belonging to the provinces, belongs to the federal government. Therefore, I maintain it is the duty of the federal government to take such steps as will protect the health of the people. At the same time there it no necessity of interfering with the rights and the work of the provincial governments. The federal government is doing many things for the benefit of its people that are also being done by the provincial governments, and I do not know that they ever clash. Both are doing their work in agriculture and in many other things. To advance this constitutional difficulty seems like shirking a duty, like hunting for an excuse, like the argument that the Levite might have used when he found the poor fellow wounded and suffering by the wayside. He might have said: I belong to a tribe whose duty it is to perform religious ceremonies only; I am not here to attend to the fallen, it it not my work, the man probably has friends or relatives somewhere—and so he passed by on the other side. How much better for the government to take the course of the samaritan who came along that way. I think he was a country doctor, by the way, because he was poor and had only a few coppers in his pocket, but he had a big heart in his body and he took up the poor fellow, he did not wait to say: This fellow may not be deserving and it is not my place to look after him anyway, he probably has friends somewhere. He assisted him as far as he was able with first aid to the wounded and then took him to the first hotel he came to. Like many another country doctor he had not much to pay his board, so he ran his face for the man's board for several days until he might come back again. How much better for the government to take that course, helping in this great cause of humanity.

I have no doubt this is coming, I have no doubt we will have the government of Canada, as well as the local governments, taking hold of this great work of assisting the people to preserve their lives. I hope this question will be discussed during the evening session, I hope that not only every medical man in this House will support the member for Argenteuil in his resolution, but that as many laymen as medical men will urge this thing and not forget that there are other diseases besides tuberculosis, in preventing which this government should assist.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced into the House to-day by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Geo. H. Perley) is one of somewhat similar nature to other resolutions that have been introduced into this House on more than one occasion in the past. There is no need of an apology, however, on this score for its introduction on this occasion. The widespread and far-reaching importance of the topic is surely sufficient justification for its engaging the attention of the members of this House; and in my opinion, until the ultimate object shall have been attained, it cannot be introduced too frequently. I take it that the primary object of the state is the welfare of the people, which should include not only their moral and intellectual, but also their physical welfare; and, Sir, the disease that Oliver Wendell Holmes has rightly termed the white plague, that carries off annually about a million of the population of this world, and that is preventable as well as curable in its incipient statges, is surely of sufficient importance to engage the serious attention of the people's representatives. One of the greatest obstacles that has to be overcome in the fight against tuberculosis is the apathy of the people, and a discussion in the parliament of our country, if properly presented to the public, for which we must of course rely upon the press—though I fear, from the appearance of the press gallery just now we are not going to have that duty very well performed on this occasion, should contribute to no small extent in overcoming

this apathy and in renewing interest in what is undoubtedly a national problem. In fighting against tuberculosis we are not fighting against an unknown or mysterious foe. The nature of this disease is now fully known, and if we apply in Canada the same efforts that have been applied successfully in other countries, there is no reason why we should not expect equally good results. It is not only the very high mortality resulting from the disease, carrying off as it does the pick and flower of our Canadian manhood and womanhood, that makes it such a dire enemy of humanity, but also the large proportion of our people who are invalided through its ravages. I think I am within the mark when I say that from five to eight times the number of people who die from the disease are rendered invalids by its ravages. It has been pointed out this afternoon that we are spending close on $1,000,000 annually for the purpose of bringing in immigrants from other countries to our shores; and I think it takes on the average one-fourth of all the immigrants who come to us to replace those of our people who are rendered invalid by tuberculosis. I think it would pay us very much better as an investment to look after the health of our own people and save their lives, than to bring in immigrants, many of them from countries where this disease abounds, to become a constant menace to our own citizens. I am not deprecating the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money for immigration purposes; but I recognize that the immigrants cannot equal the home-grown variety, those born and bred in Canada, British subjects by birth, and accustomed from infancy to our laws and institutions.

I wish to refer very briefly to the character of the work that is being carried on in some other countries, and to the good results obtained. For instance, in Germany, which is one of the most advanced countries in the fight against tuberculosis, the state has recognized that it has a duty to perform, and by means of wise legislation it has so improved the condition of the labouring classes that this disease has been cut down 40 per cent or more in a little over a quarter of a century. The insurance societies have undertaken an important part of the work. They have founded societies for the construction of sanatoria, which is the most modern method of treating the disease, and have popularized other institutions for the purpose of teaching the masses the nature of the disease. Germany has a very large industrial population, and the workshop is one of the commonest places for the propagation of this disease if proper sanitary precautions are not adopted. It is estimated that 75 per cent of those who die of tuberculosis in Germany are of the wage-earning classes. A few years ago 37 of the insurance societies of Germany combined to allocate a capital of £2,000,000 sterling for the purpose of equipping sanatoria for the treatment of those of their own classes who were affected with tuberculosis, and these societies, after investigation, came to the conclusion that it paid them much better to cure consumption than to subsidize it, as they were doing with the large amount of money they paid out to the heirs of those who died from the disease. In addition to building these sanatoria, the insurance societies have spent £6,650,000 for the purpose of constructing well ventilated and sanitary dwelling houses for the labouring classes who are their clients. The result has been that of those treated in the sanatoria of these societies fully 70 per cent have been returned to their homes and their work as economic cures. By that I mean those who having had their cases diagnosed in the early stage of the disease, have sought treatment in the sanatoria, and, after being there for a few months only, have been able to return to their work, whereas if they had neglected the disease in its incipient stage, they would not have in all probability been able to pursue their avocations. In 1907 the insurance societies of Germany had erected for the working classes no less than 87 sanatoria with a capacity of 8,422 beds. These are thrown open to the working classes, and they receive treatment in the shape of plenty of fresh air, wholesome food and repose. 30,000 working people—men, women and children—are thus treated annually. I have stated that in Germany the state recognizes that it has a duty to perform in this matter. The chief duty which the state there has performed has been to adopt legislation to improve the condition of the working people. Some years ago there was placed on the statute book the Workingmen's Compulsory Insurance Act, under which every workman over 16 years of age, whose wage does not amount to more than £100 per annum, is compelled to insure. The Act covers three varieties of insurance: first, against sickness; second, against accidents; and third, against invalidity and old age. The workingman is not required to pay the whole cost of the insurance. In the case of sickness the workingman contributes two-thirds and the employer one-third of the weekly contribution; in case of accident, the employer pays the whole; and in the case of invalidity and old age, in which class is included tuberculosis, the workingman and the employer pay equal parts. The workingman and the employer pays equal contributions, and then the state comes in with a pension of two pounds ten to every person who is insured under the inability clause. The state, the employer, and the workman recognize they owe a joint debt, and by contributing together

they leave no insured man dependent upon charity, who suffers from a chronic disease which renders him unfit to do his work. The result of this compulsory Insurance Act has been that in twenty years, from 1885 to 1905, close on £200,000,000 has been paid out under this Act to insured members amongst the working classes in Germany who because of ill-health were unable to sustain themselves and their families. By virtue of this law 13,000,000 German subjects have been insured. The reason they adopted this compulsory Insurance Act was that upon an examination of the inability statistics it was found that of those engaged in mines, metallurgy, and the building trades, fully fifty per cent of the invalids under thirty years were suffering from tuberculosis. Hon. members of the House will see that anything that tends to improve the condition of the working classes from a sanitary point of view will lead to a reduction in the death rate, as it has done in Germany. The result of the good working of this compulsory Insurance Act was set forth in a statement by the German Minister of the Interior a short time ago when he said:

> If Germany has experienced vast industrial expansion, possibly unequalled by that of any other country in the world during the same time, it is chiefly due to the efficiency of its workers and the efficiency of its workers has been largely brought about through legislation of recent years to provide a tolerable standard of life for the working people and so far as possible to guarantee their physical condition.

The German empire believes that anything it can do, it is its duty to do towards improving the health of the people, because they believe that even from the commercial standpoint, healthy workmen give the best returns to the state. They have as well in Germany compulsory notification, and every medical man in attendance on a case of tuberculosis is compelled by law to notify the proper authority so soon as he has made a diagnosis. That is not confined to the medical men; it is also a compulsory duty on the keepers of boarding houses and hotels, and public institutions such as the asylums and jails. This in brief is an outline of the work they are carrying on in Germany. A word with regard to what is being done in Ireland. Some years ago the death rate from tuberculosis in Ireland was considerably lower than in either England or Scotland, but Ireland did not keep abreast of the spirit of the times as the sister countries did and the result has been that at the present day the death rate in England and Scotland has been so materially reduced that it is now less than the death rate in Ireland. Through the efforts of some public spirited citizens in Ireland they are now carrying on a propaganda of education which is likely to lead to results as satisfactory as those obtained in other countries. They have a national health association for educative purposes, and they have itinerant tuberculosis exhibitions. These exhibitions move from place to place; the disease is explained by those who are posted on it. Under the auspices of this association addresses have been delivered to large gatherings of the people by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, by the Countess of Aberdeen (who has taken a great interest in the work and who has put herself at the head of the movement), by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and by our own Dr. Osler, who is now a professor at Oxford and who is lending his support to the propaganda. In Ireland, in one year out of 74,000 deaths, no less than 12,000 were from tuberculosis, showing the wide spread nature of the disease and the great field which the National Health Association of Ireland has to exploit. The result of these tuberculosis exhibitions has been thus far that the people are becoming educated to the true danger of the disease and stimulated to zeal in all matters pertaining to sanitary measures. Their houses are better ventilated; they are not hermetically sealed as many of them were in the past, and the farmers and dairymen of Ireland are applying in a large degree the tuberculin test to their cattle. It is estimated that fully thirty per cent of the milch cows in Ireland have been affected with tuberculosis. How can we expect that a young population will grow up healthy if there is a contaminated milk supply? England is one of the foremost nations in the fight against tuberculosis, and they have adopted in England what they have not got in some other countries, namely, sanatoria for incipient cases, as well as public hospitals for the advanced stages of the disease. In order to contend against this disease scientifically it is absolutely necessary to segregate as much as possible those in the incipient stages from those in the advanced stages of the disease. In England, in 1899, under the presidency of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the National Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis was established, and its work is largely of an educative character. Special hospitals have been erected for the cure of this disease in its advanced stages as well as sanatoria for those afflicted with the disease in its incipient forms. All these methods have reduced the death rate in England fully fifty per cent in half a century. England has also improved her sanitary laws. Mr. Gladstone legislated to provide for the better housing of the working people, workshops are now inspected and sanitary precautions are taken which have redounded to the physical welfare of the people. But there is one sad feature in con-

nection with the history of tuberculosis in England, and that is that while the death rate from tuberculosis amongst adults has decreased fully fifty per cent, on the other hand the infantile mortality from the disease has increased twenty-seven per cent during the same period. That is a sad feature, and the explanation is due to the contaminated milk supply. In England, until recently, they have had no inspection of byres such as they have had in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, and the result is that from the contaminated milk, infants under one year get abdominal tuberculosis, which is the cause of the very high mortality amongst the infants. This shows the great necessity for a rigid inspection of our dairies as well as our abbatoirs and slaughter houses so as to guard against a contaminated milk and meat supply.

In Belgium, they have a national league for the prevention of tuberculosis whose chief seat is at Brussels. They have branch associations in each province. This is carried on, as in the association in England and other parts of the world, for educational effect. Amongst other good laws, they have in that country a rigid inspection of dairies and abattoirs, both public and private, to guard the people against being supplied with contaminated milk or meat. In Prussia, they have reduced the death-rate fully 30 per cent during the past twenty-five years by wise precautionary legislation. In France, they have a society for the prevention of tuberculosis. They enlist the assistance of experts and those who are in a position to teach others, who, as in England, go from town to town instructing the people as to the nature of the disease and as to the measures that they should take to prevent its spread. In Norway they take such interest in the question that they have voted 40,000 crowns to publish a popular work on tuberculosis as a means of disseminating information on the subject among the masses. And they have set aside 2,000 crowns as a fund to be used in defraying the travelling expenses of physicians and others who desire to study the management of sanatoria. So, in all these countries, they are carrying out united and intelligent work to stamp out the disease. Coming nearer home, let me refer to what has been done in the city of New York. That city, as we all know, is the dumping place for the immigration coming into the United States, so that if they had not the best preventive and regulative legislation, we might look for an exceedingly high death-rate in that city. And, some years ago that was the case. But, in New York, within the past thirty or thirty-five years, they have reduced the mortality from tuberculosis by fully 40 per cent. They have sanatoria for the treatment of tuberculosis, and they have compulsory notification as in Germany. In Canada, in recent years, we have not been standing still. In the province of Nova Scotia—and I give that province credit for leading the way—they have a provincial sanatorium for the treatment of consumption. A similar institution exists in British Columbia, erected not long ago at Kamloops. They are now erecting one in Manitoba which will be completed within the course of next month. And the province of Ontario, I believe, has more than one, some of a public and some of a private character. So, our provinces are not seeking to evade their responsibilities in grappling with this disease. There is one way of carrying on this work, which I am glad to say, is adopted in some of our cities, and that is the compulsory inspection of school children. There you will find tuberculosis, in the form of swollen glands and so on, the disease establishing itself before the parents of the children are aware of it. By making known the condition to the parents, steps can be taken to prevent the ravages of the disease. Not only is it wise to have a compulsory inspection of school children, but the school is a splendid place in which to carry on educational propaganda on this subject. I was glad to learn that in the city of Winnipeg, a short time ago, no less than thirty-three medical men joined in making visits to every school in the city and gave lectures to the children on habits and hygiene. The youthful mind is an impressionable mind, and anything inculcated therein will be retained and become of service in the future life of the child. But, we should have something more. I am glad to say, we have a more rigid inspection of our immigrants than we formerly had. But, unless it has been recently established, there is no inspection of the immigrants before they reach this country. Put yourself in the position of an immigrant. He comes, let us say from some country of southern Europe, and, with his family, he takes ship to cross the ocean to Canada. On reaching our shores he is subjected to inspection and by reason of the fact that he has tuberculosis he is sent back to the country from which he came, torn, it may be, from his family, and put to all the misery of separation and to great trouble and expense as well. If the immigrants were inspected prior to going on the ocean, all this trouble, sorrow and expense would be avoided. Besides, a more rigid inspection carried on on the other side of the water with a view to making a selection of those who are to come to live amongst us would redound greatly to the advantage of Canada. There should also be a rigid inspection of settlers' effects. We all know that settlers' effects may carry the germs of infectious diseases, including tuberculosis, and rigid inspection and disinfection of settlers' effects would have excellent results.

Now, we have heard a great deal about the British North America Act standing in the way and preventing us from taking up this work as a Dominion work. I think that argument has been effectually disposed of by the hon. members who preceded me. This British North America Act is held up as a bugaboo, it is treated as an excuse for us to unload our responsibilities, or a portion of our responsibilities, upon the provincial authorities. I do not see why we should allow this to scare us away from our duties, or why we should plead it as an excuse. Illustrations have been given here to-day of the way in which the officials of this government act in concert with those of the governments of the several provinces in matters relating to education. Now, education is a subject that is relegated solely to the control of the provinces by the British North America Act, but consider such a matter, for instance, as the education of the farmer. Go to a meeting of a farmers' institute, and there on the same platform you will find a Dominion government official from one of the experimental farms who is there to assist in educating the farmer in the best way to carry on some of the many operations of the farm, and also some professor sent out under the auspices of the provincial authorities to carry on the work of education. These two officials work together, there is no clashing of authority, no question is raised by the provincial authorities that the Dominion government must keep off its preserve and must leave education wholly to the provinces. They are only too glad to share their responsibility. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will know full well that a few years ago the question of looking after the health of animals was, in some provinces at least, wholly in the hands of the provincial authorities. But a mutual understanding was arrived at between the officials of the Minister of Agriculture and the officials of the provinces and this was handed over to the Dominion government, though, prior to that time, it had been thought a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the province. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to cases in which assistance was given by this government to railways working under provincial charter. And so we could go on giving illustration after illustration to show that there has been invasion of the provincial domain without objection from the provincial authorities. This fight against tuberculosis should be a national affair. There will be no jealousy, no cry of provincial rights or anything of that nature from the provincial governments if the Dominion government desires to come in and lend a helping hand. We hear it stated that the Dominion government should not build sanatoria or hospitals. That may be very true. But the Dominion government can render assistance to such institutions in operation. There are to-day at least two hospitals that are managed under civic authority—those at Winnipeg and St. Boniface—that receive money grants from the Dominion parliament. Why? Because immigrants are brought in by the Dominion government and dumped in the city of Winnipeg, and the Dominion authorities do not think it right or fair that the whole expense of treating and looking after those immigrants who need hospital care should devolve upon provincial or civic authorities. The Dominion recognizes that it has a duty to perform, and so it aids these hospitals by money grants year after year. We are carrying on a propaganda in the provinces to-day. They are doing good work by means of distribution of literature and by lectures. In this and other ways, many of the provinces are doing their full duty. Besides, we have our medical associations, and, philanthropists as they always are, the medical men are discharging their duty in the matter by getting out pamphlets on the disease and having them widely distributed. The good done by the central anti-tuberculosis association has been referred to by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). It is a good work. I think $5,000 is entirely too small a sum to enable that board to discharge the functions that they have been trying to discharge during the last two years, at any rate I would certainly favour an increased amount for the central association. But, in addition to all this, we require the united and hearty co-operation of the Dominion government. If we do not wish to go into the sanatoria business ourselves—and I am not urging the government to do so at the present time—we would assist those sanatoria now in operation by giving them grants according to population of the hospitals or by giving grants outright as they do in the case of the Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals.

There are many things this government might do in addition to improving sanitary conditions. I will refer to one of them, and I have already refered to it when speaking on this subject in years past. I think we ought to have a Dominion laboratory in this country where our young men could enjoy the opportunities for experimentation that are afforded in other countries. Is it not rather humiliating to think that in a nation like Canada, her young men have to go abroad to find under a foreign flag a scope for their talents, where they are enabled to experiment in the preparation of serums, anti-toxins, and such drugs which we have to import from England, or Germany, or the United States? If we were alive to our own duty we should provide scope for our own young men, and we would

have the serums manufactured within the confines of our own country. I commend these few remarks to the House, and especially to the Minister of Agriculture. I trust the Dominion government will grapple with this question with a little more vigour than they have shown in the past. While I commend them for what they have done in the past, I think that a much wider field lies open before them full of opportunities, and I would urge upon them to take into their serious consideration this subject with a view of meeting more fully than in the past the urgent demands of the country in this matter.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). I do not intend to take up much time in discussing this subject. One splendid feature of the debate so far is that the speeches have been so short; that is a plan which I very much favour in the discussion of all subjects. I think we are indebted to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) who introduced this motion, and who introduced the same subject four or five years ago. I propose in my remarks to look at the subject from a little different point of view than that from which other hon. gentlemen have chosen to regard it. I do not think any medical man, or any layman, need make an apology to this House for taking up some time in discussing this great question. My hon. friend from Argenteuil made many pertinent remarks, but none was more pertinent than when he said that if the people of this country were familiar, as they should be, with the ravages of this disease, the government would be compelled to act. I think that is an absolute fact. When we realize that in Canada to-day there are from 50,000 to 60,000 people affected with tuberculosis, and that from 10,000 to 12,000 are dying annually, the subject assumes tremendous importance. Especially do we become impressed in view of the well established fact to-day that tuberculosis is not only a preventable disease, but it is a curable disease. I know it is very difficult to make the people believe that, it will be difficult to make many members of this House believe it. Any medical man in this country who has practised for some time will tell you that when a patient comes to us for physical examination with the slightest idea that he is affected with tuberculosis, it takes a good deal of courage on our part to give the patient a straight diagnosis. We have always felt in our practice that once we declare the patients to be tubercular, or to have consumption, as the term is, they pretty nearly always abandon hope; there is no question about that. Now, if medical science has done nothing more than to restore hope in the breast of the patient, it has certainly done a great deal already, for any physician is ready to admit that hope is one of the greatest aids we have in the medical profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may seem a strange thing to say that tuberculosis is curable, or that it is preventable. But that is a fact established centuries ago. In the first centuries the best medical men held that this disease was contagious, that it could be communicated from one person to another; they went further, and they said that the best means of curing it was fresh air. Now we have got but very little beyond that state of affairs to-day. I think there is no medical man in Canada who pretends to prescribe medicine now to his tubercular patients; he advises them to live out of doors, and that is the reason why the idea of the sanatorium has arisen and has taken so much extension. They went further in olden times, and we find that in the fifteenth century they used means which we do not often use to-day, but which we should use to a greater extent than we do. If a patient died of tuberculosis or consumption, as it was then termed, the clothing and the bed-clothing had to be destroyed. Now certainly that is an evidence of the belief that tuberculosis is preventable or curable. The question then arises in our minds, how is it that, if this belief has been prevalent during all those centuries, we have not made more progress in our treatment of the disease? In regard to the sanatoria in Canada, I think perhaps we have done as much as most other countries, considering that we are a new country. I remarked a little while ago that from 50,000 to 60,000 people in this country were affected with tuberculosis, and yet in spite of all that the provinces have done, they have only beds for about 500 patients. I have a list of the provinces, but I will not read it. It is enough to say that in the whole Dominion there are only beds for about 500 patients.

Now it is established that the treatment patients receive in the sanatorium is the only kind that holds out much hope for them as a cure of tuberculosis. What is to become of all the others? And just at that point comes in the work of the association of which my hon. friend who introduced this motion was talking to-day, in connection with the education of the people. He has given you a pretty clear idea of what that association is doing in an educational way. I just refer to that to point out that we have only provided for 500 persons and to ask what we are going to do for the rest. I have had a little experience with tuberculosis and I have looked into the experience of some of the best men of this country. I say that splendid results can be achieved outside of a sanatorium. The same kind of treatment is required inside and outside of a sana-

torium. Persons should be instructed to sleep outdoors, to sleep on the verandah. I live in a fairly cold country and some people may say: Surely your patients cannot sleep outdoors in Manitoba? I have patients with whom I have achieved great success in my own practice. I might also refer you to Dr. Bell, one of the best bacteriologists of this country, an honest man, and he cures a great many patients by having them sleep, during even this winter, on the verandah. That is one point that this association should impress upon the people. They should instruct them that if they cannot go to a sanatorium they can take the same kind of treatment. I have very carefully read the speech that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) made five years ago on this subject and for fear that I may misquote him I want to refer to a few sentences which he used. I wonder if he has read over this speech carefully since he made it. It is in the minister's department that this matter is placed and I would like to have more faith that the minister is in earnest in connection with this great question, but I look upon this speech of his as more the speech of the politician than of the statesman, as trying to evade the question by having recourse to the British North America Act, trying to get all out of that Act that can be got out of it in connection with this most important subject. He says:

I would point out that up to the present time no scheme has been put forward by those who are interested and who form this association which they could lay before the government or before parliament to indicate in what way such work as that might be improved, extended or rendered more effective.

If he had any excuse along that line when he spoke before, I think the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion to-day has taken that excuse from him, and I just wondered when my hon. friend was speaking what kind of a speech he would make to-night in reference to that point. They may not have done all they could. I am of the opinion that there are too many academic speeches on this as on many other subjects, and I want to get down to practical facts. I think, in the short time at my disposal, that I can show the minister that, notwithstanding how hard and fast the British North America Act may be, there are lines along which this government can act and do as much good as if the British North America Act in this respect was wide open.

It is quite possible that the association for preventing the spread of tuberculosis may be able to provide that information. . . . It would be impossible, I think, for me or any other member of the government to decide or to say what we ought to do or what we could do until some detail of a scheme of the kind were laid before parliament and before the government, but we think that it would be in the interest of the people at large that those who are to-day giving their attention to this work should turn their attention most particularly to devising something which might be done under the authority and through the intervention of this parliament.

I think that the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion has made that right.

To the Dominion is given by the British North America Act the establishment and maintenance of quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals.

The Minister of Agriculture will go no further than that. Well, let us take him at his word. But, before I refer to that, a contrast was drawn in the House this afternoon between those countries that have adopted the outdoor treatment for the cure of tubercular patients and those countries which have paid no attention to outdoor treatment. In England, in 1891, about 22½ people in ten thousand died of tuberculosis. To-day in England they cure about fifty per cent of the patients, and instead of having 22½ deaths in ten thousand they have about half that number. Portugal, which has done very little for the relief of its people in this connection and which has a population of 4,500,000, loses about 20,000 people annually from tuberculosis. I do not think it is necessary for me to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to any other instances. There are two bald cases. One has adopted the outdoor treatment and the results are apparent. I believe that this government have a duty to perform no matter what view they take of the British North America Act, and I am going to refer to a few of the ways in which that duty can be carried out. Tuberculosis to-day is considered to be a contagious disease which can be communicated from one to the other. I admit that there is perhaps too much stress laid upon the question of the sputum or that which the tubercular patient spits out and which, becoming dry, is disseminated and breathed in by other people. No doubt that is the most prominent way of communicating the disease, but there are many other ways. When a patient coughs, the moisture which is discharged into the atmosphere, certainly is a means of contagion. Living in ill-ventilated rooms, poor food, insufficient clothing, anything that reduces the constitution of the individual, is a means of inducing tuberculosis. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) referred to the milk supply. That is a more important question than this country has yet realized. We have found that tubercular bacilli are not affected very much by the gastric juices of the stomach. The bacillus still remains in such a condition that it is able to do a great deal of damage

to the child or person who has drunk it. It seems to be absorbed into the glandular system. While the results along that line are not very clear there is still a great deal of opinion that we contract tuberculosis from eating the meat of tubercular animals. My hon. friend from Grev (Mr. Miller) asked a question along that line, and I may be anticipating what he wishes to demonstrate by saying that this government have spent more in guarding animal life than they have on humanity. I do not care how much they spend in protecting domestic animals from disease, if in all cases the money is spent judiciously and to the best advantage; but I believe that we should take even more pains than we have bestowed on the cattle we import into this country in the protection of human life. In relation to cattle we have to-day the tuberculin test, by which we may ascertain absolutely that the food of which we partake is free from tuberculosis. Having that test, money is no consideration; at any cost we must be sure that our food, our meat and milk are free from tuberculosis.

But let us for a moment consider other methods by which the federal government can do great work in preventing tuberculosis. It has been said that if we are to grapple with this great subject we need an intelligent people, expert physicians and wise governments. Look to-day at the army and navy, where you have intelligent official superintendence of the health of men. Fewer cases of tuberculosis develop in the army and navy of Great Britain than in any other set of men. Why? No man can enter either the army or navy until he passes a satisfactory physical examination by a medical man and he is examined from time to time after enlisting; he must be physically healthy or he is not permitted to remain a member of the army or navy. Let our government apply that same principle in every department of its administration, and I am not sure that it will not do as much to prevent tuberculosis as all the sanatoria of this country are doing to-day. Take, for example, the opportunity that lies before the government in the prevention of tuberculosis among Indians. We have in Canada to-day about 375 bands of Indians with a population of about 110,000. Every one knows that the Indian is four times as susceptible to tuberculosis as the white man. In the west the Indians generally wander over the country, in Ontario they live a more settled life and in Ontario they do not spread the disease to the same extent as in the Northwest. A little is being done for the Indians, but very little. Surely the British North America Act does not prevent the Minister of the Interior from having his officials ascertain who among the Indians are affected with this disease and seeing that they are segregated or kept from the other Indians, so that they are not spitting over the prairies with the chance that the sputum will be licked up by animals, absorbed into the glands and cause tubercular beef.

Let us look at the great department of the post office of this country. No other department of the government comes so closely in contact with the people as the Post Office Department. There is scarcely a person in Canada who does not have something to do with letters or papers handled by the post office. There are to-day almost 4,000 clerks in the post office of Canada. No one of these officers who handles the mails should be permitted to discharge his duties without having passed a physical examination for tuberculosis just as he would have to do in the Militia Department. There is great danger of the mail bags becoming contaminated with tubercular bacilli. At every station great bags of mail too heavy to be carried, are thrown from the mail car and dragged along and across the platform. Perhaps just before the mail bag is thrown on the platform a tubercular patient may have spat on the platform—and I am almost afraid to say that one tubercular patient can expectorate seven billion tubercular bacilli in one day. Tubercular patients are not confined to bed in the earlier stages and in the small towns, as they have not much to do, they are likely to be found around the station at train time, so that this danger is a very real one. I would suggest to the government that they should have disinfecting stations for mail bags on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coast and also at one or more central points. It may be said that the mail is inside the bags, but as this economical government keeps patching these bags year after year and in sending them for repairs pack nineteen bags in one bag, the outside of each of these bags may contaminate the containing bag. Surely the British North America Act would not prevent these simple precautions in the Post Office Department, the disinfecting of mail bags and the physical examination of the men and women who handle the mail that goes into the families of different countries.

I am about to make a statement which I believe to be exceedingly important, but which I hesitate to make for fear of being suspected of unfair criticism. I may say, by way of preface, that I know very few civil servants in this country and that in the statement I am about to make I have no reference to any particular case. We have heard a great deal about isolating tubercular patients. We isolate small-pox and scarlet fever patients and we will never get rid of tuberculosis until we look on it just as we do on small-pox and scarlet

fever. I am told that in the departments in Ottawa there are tubercular patients. If persons suffering from tuberculosis are likely to do harm on the farm, how much more harm are they likely to do where a great number of young men and young women, at the very age when they are most susceptible to this disease, are brought into contact with each other in their daily work. I am told that there are quite a few persons in the Civil Service of this town who are afflicted with tuberculosis in an advanced stage. If that condition of affairs exists, I say, with all sympathy for those who are afflicted, that it is a condition of affairs that should be remedied at once. If these civil servants are not in a position to take care of themselves, the government should do something for them; and I am prepared to support the expenditure of any amount of money for this purpose, for money is no object in dealing with this great problem. But these persons should not, because they are poor or are deserving of our sympathy, be allowed to mingle from day to day with young men and young women who are free from that disease. This is another direction in which the British North America Act does not prevent the Minister of Agriculture working.

I am not going to discuss the Immigration Department. The Minister of the Interior is not here, and I do not want to say anything to which he would not have an opportunity to reply; but I have reason to believe that all the tuberculosis patients are not turned back, but a good many come in.

I feel that there is no subject that more deserves the attention of this House than this very question I have tried to suggest some methods by which the government could improve the present condition of affairs. I am strongly of the opinion that we should have in this country a bureau of health as a separate department. There is no other department so important. It seems strange that up to the present time the great country to the south of us has not had a bureau of health; but I am glad to observe that President Taft realized the importance of the subject and proposes that the United States shall have a bureau of health under a separate minister. Whether or not Canada could go just that far today I am not prepared to say, but I believe that is what we should aim at. The provinces are doing a great deal in this matter, and I am pleased to have a couple of photographs to show the Minister of Agriculture and other members of the government what the province of Manitoba is doing in this work. We shall have completed in about a month an institution with 50 beds.

Now, this motion says:

That this House is of the opinion that parliament should now take more active steps to further lessen the great suffering and mortality caused by this disease.

I do not think I have said one word tonight outside the scope of that motion, and I would like to impress on every member of this House that he cannot do a better work for the people—and surely we are here to work in the best interests of the people—than to plead with his constituents to see that something is done in connection with this very important subject.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for the sole and only purpose of acquainting this House with the work that has been done by the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis; in doing that, I do not wish to conceal the fact that my desire is to influence this government to make a larger grant to that association. I have been interested in and connected with the work of the association for several years, and it has been deemed to be due to this government, which has made an annual grant to the association for some years past, and due to this parliament that a fairly full account should be given of the manner in which the association has expended that money. The Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis was founded in 1899 at the instance of Lord Minto, then Governor General of Canada. In the early days of the association, its income was very small, and it could only attempt small things. In 1902 this government made a grant to the association of $1,000. In the following year the association engaged as its secretary the Rev. Dr. Moore, a Presbyterian minister who was greatly interested in the subject, a man of culture, tact and good judgment. Dr. Moore has continued in the service of the association as its secretary, and perhaps to no one person is due more than to him the success which has attended its efforts. For some time after Dr. Moore was engaged as secretary, the greater part of the work of the association was done by and through him. His time was employed in part in the circulation of literature, which was mailed from the central office in Ottawa, and in part in delivering lectures throughout the Dominion. I do not think the association could have found any man within or without the medical profession whose lectures would have attracted more attention, aroused greater interest, provoked more inquiries or disseminated more information than the lectures given by this gentleman. I know this from reports which I have heard of his lectures and from having listened to one of his lectures myself. From those lectures much good has resulted.

In 1903 the Canadian government increased the grant of $1,000 to $2,000 and continued for some years after 1903 to give the increased sum per annum. In 1908

and 1909 the government was generous enough and wise enough to give the association an increased grant yearly of $5,000. These donations enabled the association to extend its work and the splendid results attained were soon apparent all over the land. In addition to the lectures delivered by Dr. Moore, and the circulation of literature, the association prepared articles and reports for the newspapers, and I desire to express the thanks of the association to the newspaper press of Canada for the liberal and prominent space they gave to these reports and articles. From the establishment of the association in 1899 to the present day, nine general annual meetings have been held, eight in Ottawa, which is the headquarters of the association, and the last one in Hamilton, Ontario. At each of these meetings addresses on the subject of tuberculosis, the best means of combatting it and preventing it, have been addressed by eminent medical men, most of them gentlemen who because of their special experience were peculiarly fitted to discuss the subject intelligently. Among the medical men who have addressed these annual gatherings have been Dr. Knopf of New York, Dr. Ravanel of Philadelphia, Dr. White of Pittsburg, Professor Adami of Montreal, the present president of the association, Drs. Richer and Laberge of Montreal, Dr. Sir James Grant and Dr. Bryce of Ottawa and Dr. Sheard of Toronto. The annual reports of the association have contained the addresses delivered by these eminent medical men together with a full report of the criticisms, notes and suggestions made by other medical men who were present at these gatherings. The annual general meetings of the association show clearly the awakened interest in this important subject throughout the Dominion for they have always been well attended by prominent medical and public spirited citizens from all over Canada. These annual reports have been mailed each year to persons who were known to take an interest in the subject and to great numbers of others who have written to the secretary requesting copies. Since 1899 when the association was established, fifty-five branch associations have been formed in different parts of Canada and there is no doubt at all but that these fifty-five associations were organized very largely through the influence of the parent organization in whose behalf I speak to-night. Last winter Dr. Pagé of Quebec was instrumental in calling a public meeting which was attended by prominent citizens and as a result a local association was formed in the ancient capital. Since 1891 seven sanatoria have been erected in Canada, due largely to the interest awakened in the subject by the Canadian association for the prevention of tuberculosis. Free dispensaries have been established in Winnipeg, Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Ottawa and Halifax. A great deal of literature has been distributed by the association and this literature has been written in plain English, which the lay people can understand. This literature has I believe taught the people who read it the best methods of stamping out the disease, of preventing contagion and infection, and taking care of the unfortunate patients. Here are some samples of this literature: Here is a little pamphlet entitled 'Consumption—treatment at home, and rules for living,' this is an English publication written by H. Wassen Trowe, M.D.; here is another little pamphlet entitled 'Social and medical diseases by A. J. Richer, M.D., Montreal,' here is a paper written by Sir James Grant, upon our children; here is a leaflet that has been widely circulated, entitled 'How to prevent consumption'; another entitled 'Inspection of milk and meat'; another entitled 'Inspection of schools and school children'; another entitled 'consumption, its cause, treatment, and prevention.' Literature of this kind printed in the English and French languages has been circulated so persistently that including the literature now on hand it will amount to 7,000,000,000 pages. This literature has been systematically circulated and those employed in distributing it take the voters' lists of the municipalities as the mailing lists from which to make the distribution. So great has been the interest taken by the people of the country generally in this literature that in advance of the mailing many applications have been coming in from all over Canada asking the secretary to send literature. Many hundreds of letters have been received from all parts of the country expressing appreciation of this literature and the thanks of the recipients. The head office of the association in Ottawa has been a general information bureau; people in every province of the Dominion have been constantly writing to the secretary for all kinds of instruction. Letters have come from the individual patient wanting to know how to regulate his diet and his habits of living; letters have come from friends, members of whose families have been afflicted, and letters have come from communities who contemplate the building of sanatoria asking for plans and estimated cost and such details. All of these letters have been promptly and carefully replied to. Lecturers of the association have lectured not only at public meetings specially called for the purpose, but at medical associations, normal schools, colleges, the senior departments of public schools, teachers associations, farmers gatherings and all kinds of public assemblies. The lecturer of the association at these gatherings has been a most welcome guest and has been most carefully listened to. Dr.

Valin, professor of Hygiene of Laval university is now engaged by the association to lecture on tuberculosis in the French tongue throughout the province of Quebec.

In 1908, our association was fortunate in securing the services of Dr. George D. Porter. Dr. Porter was engaged by the association as associate secretary and travelling lecturer. The experiences of Dr. Porter's own life have peculiarly fitted him for the work in which he is now engaged. He is not only an enthusiast, but an expert, and not only an expert, but an enthusiast—the right man in the right place.

Mr. BLACK. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member for Hants says: 'Hear, hear.' He has heard Dr. Porter within the last few months and knows whereof he speaks in approving that gentleman's work. So great was the interest of Dr. Porter in the work of the association, so well does he realize the necessity of this work, that for several months he gave his services to the association entirely without charge. And the association was glad to avail themselves of his services without pay simply because there was not a dollar in the treasury with which to pay him. However, from every quarter comes high praise of Dr. Porter's work. I desire to read a very short extract from the Charlottetown 'Guardian' of November 18 last. This newspaper gives prominence to a long report of a meeting addressed by Dr. Porter. The heading is 'Charlottetown will fight white plague; a subordinate anti-tuberculosis league formed last night at a meeting which was addressed by Dr. Porter, who held the close attention of his audience.' One paragraph of this report says:

On the platform were his Honour the Lieutenant Governor, Premier Haszard, Dr. McLaughlin, Dr. Yeo, Dr. McNeill, Rev. G. J. McLellan, Rev. Maurice McDonald, L. J. Miller and others.

This shows that the most influential and prominent people of the city listened with great interest to Dr. Porter, and, after hearing his lecture, organized a local association. I want to point out to you that not only were the people benefited who listened to Dr. Porter's words, but those who read the newspapers had the benefit of a careful and full report and thus received the information he gave. The Charlottetown 'Patriot' of November 12 says:

It is pleasing to note that Dr. Porter, the energetic associate secretary of the Canadian Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, is meeting with large and interested audiences in his tour through our own and the other maritime provinces. . . . The meetings at Mount Stewart and Souris, held on Wednesday and last night, were largely attended, the audience following closely Dr. Porter's plain, convincing talk. Dr. Porter to-night speaks at Montague and to-morrow night at York.

I find an account of the meeting addressed by Dr. Porter at Guelph. And, while at Guelph, by invitation of President Creelman of the Ontario Agricultural College, Dr. Porter had the opportunity of addressing the students there. In Woodstock, by invitation of the principal, Mr. McNeil, he addressed the students of the college. And by invitation of the newly formed league in Galt, he returned in February and gave a public address upon tuberculosis. Let me read a letter written by Dr. Porter himself to Dr. Adami, the president of the association:

November 23, 1909.

Prof. J. George Adami,

331 Peel Street, Montreal, Quebec.

Dear Doctor Adami,—I have much pleasure in submitting a brief report of the work which I have been engaged in this fall.

I have held twenty-two public meetings, addressed five different colleges and normal schools, and assisted in organizing six societies (Charlottetown, New Glasgow, Windsor, Fredericton, Moncton, and one for the three counties—Pictou, Guysborough and Cape Breton), and have met with an encouraging response from the medical profession, the press and the public in this work, the average attendance being about 300 at each meeting.

In New Brunswick, the Premier was present at a meeting in St. John, and evinced much interest in the work. His government contributed recently $20,000 towards some provision for cases in that province. Dr. Walker and myself had the privilege of bringing the work before the Presbyterian Synod while it was meeting in St. John.

In Halifax, Premier Murray has also been much interested in the work. The league which was recently organized there by Dr. McCreay, of Montreal, is in a flourishing state and they are actively engaged in an educational campaign as well as in looking after a number of needy cases.

In Prince Edward Island, where eight meetings were held, both His Excellency the Governor General and the Premier expressed themselves in public as to the necessity of educating the public and in making provision for suitable cases.

I must mention the splendid series of five meetings which were arranged for me by Dr. Black, M.P., of Windsor, in the southwest portion of Nova Scotia (Windsor, Wolfville, Digby, Annapolis and Yarmouth).

At a meeting in New Glasgow a local league was formed and also a league for three counties (Pictou, Guysborough and Cape Breton), which is composed of the medical men and the authorities of the Francis Xavier College, of which Dr. McPherson was made honorary president. Under the auspices of this league, an active campaign of education is to be undertaken. They have invited me to address some dozen meetings this coming month as a help towards arousing public interest.

Altogether the work in the maritime pro-

vinces and Prince Edward Island is very promising.

In the meantime, I have the honour to be
Yours very truly,
GEORGE D. PORTER.

Now, I have been connected with the work of this association only for the last two or three years. I feel that some mention ought to be made and some credit given to the persons who have borne the brunt of the work of the association, those who formed the organization and have since helped in carrying on the work. I realize that, with my partial knowledge of the work, should I attempt to mention the names of those who are most entitled to credit in the early times of the association when it often met with discouragements—for those were days when the public interest was not manifested in the subject as it is to-day—I should omit some names perhaps as well worthy of our thanks as those whom I shall mention. Yet I desire to name some to whom the thanks of this whole Dominion are due for the time and the talent and energy that they have devoted to the work of the association. I have already stated that the association was instituted at the suggestion of the Earl of Minto. To him is due, therefore, a very large measure of credit for what has been accomplished. His Excellency Earl Grey, our present Governor General, has been and is the honorary president of the association. He has not been a mere figurehead, but has taken an active, intelligent and helpful interest in the work. He has been personally present at some of the annual meetings, has delivered addresses and has shown his sympathy in many ways, has also given many useful hints that have been of real help to the association. The association has had no better, warmer, or more consistent friend than Hon. Mr. Fisher, the Minister of Agriculture. His time has been so fully taken up with other things that it has not been possible for him to be present at all the meetings of the association, yet he has kept himself informed of what is doing, has kept constantly in touch with the work and has given the association valuable advice and information and has been indeed a real friend. I may mention also Mr. Courtney, who was treasurer of the association and is now honorary treasurer. He laboured faithfully and well in the interests of the association. I would recall also the name of Senator Edwards, one of the earlier presidents of the association. I am not well acquainted with the work which Senator Edwards did, because he has not, since I became connected with the association, taken an active part, as I understand he did in the early days. The association has had no more ardent, practical, consistent friend than Mr. Geo. H. Perley, M.P., the mover of this resolution. I will also mention the names of Sir James Grant, of Dr. Small, of Mr. Manuel, of Dr. Montizambert and of Dr. Rutherford. All these gentlemen have aided very materially to bring about the success that has attended the efforts of the association. These men, you will observe, are all of the city of Ottawa, the head office of the association is in Ottawa; it is then a matter of necessity that the persons who take a prominent part and bear the brunt of the routine work are men resident of the city. But I would call your attention to this further fact, that Drs. Daniel, Black and Schaffner, and Mr. Barker, members of this House of Commons, are on the executive of the association; and while they have not attended all the meetings they have attended many of the executive meetings of the association. The association had the benefit of their knowledge, the benefit of their suggestions, and they have been exceedingly helpful. Then I point out that prominent medical men, and prominent public spirited men outside the profession, from one end of Canada to the other, have been very helpful indeed to the work of the association, helpful by their correspondence and the suggestions they have made by correspondence, and by attending the annual meetings, and exceedingly helpful to the association by carrying on field work in the localities in which they respectively live. I want to say that the work of the association has not been a local work, it has been a work extending from ocean to ocean, a work extending from the United States border line away to the far north, farther north than the white man has yet chosen permanently to reside.

It has been a work carried on in both French and English, and many lectures have been delivered in both French and English. The literature of the society has been printed in both languages. The aim, the object of the association has been to enlighten the ignorant and to help the poor. When I say to enlighten the ignorant, I mean to enlighten those who have been ignorant of the great facts concerning this dread disease. I would say that the aim of the association has been to help the poor. The association has helped the rich as well as the poor, but in this as in every other case those most needing help have been the poor who, because of their poverty have been unable to help themselves.

The question may well be asked, the question has been asked: Why has not the work of the association been carried on by private subscription? Sir, it is just as easy to answer that question as it is to ask it. It was, I think, well answered by the hon. member for Argenteuil who moved the resolution, when he said that the aim of the central organization is to promote the establishment of branch associations. The moment you establish a branch as-

sociation you establish a centre to which of necessity must be contributed all the funds that can be gathered in that locality for carrying on the local work. The hon. member for Argenteuil has given an instance of that as relating to the work in the city of Ottawa, where local public spirited men have contributed liberally and generously to the construction and maintenance of a hospital in the city, and to other work carried on within the city. It is not possible for every local association to build a hospital or sanatorium, but in the smaller local communities, in the smaller villages and towns, in rural centres where local associations are formed, it will be their duty to see that every consumptive patient within their territory is practically taken care of in their own homes where they may be provided with proper medical care, with proper nursing, with proper food, where they lack either means or intelligence to obtain that food for themselves. It will be the work of the local associations in such places to see that sputum cups are provided, and that every possible means is taken by proper sanitary regulations in order that there may not be contagion and infection carrying the disease to others as well as to those already affected.

Sir, it has been pointed out that this government has expended over a million and a half dollars in the last five years in preventing and stamping out disease in domestic animals. No one has found fault with that, no one will. It has been a very important work, properly and well carried out. But, Sir, if it is a praiseworthy work to expend a million and a half in five years to cure diseases of horses, cattle, sheep and swine that are in the barnyards, it is at least as important and much more important to spend large sums for the cure of men, women and children who are in the dwelling houses. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say to this government, that every single dollar that has been given by the government to the association has been economically, wisely and carefully spent. It has surprised me to see how exceedingly careful the expenditure of every single dollar was weighed and considered before the expenditure was ventured upon.

It may be said that if this association depends, as I admit that it does depend, almost entirely, one might say entirely, upon the government for its income—it may be said that it is really a government undertaking, and some may say, as I have heard some say around me to-night, that if the government provides the whole amount, the government might as well take over the work. But I wish to say that even though we admit that it is really and substantially the work of the government, yet I say that the work is being better carried on, more economically carried on, than it could possibly be carried on by any department of the government. Why? Because this work being carried on by a private association receives the gratuitous assistance, the gratuitous aid of clever, earnest and zealous men, aid which the government could not obtain gratuitously, and that is a very important consideration.

Further, let me say that gentlemen interested in the association recently approached the railways of the country and asked them to provide free passes for carrying to and fro the lecturers of the association; and I want to convey the thanks of the association to the railway companies for their generosity. The Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Intercolonial railway have cheerfully and readily given free passes to the lecturers of the association. This effects a considerable saving that would not have been effected, and would not have been asked, and if asked would not have been granted, had the government been carrying on the work.

Now, Sir, in conclusion let me read to you this resolution recently passed at an executive meeting of the association. The resolution passed within the last week or ten days is as follows:

> That the association finds it quite impossible to carry on its work as it would like to do and feels that it ought to do, with its present small revenue. The association has endeavoured to send out over the whole Dominion, suitable literature, in the French language in the French districts, and in English throughout the remainder of the Dominion. And also to keep in the field continuously a medical lecturer, and other medical lecturers for portions of the year. The association has been much encouraged by the undoubted evidences of the splendid success of its work to date, and respectfully requests the parliament of Canada to largely increase this year the annual grant which they have been good enough to make to the association.

Now, Sir, in conclusion I have to thank the government on behalf of the association for their liberality, for their generosity in years that are past, and at the same time to ask the government, to ask parliament, to increase the grant this year from $5,000 to at least $10,000. The hon. member who placed this resolution on the Order Paper, in the last part of it, uses these words:

> This House is of the opinion that parliament should now take more active steps to further lessen the great suffering and mortality caused by this disease.

I think, although I have no authority to speak for him, that the mover of the resolution and that the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis will accept it as carrying out of the meaning

in this resolution if the government will be liberal enough to grant the association, for the present year, the sum of $10,000

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) deserves the thanks of this House and of the people of Canada at large.

I trust this House will not share the opinion that parliament should take more determined steps to still further reduce the great sufferings and the number of deaths caused by consumption. Yes, it is our duty to make the most strenuous efforts to reduce the rate of sickness and death caused by tuberculosis in our country. Canada loses 8,000 lives every year by that dreaded disease, while 40,000 persons are suffering with it in the various provinces of the Dominion. Allow me in view of these alarming figures to read an important page concerning the work that is being done in the state of Rhode Island to stay the progress of tuberculosis:

Despite its wealth, its strength and its prosperity, is the American nation in a position to throw absolutely away every year the sum of $430,000,000?

This is the question which is put to the public by the Rhode Island Anti-Tuberculosis Association. According to secretary Wallace Hatch, the white plague means to the nation an annual loss of $430,000,000.

This loss of money and the still more deplorable loss of thousands of lives each year will be stopped as soon as the anti-tuberculosis associations which are at work in the whole extent of this country have succeeded in teaching the people at large the essential facts relating to the cause, the treatment and the prevention of this terrible disease.

The brightest future is confronting the workers in Rhode Island. They announce a very effective work already begun and to be pursued. The state board of health and those of the leading cities are doing inestimable service to the cause. Education boards are opening schools of instruction. Hygienic rules are printed in the text books and doctors are permitted to address the pupils in schools.

Manufacturers on the other hand are contributing to the great popular movement of educating the masses by including in the pay envelopes printed rules on hygiene, by posting up useful informations in their shops and by recommending to their sick employees to report to local or nearby associations. Lectures are also delivered to the workingmen.

Ministers of the church lend their influential and benevolent support to the movement in their respective pulpits.

Many more private and public organizations do their utmost to help the authorities.

Every year this great regenerating movement in the United States which is intended to snatch the white race from this plague that strikes at the country's vitals and open up every year so many thousands of graves for youthful victims is making immense progress. The future of the nation is at stake. The work will only stop when the last man, the last woman, the last child in the country will have intimately identified himself with it, and when the last track of tuberculosis has for ever vanished from the American soil.

We must for the sake of humanitarianism and in the interest of the people of Canada follow that wise advice and we will be able thereby to maintain our nation to the fore among the other nations of the world We join in the generous work accomplished by our elder brothers. Our doctors attended the anti-tuberculosis congress held at Washington in September, 1908. Medical men and the public at large in the city of Montreal are not indifferent to modern progress, and they endeavour to battle against the fearful foe. I read the following lines in the "Union Médicale du Canada" of December 1, 1909:

On November 29, 1902, a number of gentlemen prominent in the world of finance, industry and commerce, as well as in the professions, informed on the one hand with the means employed in the various countries for the prevention of tuberculosis and on the other, feeling justly alarmed at the ravages of the disease in our city, founded in a public meeting held under the patronage or his Excellency the Governor General of Canada an association for the protection of the people against consumption. . .

Then the "Union Médicale" shows the happy results which crowned the efforts of those real philanthropists. Quebec city has also organized an anti-tuberculosis association, but this government must not remain idle. Here is what Dr. Rousseau said at the medical congress held at Three Rivers:

The government cannot remain indifferent in presence of the greatest social evil which exists. We do not expect them to do all that is to be done but we do expect them to do their share of educating work. Their imperative duty consists in spreading information and helping every anti-tuberculosis movement.

The rector of Laval University at Quebec, wishing to help in fighting the awful disease, invited Dr. Rousseau, in March, 1909, to deliver a lecture at the University on the nature of tuberculosis and the conditions in which it will develop. Allow me to read the last page of his lecture:

You cannot think nowadays of insolating the consumptive, of tearing him violently away from his surroundings before his sad death.

But let assistance be tendered them; let some guidance, some help be extended to them in the fulfilment of their arduous duties towards their kindred and towards society; either in a sanatorium, in a hospital or in their own homes, properly isolated, let them find conditions of comfort and safety which are not generally available to such patients. That is what we are in a position to do and what we should do; there lies the way out, provided generous contributions are forthcoming.

But we prefer dickering, dilly-dallying in the hope perhaps, a vain hope for the time being at any rate, that some great cure, some anti-tuberculosis serum will be discovered, though there is not the least foreboding of such a discovery.

Now, when there are available to us efficient means of protection, it is unfair and unwise on our part to neglect them and be content with beseaching the medical profession to effect some wonderful discovery for our protection. Thus are we courting sad disappointment. Wealth, indeed, is more frequently met with than genius.

The government of the province of Quebec has appointed a royal commission to look into the means of preventing the spread of tuberculosis. I anticipate satisfactory results from the findings of that commission. However, if we are truly anxious of wiping out all traces of tuberculosis from our Canadian soil, we should close our doors to tuberculous immigrants. To attain that great object, to meet the wishes laid down in the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Argentueil, we should adopt better methods of inspection as regards immigrants. Men in good standing attach great importance to the medical examination as now effected at the shipping port. What reliance should we put in such inspection?

In the month of August, 1906, inspector B. Smith, of the Ontario charitable institutions (Report for 1908, page 16) noticed on a steamer a poor tuberculous immigrant who could hardly walk. Of course, such an immigrant, on the verge of death, could not be admitted. He was deported by the authorities and died on reaching Glasgow. If the steamship company's medical officer had thought of casting an eye on that poor man, he would not have permitted him to board the ship. Disease was fast carrying away that immigrant, heartbroken and disappointed as he was. The whole system is a downright mockery. I have evidence from the best sources to uphold me in this. According to Doctor D. Pagé, immigrants at the shipping ports in Europe are subjected to a superficial examination only. According to Dr. Bryce, the inspection effected at the shipping ports does not differ from the ordinary routine of the steamship companies.

The Immigration Act provides that all persons suffering from contagious or infectious diseases shall be excluded. Consumption of the lungs which represents the last phases of tuberculosis, should certainly be included among the diseases of a contagious and infectious character. The laws of the United States specially mention tuberculosis, and rightly so. Now on May 10, 1909, the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), requested that the Minister of the Interior should make provision for the exclusion of tuberculous immigrants. The hon. minister's answer was rather startling: 'We all admit, he said, the advisability of excluding those who are suffering from tuberculosis, but its diagnosis is a difficult matter at its various stages, and we would be imposing on the department a task which they could not fulfil in a satisfactory manner.' I deplore this woeful expression of opinion, this extraordinary stand on the part of the minister.

As regards the greater number of immigrants sent to Canada by charitable associations, the trade carried on, the air breathed in the factories, the overcrowding in tenements, poor ventilation, scarcity of light and suitable food are so many factors concerning which the authorities should exert the closest supervision. The proportion of people affected or dying from tuberculosis in British cities, whence thousands of immigrants come to Canada, is very high. Such immigrants should be submitted to a very searching examination of the respiratory organs.

In 1906, at the meetings of the anti-tuberculosis association, Dr. Pagé submitted an interesting paper on tuberculosis from the standpoint of immigration. He showed how dangerous was the situation and tried to indicate a remedy. Indeed the members of the association at once appointed a committee to interview the hon. Minister of the Interior. The latter promised to take the most energetic steps towards excluding tuberculous people. Notwithstanding which, on May 10, 1909, the hon. minister refused to include tuberculosis in the list of diseases entailing exclusion.

Tuberculous immigrants are coming in. Dr. Pagé, in the course of the civil service investigation spoke as follows: 'A certain number of tuberculous immigrants may escape our attention. The disease is difficult to diagnose at its inception, and we have not enough time at our disposal to make the required examination'. Such a startling statement points to the absolute insufficiency of our system of medical inspection. In the crusade we are waging against this most disastrous disease, it is to the government we must appeal for guidance and help.

The hon. Minister of the Interior taking heed of the progress of scientific discovery, should lay down as a rule the exclusion of tuberculous immigrants. He should increase the number of our medical inspectors at all large ports. He should promptly adopt a system whereby these medical men would be in a position to carry on careful examinations with the object of detecting any incipient case of tuberculosis. I am aware that the diagnosis of that disease is not always an easy matter. Certain forms evolve insidiously, and little by little leave an impress on the organism. However, tuberculous people cannot readily escape detection by competent physicians, provided

the latter have enough time allowed them to permit a thorough investigation. In March, 1908, Dr. Bryce seems to think that the difficulties in the way of diagnosing cases of tuberculosis were sufficient to excuse the introduction of tuberculous immigrants into Canada. He even went so far as to quote high medical authorities with a view to proving that such diagnosis in a great many cases can be obtained only at an advanced stage of the disease. The stand taken by Dr. Brice seems to me most regrettable as regards the selection of immigrants. According to the most renowned clinicians, the diagnosis of incipient tuberculosis can be obtained by a series of clinical symptoms and phenomena following the injection of tuberculine. At the very outset, that is in the stage of primary development of the tubercles, the physician who undertsands auscultation is in a position to diagnose a case of tuberculosis. Through the use of the microscope and a knowledge of bacteriology, and by means of the X rays, cases of that disease may be diagnosed at the outset. The possibility of detecting incipient cases of tuberculosis imparts great practical interest to the examination of immigrants. We are sadly at fault when admitting tuberculous immigrants into Canada. Not only is there danger of contaminating the present generation of Canadians, but also of transmitting this tuberculous taint to future generations.

An incomplete, insufficient medical examination is apt to give the worst results. Tuberculous immigrants begin by contaminating some of their fellow-travellers on board ship. Then they contaminate people with whom they live in Canada, and imperil the health and existence of the whole community. Previous to 1904 there existed no systematic inspection of immigrants. The government then recognized the necessity of medical intervention with a view to ascertaining what immigrants were possessed of sufficient brains to understand the working of our institutions and live in harmony with our people, while helping on our national progress. That was a step in advance; however, legislation is still very imperfect. If we really have at heart our country's welfare, we are bound to improve our methods of inspection, in such a way as to exclude all tuberculous immigrants.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would not address the House at this late hour were it not that by remaining silent I might be misunderstood as either opposed to the resolution or not sufficiently interested in one of the most important subjects that can at any time engage the attention of the Canadian parliament. The knowledge that medical men have of the ravages of this disease and the possibility of curing hundreds of thousands of cases, in addition to relieving the sufferings of a very large number, lengthening their lives and minimizing the danger of their presence amongst others, is such that no medical man can be indifferent to this very important question. There is equally good work open for us to do, whether it is by education, by hygiene, by prophylaxis, which is preventing, or by providing better food for the people. It is sufficient to engage the philanthropic attention of the best minds, not only of the medical profession to-day, but of any class of people in the community. It is said: How can we, the Canadian parliament, assist in this good work? It is claimed by some that it is not within our province to assist this work. This association aims purely at the dissemination of information. When has parliament disclaimed its right to give assistance in disseminating knowledge? Never. Since I came into the Canadian parliament or so far as I am aware before that time, it has never been claimed that it was unconstitutional or improper for this parliament to aid in the dissemination of information. We give money for the dissemination of information in a great many lines outside of that which claims our attention to-night. Many years ago we accepted the principle and voted yearly $2,000 for the purpose of publishing a health magazine, or a bureau of statistics and health for the purpose of dealing with sanitary subjects. That was kept up for many years under Dr. Playter, and I do not think any one complained at the giving of that amount of money nor was it considered that there was not an ample return to the country for its expenditure. I claim that parliament can spend money for any purpose it likes, there was no interference with our right either in the British North America Act or any other Act. We can subsidize anything we desire, we can give money for any purpose we wish. We subsidize the building of railways by money grants, we give money to steamships, we vote money to employ lecturers to instruct the farmers with reference to diseases of plants, grain, fruit and all vegetable diseases. No one objects to this nor does any one say it is wrong. We give aid to lectures to the farmers with regard to the diseases of animals, and why can we not as well vote money to disseminate information with regard to what is above all these others in importance, the health of our people. If we vote money for these purposes in relation to plants and animals, why can we not do it in the interest of the great human family? It is said that from 8,000 to 10,000 die annually of this disease in Canada. If we can do anything to lessen that number, surely a donation of money is not out of place. We may lessen the death rate by disseminating knowledge, teaching the peo-

ple how to prevent and combat that disease. If you educate people so that they will understand how to prevent consumption, how to care for themselves by better hygienic surroundings when affected by it, how to isolate themselves, you will go a long way towards lessening the death rate from consumption. But we can go further and educate the people to care for themselves from a sanitary and dietetic point of view, teaching them the value of fresh air and of favourable surroundings. To my mind if we gave instead of $4,000 or $5,000, a couple of hundred thousand, not one word of complaint would be heard in the country. But we must do more than educate, we must prevent it if possible. It has been said that the Indian cannot bear civilization, he dies off when you civilize him. What is meant by civilization? Taking him out of the wigwam, removing him from his outdoor life, and placing him in a close sealed house. The result is that consumption carries off thousands of Indians, and if the Indians were compelled to live in the same kind of lath and plaster house that the white man lives in it would be only a few years until they would be wiped out. Why is it so few Indians die when living a nomadic life? Because the fresh air, by vitalizing the blood, prevents the development of the bacilli favourable to tuberculosis in the human economy.

We must check consumption by supplying pure food. We must go beyond the disease among human beings and secure immunity from the disease in animals as well. In a report of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1905, I find some statistics bearing on this which are of importance to us. We eat a great deal of beef and pork in this country. The United States Department of Agriculture state that out of 25,000,000 hogs slaughtered in one year in the United States, 217,000 were affected with tuberculosis. Out of 6,000,000 cattle 11,000 were affected with tuberculosis but out of 8,000,000 sheep only 27 were so affected. That is only one sheep in every 295,550 was affected with tuberculosis whilst amongst the cattle there were 555 in every 291,000 and amongst the hogs there were 2,390 affected with tuberculosis in every 291,000. Ought not this to teach us a very important lesson—that we are eating very much of that kind of meat which has in it the greatest elements of danger to the human family, and that of the three kinds of meat, mutton and lamb are what we should prefer if we desire to avoid that danger. We must attack this disease not only by education, but by building up a stronger and more vital physical constitution in the people, because the stronger the constitution the less liable it will be to the inroads of the disease. This is the reason for the importance of supplying the human family with good food, whether it is butter, meat, cheese or milk, in all of which the tuberculosis bacillus is found. The fact that thousands of infants are fed on milk which is largely tuberculous means that if these children grow up to manhood and womanhood they will have less vigorous constitutions to resist the disease than those who have been fed on pure food. How important it is, therefore, that we should attack tuberculosis in the dairies and in the herds of cattle and swine as well as in the human economy. In all of these directions we should spend money freely. A few years ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he had made any calculation of how long it would take to eradicate tuberculosis from the herds of our country. I do not remember what his answer was, but one who knew whereof he spoke said that we could eradicate it in a few years if we were willing to pay enough money to do the work. How valuable this would be to the many thousands of young children who live largely or chiefly on milk. This subject is too important to be set aside by any quibbles about our constitutional rights under the British North America Act. That Act does not stand in the way of our doing our duty in this matter. We build marine hospitals which will harbour tuberculosis patients as well as others. We can grant money for technical education to the farmer and the horticulturist. Why can we not grant money to educate the men who look after the health of the human family? In my judgment we can do it, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture will give the House an intimation to night that the government have reached the conclusion that there is a valuable work in this matter that can and should be done, and that towards that work they are prepared to give adequate assistance.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the proposer of this resolution not only on the manner in which he has presented a complex and important question to the House, but also on the untiring enthusiasm and industry which he has displayed for many years past in presenting the question to the public of Canada as well as to the House. I also wish to join with my hon. friend from Grey in saying a word of praise and congratulation to the members of the Canadian Association for the Prevention of the Spread of Tuberculosis. The gentlemen who have been engaged in this work have been doing sometimes a very discouraging and sometimes, as it appeared to be, a thankless work. But they have persisted in their efforts, until at last I think they have been able to show a measure of success which calls for the recognition and gratitude of the people of the country. In speaking on this question, let me at once, in response

to the appeal of my hon. friend from Grey, say that I wish to support the resolution, and I hope the House will adopt it with unanimity so as to show to the people of the country that this House fully realizes the importance of and entirely sympathizes with every method that can possibly be adopted for stamping out this very dangerous malady. I am prepared to say that as no new step is asked of us by the present motion, I believe the government will be ready to recognize the appeal of the House and ask for further aid for the Canadian association. In doing this we are adopting no new plan or taking no new step which might bring us into conflict with the constitution or with the provincial authorities. I am glad that on this occasion the debate has taken that course. I am glad that we are not asked, as we were on a former occasion, to do something that we could not see our way to doing. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) quoted some remarks of mine made five years ago. Well, I have no objection to my remarks being quoted, although five years have passed, but I would like to point out to my hon. friend that I was then discussing a totally different proposition. We were then being asked to grant aid for the establishment of sanatoria in Canada—to do something which by the British North America Act is in definite words relegated to the provincial authorities. I do not wish to discuss to any great extent the question of the British North America Act, but I must confess that I am not as prepared to trespass upon the special purview of the provincial authorities as my hon. friend from Argenteuil seems to think we ought to be. I do not consider that the illustration which he gave of the man in the burning house offending against a technical ordinance was a good one, because the question of the powers relegated by the British North America Act to the provincial authorities and to this parliament respectively is in no sense technical.

When that Act was drawn up those things which were more local in their character were placed under the control of the provinces and those things which were of a more general nature were entrusted to this parliament. I have no hesitation in believing that the framers of that legislation, after careful consideration and study, have given good reason for the disposition of the items in that Act. Under these circumstances I hesitate to undertake to overstep the bounds of the authority of this parliament and to enter the provincial sphere. The question of education and the question of the action of my own department has been cited here to-night, but I would point out to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) that when the Agricultural Department undertakes to deal with agricultural subjects it is not dealing with what is technically called education. Education as I understand it in the terms of the British North America Act, is the education of the youth of the country, and not the giving of information to the grown people who are engaged in our various industries, agriculture among the number. The department over which I have the honour for the moment to preside has not in any way undertaken the education of the young people of the country by means of schools or colleges. What it has done is to conduct experiments in agriculture and to place the results of these experiments before the people for their benefit. There is a well-defined difference between that sort of work and the education of the youth. I would say, further, that the work of the Department of Agriculture is very similar to the work of the association for the prevention of tuberculosis, and I am, therefore, quite at one with the movement to have this government grant any reasonable request for circulating information calculated to check the spread of disease. I am glad to know that the provinces have fully recognized their responsibility in regard to hospitals or sanataria. Several of the provinces have already established these hospitals and my friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has sent me photographs of a very beautiful and I am sure complete and well equipped sanatorium at Ninette, in Manitoba. I know that the province of British Columdia has established a sanatarium and I think the province of Nova Scotia has done something of a similar character. My hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Paquette) told us that the government of the province of Quebec has not yet established a sanatorium, but that it has appointed a commission to investigate tuberculosis and to furnish information as to how that province may best deal with this dread disease. The provinces, therefore, are meeting their responsibilities in this respect and I do not think it would be at all advisable for this parliament to overlap the work they are doing or to try to duplicate it. Let me say a word with regard to what we are doing in reference to the health of animals. Some hon. gentlemen have drawn the conclusion that we are spending much more money on the health of animals than we are for the health of the human being, but I would like to say here at once that every cent spent in Canada for the health of animals is really spent for the health of the human being. We are looking after the animals because we want to ensure that the human being may be certain that the meat he eats, the milk he drinks and the products of the animal which he consumes shall be wholesome. Of course, the regulations in regard to the treatment of animals for disease are very much more simple than they could

possibly be in the case of the human being, because, in the public interest, we can slaughter diseased animals where that becomes necessary. Of the money expended in the last few years in connection with the health of animals, about $700,000 has been paid as compensation for animals slaughtered, and that for the purpose of seeing that disease is not spread which is inimical to the human being. It is true that the Department of Agriculture deals with quarantine, but when you compare the money spent for the health of animals with the money spent for the protection of the health of the human being, you must eliminate from the former the large sums which are paid as compensation for the animals killed. Even in that view I reiterate that the money spent in connection with the health of animals is spent for the benefit of the health of the people of the country and not primarily or essentially for the protection of other animals against disease. Let me say that I do not believe there is any other country which can to-day present such a clean bill of health for its domestic animals as Canada can. In this connection I feel it my duty to take up the cudgels in defence of the Canadian cow. There is a tendency abroad to lay pretty nearly all the tuberculosis in the country to tubercular milk. Well, I have made a good deal of investigation and I have studied the question carefully, and from the information I have been able to get I am prepared to say that not 10 per cent of the tuberculosis in Canada can in any way be traced to the consumption of tubercular milk. There is the tuberculin test which can be applied to animals and that will test the presence of tuberculosis in any form in any part of the animal, but we have shown conclusively from experiments that the milk from a tuberculous animal in numberless instances contains no active germ of tuberculosis which could possibly communicate tuberculosis to any human being who drinks it. There is this unfortunate fact, however, in connection with the tuberculin test, and it is the chief weakness of the test, that while the test almost absolutely shows whether there is any tubercle in the animal it does not show where the tubercle is nor the extent of the tubercle, and especially it does not show whether the tubercle in the animal can affect the purity of the milk or on the other hand the presence of disease germs in it.

Under these circumstances, while the tuberculin test does place any animal that reacts to it under suspicion, and though that animal may have in its udder and in its milk the germs of tuberculosis which may infect the person consuming that milk, the fact that the animal reacts to the tuberculin test is absolutely no proof whatever that its milk will be dangerous to a person drinking it. Personally, I would not drink the milk of any animal that reacted to the test because I would wish to spend my money rather upon safeguarding myself than in the purchase of cheaper milk that was not so safeguarded. At the same time it would be the height of folly, and I think it is to-day a mistake for people to believe or expect that the animals should be slaughtered simply because they have reacted to the tuberculin test. I state this with a full sense of my responsibility in so doing. I say it because I have studied the question for many years and because I have had experience of the disease in my own barns and my own herds, and I have seen the effect of it in other herds. Also, I have been in charge for thirteen years of the experiments of the scientific veterinaries who have examined into this question continuously ever since I entered office as minister. I wish to say further that, at present, we are trying to find some method, some sensible, practical method, not too extreme, not unnecessarily severe on the owners of stock, by which we can deal with tuberculosis among cattle, among cows especially.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the minister think he should attach more importance to the danger of drinking milk that may be infected with tuberculosis? What does he make of the experiments of Senator Edwards? Senator Edwards took calves from cows affected with tuberculosis and, from the first, gave them pure milk from other cows, and, as I understand the matter in discussing it with the senator, not in one case did he find the tuberculosis present in the young animal. Is it not likely that milk is one of the means by which the disease is transferred from the dam?

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. member has misunderstood me. I said that personally I would not drink the milk of any animal that reacted to the tuberculin test. That animal is under suspicion. But I know, from abundant experiments, that the milk of a great many animals that react to the tuberculin test does not contain the germs of tuberculosis. If the milk does contain the germs of tuberculosis, of course it is dangerous; but the fact that a cow reacts to the tuberculin test is absolutely no proof that her milk will contain tuberculosis germs. Do not let me be misunderstood. I do not wish people to cease trying to remove tuberculosis from the cows of the country. I think that every means ought to be taken to accomplish that object, so long as we step on sure ground. But to undertake the slaughter of innumerable animals without being perfectly sure that their slaughter is necessary for the health of human beings would be folly and a wrongful waste of a great asset of the people of Canada.

I was going to say, when I was interrupted, that at a meeting of the North American Veterinary Association last summer, Dr. Rutherford, the chief veterinary officer of my department was present, and he secured the appointment of a joint committee of American and Canadian veterinary surgeons, which committee is to meet, I think, this week in Buffalo for the purpose of trying to elaborate a practical, sane treatment of cows for the purpose of minimizing tuberculosis in our herds. I hope and believe that a scheme will be elaborated by that body of men, probably the best experts on that question to be found anywhere, and that it will be able to present shortly to the department at Washington and to my own department a scheme for practical steps to further reduce tuberculosis.

Now, I began a few minutes ago by saying our herds were healthy, that we have not a very large percentage of cattle or swine in Canada affected by tuberculosis, and hardly any sheep so affected. We have had, for some years past, a very strict system of inspection of all the meat packing establishments in Canada which are engaged in the export trade. Our veterinary surgeons have carefully examined every animals carcass taken into these establishments, and the percentage of rejections and condemnations for tuberculosis is so small as to justify absolutely what I have said. I have not before me the exact figures, but my recollection is that in the case of cattle the rejections are less than two per cent, and in the case of hogs less than five per cent. The animals slaughtered in these establishments come in from all over the country, without any inspection before they arrive, and without any selection, and yet only a few of them are condemned for tuberculosis. Every carcass in the slightest degree affected by tuberculosis is condemned. Under these circumstances, I think I am justified in saying that the animals of Canada are exceptionally healthy and that the danger of communicating tuberculosis through food is not great. I have further the opinion of doctors and others who have discussed it with me that not ten per cent of tuberculosis is contracted through drinking any milk in Canada.

Now, let me say one or two things in regard to the requests made of us. I think it was my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) who spoke of the good we could do in the way of registration and notification. That is a matter, I think, purely local and municipal, and we can hardly entertain it or deal with it. I am glad that in this debate there has been no suggestion, as there was in former debates on the subject, that we should undertake to build or aid the building of sanatoria. It is true that years ago when this question came up I objected to our undertaking the work, and I am glad that the whole tone of the debate to-day has justified that stand. The whole debate to-day shows that the matter is now regarded as one coming within the domain of provincial authority.

I desire to pay a tribute to the high order of this debate. The medical gentlemen have given us a great deal of very valuable information, information which I think ought to be placed before the public. I do not think the association can do any better work than to distribute all over Canada copies of the 'Hansard' containing this debate. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) interested me a great deal with the information he gave us as to what is being done in Germany. I will say this for the continental nations of Europe, that in dealing with the welfare of their people they are very thorough, they go to the root of things, and do not hesitate to pass rules and regulations which we would consider somewhat drastic, and perhaps which western peoples would not like to submit to. I believe this association has done a great deal in stirring up the people to the necessity of vigorous effort in combatting the disease of tuberculosis. I agree with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Miller) that it is better that this work should be done by an association of citizens rather than by a department of the government. I cordially admit what the hon. member for Grey has said, that the association has spent their money wisely, carefully and economically. I congratulate the members of the association on their administration of the money that has been entrusted to them by parliament, and I have no doubt they will expend with equal wisdom and economy any further funds that may be granted them.

There is another point I would suggest, although it is a matter coming under the domain of the provincial authorities, and that is the problem of dealing with tuberculosis in public schools. That is a very serious problem indeed. It is certainly a hard thing to say that tubercular children must be excluded from the public schools. That cannot be done in any community without proper provision being made to secure to such children just as good an education outside the school as they could obtain within it. At the same time, it must be recognized that their presence is a menace to the health of other children, and as I say, it is one of the most painful problems that confronts us in connection with this disease. I believe, however, that in the erection and enlargement of our public schools, if more attention were paid to ventilation, more cubic air space were provided, as we know that plenty of fresh air

is extremely essential to the health of children, a great deal of danger would be removed, at any rate the danger would be minimized and, the general health of the pupils would be improved. Ill ventilation, over crowding, shutting out of the school room the cool fresh air of Canada, which is one of the best heritages we have, all these things contribute to the spread of tuberculosis among children.

Now if the House will bear with me, I would like to relate an experiment which we have been conducting with cattle, and it affords a lesson which might be of use to human beings. About four years ago the herd of cattle on the Nappan experimental farm contracted tuberculosis. It spread very rapidly through the barns, and in a few months practically all the animals were affected with tuberculosis. Dr. Rutherford wished very much to try an experiment with regard to the outdoor treatment of the animals. We brought the herd up here, and established them across the river in an isolated place nearby, where we kept them out of doors altogether for four years. Every animal was diseased when it came here. We added to the herd some other healthy animals, but no one of the healthy animals contracted the disease. Of the calves that were born to the diseased animals, born out of doors in healthy surroundings, and fed on their mothers' milk, not one was diseased. They are to-day healthy animals. I have no doubt whatever that the spread of tuberculosis amongst the dairy herds of this country is almost entirely due to the confinement in which these herds are kept, and that better ventilation of stables, byres more cleanly kept, with more sunshine and more light, would contribute more than anything else to the eradication of the disease from the herds. Of course these conditions are equally necessary, if not more necessary, to human beings. They are necessary in public buildings, they are necessary in private buildings, in schools perhaps first of all, and in all public buildings belonging to the government. One hon. gentleman spoke about what we should do in regard to our public service. I sympathize with that view. The Civil Service Commission created a couple of years ago had that very question under consideration and no doubt in the near future an improvement may be made in that matter as regards the Civil Service. I will close by saying that I hope the House will pass this resolution unanimously. I can assure the House that the government is quite disposed to do all it can within its sphere in order to strengthen this campaign against tuberculosis.

Mr. PERLEY. As no one else wishes to speak, I may say that I appreciate highly the way in which this resolution has been received. I need hardly say I had no intention of treating the British North America Act with disrespect, or lightly, in any way; certainly I desire to live up to it as much as any other member of this House. I was only arguing that what we wished to have done would not in any way interfere with it, either technically or otherwise. With regard to sanatoria, and the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture five years ago, I simply call attention to the fact that the resolution of five years ago made no mention of sanatoria, it was merely an academic resolution.

Mr. FISHER. But the debate did.

Mr. PERLEY. It was an academic resolution, but I think that certain hon. gentlemen mentioned the building of a sanatorium. I quite acknowledge that under the British North America Act it would not be wise for this government, at the present time, at all events, to take any steps in that direction. I do not ask for it. I am very glad that the government has accepted this resolution and I simply conclude with the hope, after the kind words the Minister of Agriculture has spoken on this subject, that we may expect in the supplementary estimates a reasonable increase in the grant for this important work.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the budget to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. The budget.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 14, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE SAVINGS BANK ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. G. BOYER (Vaudreuil)—(Translation)—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Savings Bank Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to promote the opening of branches of banks in the rural municipalities, namely, to empower the Postmaster General to cancel the existing savings banks in the localities where they are already established and where the funds deposited in those savings banks would be sufficient to warrant a bank in opening a branch on a similar basis as the branches established elsewhere.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a first time.

THE CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. G. BOYER (Vaudreuil)—Translation)—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) intituled: 'An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.' He said: The object of the Bill is to enlarge the power of the Minister of Marine in granting certificates of competency to masters and mates of ships trading on the inland waters of Canada.

Motion agred to, and Bill read first time.

AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a special committee of nine members be appointed, with instructions to carefully examine the rules of the House, to report what changes in their opinion might be adopted with the view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business; and that the said committee be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Pugsley, Mr. McKenzie, Mr. Carvell, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Mr. Haggart (Lanark), Mr. Barker and Mr. Doherty.

He said: I do not think this motion requires any explanation. There seems to be a general opinion on the part of the members of this House that our rules can be improved in some particulars; and, after a conference with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), I propose this committee of nine members to consider the rules with a view to amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see no objection whatever to the appointment of this committee and to some revision of our rules. I do not know that there is anything in present conditions that especially calls for amendment. I do think that some time might be saved in our proceedings, particularly in the answers to questions. Sometimes we take up an hour or even an hour and a half with answers to questions which are inaudible to about nine-tenths of the members of the House and are not really available to any member until next day. I think that our rules might be well amended in this respect. On the other hand, I do not believe that any amendment of the rules will avoid what is sometimes called waste of time. In a deliberative assembly composed of over 200 members, there will be a certain waste of time so long as human nature remains what it is; no revision of the rules will prevent it. We must also remember that parliament is a place for debate and discussion, as its very name implies. It is proper that every member of the House should have reasonable opportunity to discuss any matter that he thinks is in the public interest. It would be very undesirable to bring about any condition of affairs in which that would not be practicable. So far as the working of the present rules is concerned, I would point out that last session, which occupied exactly four months and in which a considerable amount of work was done is proof that under the rules as they are at present, the House of Commons has done and can do its work within a reasonable time. However, for the reasons I have given, and especially in view of certain amendments which I think might properly be made, I concur in the motion of the Prime Minister.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I hope that this committee will in no way attempt to interfere with the liberties of parliament, and especially with the liberties of individual members of this House. In the United States to-day, we see that the popular chamber has lost its liberties, and has passed under the domination of a speaker who is now known as a czar, and consequently that chamber, which should have been the model chamber throughout the world as a place of debate, has lost its prestige and its power, that power having passed to another body. I do not wish to see a repetition of that history in this country. We have revised our rules to a certain extent with the result that business has been facilitated. I am glad to see business facilitated, but I put in a protest now against any interference with the liberty of this House and the right of free discussion. It is a great right, and if we once part with it we may not get it back. The liberties of this House have always been upheld—at least, so I have read—by the Liberal party, and I hope that that party will be the last to in any way interfere with those liberties. Let us simplify the rules if we can, let us make shorter speeches if we can, let us have questions answered in some other way. For instance, petitions that are presented might just as well be put into a receiving basket on the table; I have seen 15 minutes of good time occupied in presenting petitions. The reading of petitions and all those things could be eliminated, and in that way facilitate business. But I do trust that this House will preserve every liberty of free discussion and of raising questions, and that they shall not be parted with in any respect.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the Prime Minister if this has any wider range than simply taking up the present rules and revising them. Does it go so far as to inquire into the making of any improvements with reference to the work of the committees of the House, as to their number, and the like of that? An intimation made by the Prime Minister some time ago when another question was being debated here, would lead me to think he had that in view. I wish at this stage to say, that whilst I have no

objection to any elimination of what is useless in the House, any abbreviation of what now may be somewhat too lengthy, I for one have no idea at all of submitting without protest to any of the well defined liberties of this House as a parliamentary body being infringed upon.

Mr. HUGHES. It is true that on going into Committee of Supply every member may raise any subject in order and discuss it. But going into Committee of Supply is a very irregular procedure. So far as I am concerned, I heartily concur in all that has been said as to the necessity of preserving liberty of debate in this House, and I would impress upon that committee the view I hold, at all events, and I think it is in the interest of parliamentary procedure and of the country at large, that there should be an opportunity on any occasion, even though the House be not going into Committee of Supply, to discuss freely matters relevant and important to the country. I trust that in revising the rules there will be no attempt to curtail the liberty of debate, or to hamper members from expressing in a proper manner the views they may wish to utter concerning the welfare of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Rumours have been prevalent for some time past in the government press that the government intended to revise the rules of the House at an early date, and to introduce what is known as the closure. I would like to ask the First Minister if that is the intention in this revision of the rules. I would like to say that so far as I can judge the temper of parliamentarians generally, they regard the freedom of debate as one of the dearest rights of the representatives of the people, and if any attempt is made under the guise of amending the rules to prevent the freest discussion of all public questions, I can only say that in my judgment the government will invite a good deal of trouble.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that the government has no intention of using the majority now supporting it in this House to curtail any of the rights and privileges of members of this parliament. We prize them as highly on this side as hon. gentlemen do on the other side. I propose that the rules of the House be referred to this committee in order to have a discussion upon them, particularly by those minds in the House who I think are the most entitled by their long experience to give a practical opinion. If it had been the intention to introduce at once what my hon. friend calls curtailment of the privileges of parliament, we might have done it as it has been done in England, though I do not think it was a curtailment of the privileges of parliament. There is such a thing as abusing the privilege of debate, as there is of abusing everything else. In asking for a committee of this kind, we want to have a discussion on the subject with a view to arriving at a unanimous conclusion on such matters as we can, though there may be some other matters as to which we may not agree. But when we come to the discussion of the report of the committee, it will be time enough for the House to make up its mind.

Motion agreed to.

EXPULSION OF A CANADIAN FROM GERMANY.

Mr. BURRELL. I desire to invite the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch which appears in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of yesterday:

A despatch to the New York 'Herald' from Dresden says:

The Canadian colony here wants the British minister resident to make representations in the Scott case. Mr. Scott, who was a Canadian student, was expelled from Saxony after paying a fine for an alleged attack upon a peasant. Mr. Scott said he acted in self defence, but he paid the fine. The order of expulsion was in the nature of an alternative—leaving or going to prison.

Freiberg students, when the order of expulsion was issued, telegraphed the London Foreign Office, asking what could be done, to which the reply came:

'Consult the British Consul at Leipsic, who is in charge of the Freiberg district.'

Up to the present no single official step in the shape of a protest has been made. Mr. Scott had to leave on Wednesday morning. Mr. Irvine Roberts, of Toronto, a solicitor now here, says British subjects appear to be absolutely without protection in Germany because the consuls are German themselves and are disinclined to prejudice themselves by strong action. An American citizen could not be so arbitrarily expelled without a vigorous 'kick' from Washington.

Then we have another despatch to the Canadian Associated Press, which appears this morning to the following effect;

Berlin, Dec. 13.—A Canadian student, G. S. Scott, Toronto, having received notice of expulsion from Saxony after being convicted of inflicting serious bodily injury on a peasant, some fellow students appealed to the British Foreign Office to intervene. The British of Cologne and Dresden also entered a protest, but the British Consul General says he has received no information enabling him to intervene.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the press reports I have read are substantially correct, I think the case is well worthy the attention of this government. Some of us personally have had occasion to take knowledge of the bureaucratic methods in operation in Dresden, particularly, and in other German states, where a man can hardly invite

a friend to come and see him without the whole transaction being bared to official eyes. It is a singular fact in connection with this despatch, that in looking up the Foreign Office list, I find that something like fifty per cent of the consuls general and vice-consuls are German, and in the particular case referred to, the consul general at Berlin is Paul von Schwabach and at Leipsic Baron von Tauchmitz. Now, we are accustomed in Canada very frequently to assert our pride of birth and our dignity as a Canadian state, and also to assert sometimes very strongly the foremost position we occupy in the councils of the empire. We had a little while ago a very dramatic recital——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no privilege at this time to discuss a question.

Mr. BURRELL. Then I ask the privilege. I was just going to remark that we had a very dramatic recital of an episode that occurred in Rome, given to us the other day by the Prime Minister, and which bears on this very subject; because if it is a fine thing to be protected by the British flag in Rome, I think Canadian citizens have just as good a right to be protected in any other foreign country. I trust the government will look into this matter.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the second volume of the Auditor General's Report. It is desirable that it should be placed on the table of the House this week, if possible, in order that it may be available before the Christmas vacation.

Mr. FIELDING. The matter was brought up in a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee recently when the Auditor General was present, and he told us that he did not think it would be possible to produce it before the recess. At my request it was then arranged that if the volume could be procured before recess, copies of it should be immediately sent to all the members of the Public Accounts Committee. I am afraid that is about the best we can do under the circumstances, though I very much regret that the volume is not before the House.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It should be sent to each member of the House as well as to each member of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FIELDING. The request came from the Public Accounts Committee, but I shall see that the Auditor General is requested to see that all the members receive it.

PRIVILEGE—REPRESENTATION OF QUEBEC EAST AND OTTAWA.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated to the House that no one yet had asked him to resign either of his seats. I would like to ask if, since he made that statement, any one has asked him to resign?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Mr. Speaker, so far nobody has asked me to resign.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty. He said: At the last session of parliament, Mr. Speaker, circumstances obliged me to submit a budget which, not to use a stronger word, was not in all respects a very cheerful one. Perhaps it was because Ministers of Finance everywhere about that time found themselves in strenuous circumstances. Perhaps it was because it was my thirteenth budget and good luck could hardly be hoped for at such a time. However that may be, it is agreeable to me to be able to round out the baker's dozen under happier conditions and to come back once more to the old familiar story of general employment and prosperous trade, increasing revenues, liberal surpluses and generous appropriations for the public service.

The last fiscal year—1908-9—as we call it—the fiscal year ended on the 31st March last, was certainly not a very good year for Canada. There had been a financial depression in the autumn of 1907, a depression which was almost world-wide, and which, in the case of the republic to the south of us, became a financial panic. It would have been too much to expect that we could escape entirely the effects of that financial depression. We did feel it in Canada to some extent—happily to a much less extent than in the case of our neighbours to the south, but still we did experience it to some extent in Canada. It began to show its effect upon our revenues in the closing period of the fiscal year, but the earlier part of the year was one of such great prosperity that, on the whole, the revenue proved to be a very excellent one; indeed, it was a record year. But, when we came to the new fiscal year beginning on the first of April, 1908, a year which ended on the 31st March last, we found that our revenues were very seriously affected. The revenue for the previous year, that which we call a record year, represented the great sum of $96,054,505.81. But, when we came to close the year 1908-9 we found that we had received a total rev-

enue of only $85,093,404.35. There was thus a decline in the year's revenue of $10,961,-101.46, or nearly $11,000,000, or to put it in another form, the falling off in the revenue amounted to 11¼ per cent. The revenue for the year was a little more than half a million of dollars greater than my estimate. The expenditure chargeable to income was $84,064,232.38. This was over $1,000,000 in excess of my estimate. I estimated the surplus at $1,500,000. The actual surplus was $1,029,171.97.

YEAR 1908-1909—CONSOLIDATED FUND.

	Actual	Estimated Budget Speech, April 20, 1909.	Greater than Estimate.	Less than Estimate.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Revenue	85,093,404 35	84,500,000 00	593,404 35	
Expenditure	84,064,232 38	83,000,000 00	1,064,232 38	
Surplus	1,029,171 97	1,500,000 00	.....	470,828 03

A statement of the sources of our revenue will be interesting for the moment, as showing wherein the failure took place. In customs there was a decrease of $10,130,474.80, and in excise there was a decrease of $844,-383.66. The post office continued its career of prosperity and had an increase of $293,-737.07. When other departments fail somewhat we are always able to turn to the post office and note the happy change that has taken place. In former years there was high postage, limited accommodation and heavy deficits. In recent years there is cheaper postage, more generous accommodation and always a liberal surplus. In the case of the Dominion lands we had an increase of revenue of $269,634.73. Miscellaneous revenues showed an increase of $93,793.97, and railways showed a falling off of $643,408.77. The chief decline, of course, was in customs. There was a falling off in excise and diminished business led to a diminished traffic on the railways, and in consequence diminished receipts.

SOURCES OF REVENUE.

Source.	Amount.	Increase, 1907-8.	Decrease, 1907-8.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Customs	47,413,336 45	.....	10,130,474 80
Excise	14,937,768 02	.... ..	844,383 65
Post office	7,401,623 93	293,737 07	....
Dominion lands	2,153,254 61	269,634 73	....
Railways	8,891,187 43	.. ....	643,408 77
Miscellaneous	4,296,233 91	93,793 97	..... .
	85,093,404 35	657,165 77	11,618,267 23
			657,165 77
Net decrease			10,961,101 46

Or a decrease of 11·4 p. c. as compared with 1907-8.

Coming now to the expenditure, we find that the total expenditure for the year 1908-9, chargeable to income, was $84,064,-232.38. This was an increase of $7,422,780.79 over the expenditure of the previous year. These increases were principally in the following departments:

Public works chargeable to income	$3,578,857 07
Interest on public debt	630,987 35
Civil government	1,194,849 45
Legislation	392,718 30
Miscellaneous	626,150 44
Ocean and river service	320,583 57
Post office	586,456 66

The item with reference to civil government was partly an increase and partly a rearrangement of charges which were transferred to the civil government item. The increase in the item of legislation included the expenses of a general election. The increase in miscellaneous included a grant of $300,000 to the Battlefields Commission and a grant of $100,000 for the relief of the sufferers by the earthquake in Italy.

Our revenue being $85,093,404.35 and our expenditure chargeable to income being $84,064,232.38, it left a surplus of $1,029,-171.97.

Coming now to the question of capital and special charges for the year 1908-9 we find they were as follows:

CAPITAL AND SPECIAL CHARGES AND INCREASE OF DEBT 1908-9.

National Transcontinental railway	$24,892,351 23
Quebec Bridge	6,424,781 00
Railways capital	4,529,052 72
Canals capital	1,873,868 45
Public Works capital	2,832.295 29
Dominion Lands capital	797,746 74
Militia capital	1,243,071 54
Total capital expenditure	$42,593,166 97

To these must be added the following special charges—

Railway subsidies	$1,785,887 39
Bounties	2,467,306 95
Charges of management loan account	1,854,488 41
Various transfers	221,311 50
Total	$48,922,161 22

Deducting from this the—		
Surplus of..	$1,029,171 97	
Sinking fund... ..	1,922,525 20	
Refunds..	1,044 72	2,952,741 89
Increase of debt..		$45,969,419 33

That was the largest increase of debt that has taken place in any year since I have had the honour of dealing with the finances of the country. I had estimated that the net debt would be increased during the year by $46,000,000; the actual increase was $45,969,419. The Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge represent of this debt $31,317,132.23. The remainder of the increase of the debt was caused by other expenditures on capital and special account. In former years we had been able to provide for most expenditures of that kind out of our income, but last year, with a falling off of $11,000,000 in our revenue, it was not possible to provide for these without some addition to the public debt.

Coming now to the current fiscal year 1909-10, I am glad to be able to have a more cheerful story to tell. There are still three and a half months of the year to run and the books of account do not close until some considerable time after the end of the fiscal year, so that it is difficult to make more than an approximate estimate at the present stage. It is, however, gratifying to us all to know that the unfavourable conditions of the former year have passed away. There has been a very gratifying recovery; we have been blessed with abundant harvests; in almost every department of labour in which our people are engaged there has been increased activity; we have recovered the lost ground in our revenue and we are now moving forward to even higher records. The revenue for 1909-10—that is the current year—to December 1, was $64,656,509.92, which represents an increase over the revenue for the corresponding period of the previous year of $9,541,282.75. Thus in eight months we have gained nine and a half million dollars of revenue over the figures of the corresponding period of the past year, which represents an increase of about $1,200,000 per month. The revenue for the last four months of the previous year amounted to $29,978,177.18. If we assume that we shall receive for the remainder of this year the same amount as we received during the corresponding period of last year this will make our revenue for the entire current year $94,634,687.10. But we may reasonably assume that there will be some further increase during these remaining four months, just what the amount of that increase may be is a point upon which I would speak with some caution. Hitherto in our comparisons between the present year and the next proceding year we have been comparing the figures of to-day with the lean period of a year ago, but about this time last year the business began to improve. The last months of the preceding fiscal year were months showing some improvement, and therefore we can not expect that during the remaining four months (or rather three and a half months) of the year, there will be as rapid increase as we have observed during the eight months. At all events there will undoubtedly be some increase. For the remaining period of the year, up to the 31st March—being four months as in the figures I present and about three and a half months actually from to-day—I propose to allow for an increase of $2,800,000. On that basis our revenue for the current year will approximate $97,500,000, or nearly one and a half million dollars better than the record year of 1907-8. I think my estimate is a safe one. It may be too conservative; it is quite possible that during the remaining four months of the year we shall make a greater increase than that I ventured to anticipate. It is quite possible that we shall come near the one hundred million dollar mark during the present year, but I do not think it is safe to estimate quite that at present.

Coming now to the question of our expenditure during the current year; it will be remembered that in view of the falling off in our revenue and the general check that had occurred in the business of the country, at the last session of parliament we severely pruned our estimates and appropriations, and many meritorious works which we would gladly have dealt with under more favourable conditions had to be laid aside.

Our expenditure on consolidated fund for the year 1908-9 was a little over $84,000,000. I estimate that in the current year the expenditure chargeable to income will not exceed $81,000,000. That is to say, we shall have a reduction of expenditure chargeable to income in the present year of $3,000,000 as compared with the figures of the preceding year. And, so, as respects the finances of this year the dominant note of the budget must be in the first place a large increase in revenue and in the second place a very substantial reduction in expenditure.

With a revenue of $97,500,000, which as I have stated is on a conservative basis, and an expenditure chargeable to income of $81,000,000, I estimate that there will be a balance this year, by way of surplus, amounting to sixteen and a half million dollars. I shall not be surprised if the expenditure proves to be a little less and the revenue somewhat more, which, of course, would give us a somewhat larger surplus.

Now, we come to the question of the capital and special expenditure during the

current year. There was voted by parliament for capital services during this year $30,484,739.54, and the corresponding appropriation for the preceding year 1908-9 was, $43,372,488.33. This shows a very large reduction in our appropriations. Of the capital appropriation for the current year 1909-10 the sum of $20,000,000 was assigned to the National Transcontinental railway, and we have reason to believe that that amount will all be spent or substantially so. Of the balance of appropriations of that class namely, $10,484,739.54, it is expected that probably $10,000,000 will be spent. We must then add railway subsidies, bounties, and other special charges which I estimate at $5,500,000.

Thus, the total capital and special charges for the year would amount to $35,500,000. The estimated reduction on consolidated fund expenditure is $3,064,232; the estimated reduction on capital and special expenditure is $13,422,161, so that our total expenditure of this year as compared with the expenditure of the previous year will show a reduction of $16,486,393.

The capital and special expenditure of the year will probably amount to $35,500,000. If we deduct from this our surplus of $16,500,000 and sinking funds, $1,250,000, making $17,750,000, this will represent an increase of debt at the close of this current year, if my estimate is correct, of $17,750,000. This will be $2,250,000 less than our expenditure on the Transcontinental railway. May I repeat here a remark I made in the last budget speech I had the honour to deliver, as indicating the financial policy which we hoped to pursue during the year. I then said:

> We think that our aim ought to be—and we shall endeavour to accomplish it as far as possible—to provide out of our revenue during the year now opening for all the ordinary expenditure and for a considerable part of our capital expenditures, if possible even for all of them. There is one work as to the wisdom of borrowing for which there can be no question, and that is the Transcontinental railway. If we can succeed in keeping down our borrowing for new work during the coming year to the sum which we wish to expend on the Transcontinental railway, I am sure we shall have a very good statement to present. I do not know that we can accomplish this, but it is to be our aim, and I am sure that if for the work of the year we have to borrow any sum in excess of that required for the Transcontinental railway it will not be very large.

I am glad to be able to say that the aim which we then set forth has been reached. We shall provide, as we believe, because we are dealing with a year not yet closed, out of our income for all the ordinary expenditure, for all the capital and special expenditure other than the Transcontinental railway, and we shall also be able to provide out of our revenue two and a quarter million dollars towards the National Transcontinental railway expenditure. Thus while we shall spend $20,000,000 on the Transcontinental railway we shall only add seventeen and three quarter millions to the net debt of the country. Putting it in another form, if we did not have this large and exceptional work to deal with, we would, within the year, reduce our public debt by two and a quarter million dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the surplus of one year building it?

Mr. FIELDING. That was a pipe dream of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) does not smoke.

Mr. FIELDING. Then he and I do not contribute much to the revenue in that direction. I hope he makes it up in some other way.

Turning now to the year 1910-11, as we call it in our accounts, the year beginning on the 1st of April next, hon. gentlemen will observe that it is quite far away and it will be difficult for us to attempt any close estimates. All I would care to say as respects that year is that we are very hopeful that we shall be able to repeat the policy of the present year with respect to keeping down the increase of debt. With the improvement in our revenues we have, of course, properly made more generous provision for the public service, but we hope and believe that the increasing revenues will justify that, and we look forward with strong expectation, as far as we can deal with matters so far in the future, that our year's operations will enable us to provide out of revenue for our ordinary expenditure and for that portion of our capital and special expenditure outside the Transcontinental railway. I think it is a fair ground for us to take that in the case of a great national work like the National Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge, now virtually a part of the Transcontinental railway, it is not unreasonable that we should expect to go on the money market and borrow, but that not only for our ordinary expenditures, but also for smaller expenditures of a capital character, we should endeavour to make provision out of our ever-increasing revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Reckoning up to the end of the fiscal year on which we have just entered, that is the year ending March 31, 1910, what will be the total expenditure on the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. FIELDING. The Transcontinental road, including the Quebec bridge, now virtually a part of it, will represent at the close of this fiscal year, $58,391,263.94.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that to March 31, 1909, or March 31, 1910?

Mr. FIELDING. That will be at the end of the last fiscal year and will not include the expenditure of the current fiscal year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My question related to the current fiscal year.

Mr. FIELDING. We are spending this year $20,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would amount then to about $78,000,000 up to the end of the current fiscal year, ending March 31, 1910?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it intended to complete the building of the Transcontinental railway at the time already stated, that is at the end of 1911, or is it proposed to go slower? Is any provision to be made for the construction of the Hudson's Bay railway?

Mr. FIELDING. The estimates before parliament include a sum for the further survey of the Hudson Bay railway route. They do not at present include any sum for construction. If it be determined that the matter is advanced to a sufficient point to call for a vote for construction, that vote will have to come in the supplementary estimates. As to the completion of the Transcontinental railway, I think we have everything to gain by pushing it to completion. The Minister of Railways will have to deal with that at a later stage, but I think we shall rush that as quickly as possible and for that reason we are taking a very liberal estimate of $27,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman made any estimate of what amount will be required after the conclusion of the present fiscal year to complete and discharge all our obligations in respect of the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not included it in this statement, but the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will have a statement at a later stage which will deal with that as with Transcontinental affairs generally.

With regard to the revenue for the coming fiscal year, I think we need have no hesitation in saying that if we do not reach the $100,000,000 mark during the current year, we shall certainly do so in the coming year, and I believe that with the large and increasing revenue we will be able to provide for our ordinary expenditure and for that portion of our capital expenditure which does not refer to the National Transcontinental railway. I would not like to speak with too much confidence on that item, as it is in the future, but at all events that is the policy I would desire to pursue if the finances will enable us to do so.

It will be observed that in the estimates for the coming year we have transferred from capital account to income account several items which for a number of years have been charged to capital account. One of these items is in regard to arms and ammunition for the militia. It has been customary, under both governments, to charge that item to capital account. In like manner, Dominion lands have been charged to capital account. I think the objection to that system may most strongly be taken in the case of Dominion lands, for we charged the expenditure in connection with the lands to capital account, while the entire receipts have always been taken into the general income for the year. In both these cases we have been following the practice of the past. I think in these cases it will be well to make a change, certainly in the case of Dominion lands. No particular reference that I am aware of has been made to that in the past and our method of dealing with these items has been precisely the same as that of preceding governments.

It will also be observed that in the appropriation we are taking for naval expenditure the charge is to be made against income. I do not wish to discuss that branch of the public business to-day, for that comes later in the hands of another minister; but it will be admitted, I think, that if we should charge the construction of ships to capital account, charging to income only the annual interest thereon and a reasonable sum for depreciation, we might justify ourselves in doing so. However, as this expenditure, which will be quite a large one, will be distributed over several years, I think we may properly charge it to income. The expenditure of the year will be charged to the revenue of the year, and we shall not be obliged to add anything to the public debt on that account.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he proposes to charge to current account the construction of naval vessels?

Mr. FIELDING. That is my proposal in the estimates for the coming year. Of course, if we had to propose the whole cost of these vessels in one year, it would be a sum which our income would not bear; but as the expenditure will necessarily have to be distributed over several years, I think it is proper to charge it to income from year to year.

Mr. FOSTER. The principle is the same.

Mr. FIELDING. The principle is exactly the same.

Mr. FOSTER. While my hon. friend has been listening to better counsels in this matter, has he come to a conclusion to adjust the bounties as well?

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to that. We have discussed from time to time the question of charging these bounties to capital account. My hon. friend is probably aware of the view which I have expressed from time to time, that the bounty is on all fours with the payment of railway subsidies, which in the time of my hon. friend as well as in our time have been charged to capital or special expenditure. When you pay a railway subsidy to the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, or any other railway company, you have nothing to show for your money. The railway belongs to the company. Nevertheless we charge the subsidy to capital. If you pay bounties for the temporary assistance of a great industry, you have nothing immediately to show for your money. The property is the property of the company, and the bounty has gone into the treasury of the company, as in the case of the railway subsidy. But you believe that good has come to the country through the development of its trade and commerce, and that is the justification of the bounty.

Mr. FOSTER. How about steamship subsidies?

Mr. FIELDING. I have never been able to regard steamship subsidies as merely temporary, for they go on from year to year. The theory of our bounties is that they are temporary aids. It is true, they have lasted somewhat longer than some of us expected; but they stand in the same relation to the country as railway subsidies. In neither case have you any visible property to represent the money paid, but in both cases you get your return in the general development of trade.

Sometimes these bounties are spoken of as if they had some relation to the question of a surplus or a deficit. Speaking generally, they have no such relation, except as to the volume of the surplus. In all the years that we have charged these bounties to capital or special account, except one, they would not have affected the question of a surplus or a deficit. The one exception was last year, when the surplus was a small one, and when, if we had charged the bounties to income, we would have had a deficit of $1,400,000. But if you take all the years in which we have paid bounties, the surpluses aggregated $131,088,259, whereas the bounties during the same period have amounted to only $18,822,751. Therefore while in one year the payment of the bounties out of income would have affected the question of a surplus, if you take the whole period, it would not have affected the question of a surplus at all. The chief bounties on iron and steel will expire on the 31st of December, 1910, that is, the bounties on pig iron, iron puddled bars and steel ingots. There is a bounty on wire rods which is not limited in time. There is a bounty on lead, which is limited to a term of years, and there is a bounty on oil which is not limited. The chief bounties, however, are those paid to the iron and steel industry, and these will expire on the 31st of December, 1910. There is a provision in the Act that bounties for electric smelting may be extended for two years longer. When the bounties were last readjusted, we were assured that parties were about engaging in electric smelting, and as it would take some time to erect their plant, they asked for an extension of a couple of years, and it was granted. As no action has been taken under that provision of the Act, I take it that the chief bounties on iron and steel will expire next year. Thereafter the bounties paid will not be very large, and whether we shall then charge them to income or to capital or special account, may be a matter to be fairly considered at that time.

In this connection, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the question of what these bounties have accomplished. I know that with some excellent citizens of Canada the idea of bounties is not popular. More than once I have met people of the very best class who shake their heads over the idea. I think, however, that it can be clearly shown that the treasury of Canada has not lost one dollar from the payment of bounties. The iron and steel industries which have been established in the country have undoubtedly had a great effect in the development of the trade in Canada. Just how far the influence of a steel industry is felt may be a matter of debate. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen have found many cases where business has been influenced favourably a long distance from the location of an iron and steel plant; I have found such cases myself; and it must be remembered that in all the principal trade centres of Canada vast quantities of goods have been purchased and sold to these steel ports, as I may describe them. The cities of Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John will all testify that their merchants have sold great quantities of goods to these steel making ports. The duties on these goods have been paid at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, as the case may be. It is not possible to measure just what these duties have amounted to, but they would not have been paid if there had not been the consumers of these goods at the steel ports. I do not think it is too much to say that millions of dollars have been paid into the Dominion treasury in that way at ports far removed from the steel ports themselves; and in considering what the government have received in return for the bounties, it would be well to bear that in mind. But

suppose we put that aside, let us look at the condition of the revenue at the steel ports themselves. These I take to be Sault Ste. Marie, in Ontario, Sydney, North Sydney and Sydney Mines in Nova Scotia, Glace Bay Mines, which supply the coal to the Sydney plant, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, and Hamilton, Ont. Now, Hamilton was an important city before the steel industry was established. Undoubtedly, Hamilton would have made very considerable progress even had there been no steel plant at that place. Let us frankly admit that. But it must be admitted also that the steel works at Hamilton have had much to do with the development of the trade of that port. Qualify as you will the figures I am about to give as respects Hamilton, yet I think that all hon. members will agree that, as respects every other point which I have named, the increase in business is due directly to the development of the iron and steel industry. Every one of these communities was a small community before the steel business began; every one has grown to be a large and important community under the influence and development of the iron and steel business. I have here a statement showing the collections of customs revenue for two periods of ten years. The first period is that from 1890 to 1899, a period during which some steel bounties were paid but during which the industry was in its infancy, and not very much progress had been made, except at New Glasgow, and even at that period New Glasgow had contributed very largely to the revenue by reason of her steel operations. We compare that period of ten years with the next ten years ending June 30, 1909:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of Customs Revenue received at the following Ports during the ten years 1890 to 1899 both inclusive, and for the ten years from 1900 to 1909, both inclusive.

Ports.	Years 1890 to 1899, June 30.	Years 1900 to 1909, June 30.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	219,763 06	2,012,066 13
Sydney, N.S	153,115 50	1,645,759 22
North Sydney, N.S. and Sydney Mines, N.S.....	192,548 97	455,320 32
Glace Bay, N.S.....	31,976 66	469,663 49
New Glasgow, N.S...	398,578 24	479,020 76
Hamilton, Ont.....	6,712,584 26	11,648,381 80
	7,708,566 69	16,710,211 72
Increase during years 1900 to 1909.....	9,011,645 03	
	16,710,211 72	

Now, let us compare the amount paid in bounties with this increase in customs duty:

Amount of bounties paid on pig iron, puddled bars, steel, manufactures of steel and wire rods during the ten years 1900 to 1909, both inclusive, $13,377,268.

Amount of increase of customs revenue at the above ports during the same period, $9,011,645.

Thus we see that nearly all that has been paid in bounties came back in revenue through the various ports I have named. Qualify that a little, if you like, respecting Hamilton. On the other hand, consider the supplies purchased in Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, that passed into consumption in these ports in which the iron and steel industry is established, and I believe I am justified in saying that every dollar that the people of Canada have paid out to the iron and steel business by way of bounties has been brought back directly to the public treasury in increased duties due to the stimulation of business.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the hon. minister any figures showing that the employees of these steel industries have come from countries outside of Canada? If not, how does he make it out that there has been an increase in the customs duties?

Mr. FIELDING. If, for instance, it can be shown that the employees of these industries came from the town the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) represents and others, and that, as a consequence, the business of those towns decayed, there would be something in his argument. But if the business of his town has prospered and there is so much new business at Sydney, Sault Ste. Marie and these other places, I confess I do not see the force of his contention.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think it should be the other way; unless the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) can show that this increase is due to additional population coming from outside countries, he has not established his case. A man will eat and wear as much in one place as in another, and to move him from one place to another does not mean an increase of business.

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of fact, a great proportion of these employees have come from other countries.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister any figures on that point?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not; but I know, as a matter of fact, that a very large percentage of the people employed in the steel industries at Sydney has come from outside countries.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would grant that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection; I desire to hear the hon. member.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would grant to the hon. minister that if he could show that the increase of employees due to the steel business represents an increase of our population from outside points, his argument is tenable; but, if they come from other portions of the country, we have a right to assume that they would have eaten and worn as much where they were as where they are, and consequently would have contributed as much to the revenue.

Mr. FIELDING. But if a man came from Owen Sound to Sydney to work in the steel industry, he left work at Owen Sound and somebody came in to do that work. For my hon. friend to prove his case, he would have to show that other parts of Canada were suffering in order that the iron and steel industry might prosper.

Now, I desire to say a word with regard to the increase of our debt. Up to June 30, 1896, the net debt of Canada was $258,497,432.77. The net debt on March 31, 1909, was $323,930,279.17, an increase in twelve and three quarter years of $65,432,846.40. During the same period, we expended on the Trancontinental and on the Quebec bridge, as previously stated, $58,391,263. So that, apart from that large undertaking —and I think we are justified in treating that as something exceptional—the increase of our debt is only $7,041,000, and that too in the face of the fact that last year we had a falling off in our revenue of $11,000,000.

Now, there is another aspect of our finances which is worthy of a moment's consideration. I refer to the charges for what we call capital and special account and the manner in which these charges have been met. Speaking generally, we might say the charges which are deemed to be on capital and special account, are of an exceptional nature which, perhaps, would justify the borrowing of money if necessary. We ought not to borrow money for our current account, we ought to pay our way; but, for anything in the way of permanent improvements or capital expenditure, if necessary, the Minister of Finance may well justify the borrowing of money. Of course it is desirable that we should provide for all we can without borrowing.

Now, I desire to show how far we have been successful in providing for that class of expenditure without borrowing. During the twelve and three-quarter years to which I have referred, the twelve and three-quarter years of this government, we have spent on capital and special expenditures such as I have been describing, $212,602,818.33; and during that time we have added to the debt of the country only $65,432,846. That is to say, of these capital and special expenditures we have borrowed but a very small porportion, and we provided of the $212,602,818, no less than $147,169,971 out of our own revenue; that is to say, that out of our revenue we not only provided for all our ordinary expenditure, but during that whole twelve and three-quarter years we provided for more than 69 per cent of our capital and special charges out of revenue, without resorting to borrowing, without going into debt.

Now, let us see what was the record of our predecessors—I do not say this for the purpose of finding fault, but it is a fair comparison. In the period from 1878 to 1896, similar charges, those called capital and special, had to be met to the amount of $167,166,252; and during that period the net debt of the country increased by $118,135,362. Mark the figures: Capital and special expenditure, $167,166,252; increase of debt, $118,135,362. So that all our hon. friends who preceded us were able to provide for expenditures of that character out of revenue, was $49,030,889; that is to say, that while we have been able to provide for expenditure of that kind out of revenue to the extent of 69 per cent, they only provided it to the extent of 29 per cent. Our predecessors had to add nearly 70 per cent of that class of expenditures to the debt of the country, while we have added only 30 per cent of that class of expenditures to the debt.

Now, one may make another comparison along the same lines. There are certain big public works which the government have sometimes to provide for, and which have to be lifted out of the common calculation. The late government had to provide for the Canadian Pacific railway; we have to provide for the Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge. I propose to eliminate from the two accounts these large and exceptional works, to leave out, in the case of my predecessors, the expenditure on account of the Canadian Pacific railway, and to leave out in our case the expenditures on account of the Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge, and what do we find? Leaving out the Canadian Pacific railway, from 1878 to 1896, our predecessors provided for 42 per cent of their capital and special expenditure out of their revenue; while we have provided for similar charges, leaving out the Transcontinental and Quebec bridge, not 42 per cent, but more than 95 per cent, out of the revenue of the country.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could the hon. the Finance Minister tell us how much taxes were collected from the people during the eighteen years from 1878 to 1896, during the 10 years from 1897 to 1907?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I cannot tell at this moment. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that the rate of customs taxation is

less now than it was in the former period; and that the only difference between my hon. friend and myself on that question is that while he wants to raise the taxation of the country, we are desirous of keeping it down. Now, the debt of a country is only a burden in proportion to the number of shoulders that have to carry it. Sometimes people speak of the growing debt of Canada, without stopping to consider, as they should, other elements of the growing time. The debt of Canada must be considered in proportion to the population of Canada. I have here a statement—I have submitted it on a previous occasion, but I have now brought it down to date; it is a statement showing the net debt of Canada for every year from 1891 down to the present time, including the current year, and giving the estimated population for the current year. It also shows the population of Canada as shown from year to year by our census officers. While our general census is taken only once in ten years, as respects our western provinces it is taken more frequently, and from year to year an estimate is made of our population by qualified census officials; so that we receive from year to year a statement of the population of the country which is approximately correct.

NET DEBT PER CAPITA.

Year.	Population.	Net Debt.	Net Debt per Capita.
1891.. ..	4,844,366	$237,809,030 51	$49 09
1892.. ..	4,889,266	241,131,434 44	49 15
1893.. ..	4,935,748	241,681,039 61	48 96
1894.. ..	4,983,903	246,183,029 48	49 40
1895.. ..	5,003,839	253,074,927 09	50 57
1896.. ..	5,086,061	258,497,432 77	50 82
1897.. ..	5,141,508	261,538,596 46	50 87
1898.. ..	5,199,267	263,956,398 91	50 77
1899.. ..	5,259,491	266,273,446 60	50 62
1900.. ..	5,322,348	265,493,806 89	49 88
1901.. ..	5,413,370	268,480,003 69	49 59
1902.. ..	5,537,500	271,829,089 62	49 08
1903.. ..	5,712,190	261,606,988 87	45 79
1904.. ..	5,890,066	260,867,718 60	44 29
1905.. ..	6,091,136	266,224,166 60	43 70
1906.. ..	6,323,557	267,042,977 75	42 23
1907.. ..	6,655,904	263,671,859 96	39 61
1908.. ..	6,863,500	277,960,859 84	40 49
1909.. ..	7,145,040	323,930,279 17	45 33
1910.. ..	7,450,990	*341,680,279 17	45 85

*Estimated.

So upon authority of the census officers of Canada, I am able to state that on the 31st day of March, at the close of the current year, by the best judgment they can bring to bear, the population of Canada will be 7,450,990. Now, if we apply these figures to the net debt of the country, we have this gratifying result, that while in 1891 the net debt was $49.09 per capita, and while it had increased in 1896 to $50.82, it began to diminish after the first year of Liberal administration, when it was $50.87; and from that point down, the figures have always been less than they were in 1896. And to-day, although in the last year we did add $46,000,000 to the debt of the country, although in the present year we shall add upwards of $17,000,000 to the net debt, yet if these figures are correct, on the 31st day of March, 1910, the net debt of Canada per head will be, not $50.82 as it was in 1896, but it will be $45.85. So, Mr. Speaker, if due regard be had to the growth and progress of Canada, the increase of debt is exceedingly small; and even with the very material sums which we have to add on account of the National Transcontinental railway, we are still in the happy position of seeing that the growth of the population and resources of Canada is faster than the growth of our public debt.

Mr. LAKE. Before the minister passes from the debt, may I ask to what extent the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific and other railways have been guaranteed up to the present time?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount is set forth in the Public Accounts. I could not give it to my hon. friend immediately, but if he will turn to the report in the Public Accounts he will find the figures there set forth.

Mr. LAKE. For last year?

Mr. FIELDING. The last blue-book contains the latest statement. If my hon. friend, on looking it up, finds it to be insufficient, I will be happy, if he will mention it to me, to see that he is put in possession of the information. I do not wish to burden the House with many statistical tables. There was a time when the budget speech was a somewhat ponderous affair, but I have endeavoured to have regard to the time and patience of the House. But, I thought a few statistics might be given to show the rapid recovery that has taken place after the check that came upon the business of the country a year or two ago. The total trade in 1908-9, as compared with 1907-8, declined to the extent of $79,524,364. Of that imports declined $61,029,917 and exports $18,494,447. An early recovery, I am glad to say, is going on and quite rapidly. For the seven months to the 31st October, 1909, being the last date for which we have the customs statistics, the total trade of all kinds exceeded that of last year by $48,400,000. Of this $34,553,278 represents imports and $13,847,219 exports. At the same rate of progress for 1910 the total trade of the current year will probably exceed that of the record year of 1907-8, when the total trade was $650,000,000.

A brief reference might also be made to the deposits in the chartered banks, merely to indicate the restoration of our financial

equilibrium. Ten years ago the deposits in the chartered banks of Canada amounted to $250,000,000. They increased rapidly and on the first September, 1907, these deposits amounted to $590,000,000. Then, under the influence of the depression which had come, they began to drop and they did drop for several months. Then they began to increase and as a result on the 31st October, 1909, the bank deposits amounted to $731,806,000, or three times nearly what they were only ten years ago.

The immigration figures are also very gratifying. I am going over these very briefly because I do not wish to weary the House with many statistics. It is hardly necessary to say that a steady influx of population is one of the important things for our country, especially our western country, which offers the greatest attractions to immigration. In the year 1908-9 there was a considerable falling off in immigration. In 1907-8 the number of immigrants was 262,469, while in the next year—1908-9—it was only 146,908, showing a decrease of 115,561. A very noticeable feature of the immigration that year was that the falling off was almost entirely in British and continental immigration. There was no falling off in the United States immigration. The movement of the tide once was setting southwards; the tide is now moving northward and even in the year of depression the immigration from the United States did not fall off. In 1907-8 the immigrants from the United States numbered 58,312 while in 1908-9 they numbered 59,832. There was a very slight increase in the number. But the returns for the present year are very encouraging indeed. Comparing the tables for the ten months of the present calendar year with those for the ten months of the previous year we find that there has been an increase of 26,824. The number of British immigrants is slightly less than in the previous year, the number from the continent is about the same and the number from the United States appears to be steadily increasing.

We have naturally desired to extend our trade relations with other countries. In that connection I might call the attention of the House to the steps that are being taken with a view to the encouragement of better trade relations between Canada and the West Indies. We have long had a considerable trade with the West Indies and at one stage it was deemed advisable that we should grant the British West Indies the benefits of our preferential tariff. So far we have not received any return of any kind. The British government have not failed to notice the desirability of establishing closer trade relations between the various branches of the empire, and it was arranged some months ago that a royal commission should be appointed by His Majesty for the purpose of inquiring into the best methods of improving the trade relations between the British West Indies and Canada. The chairman of that commission is Lord Balfour of Burleigh, a very eminent British statesman, with whom are associated Sir John Dickson Poynder and Sir Daniel Morris, and upon that commission were placed two members of the Canadian government—the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance. We have held a series of rather interesting meetings in various parts of Canada, the effect of which, I am sure, will be to enable the British commissioners to understand the question from the Canadian point of view. At the next stage the inquiry moves to the West Indies. It was the desire of the commissioners that we should join them there at a very early date, but we felt that our first duty was to the parliament of Canada and we had to ask that the meeting of the commission might be postponed. The British members of the commission will meet in Jamaica at an early date in January and will then proceed south. If the business of this parliament should be sufficiently advanced to enable my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and myself to absent ourselves we hope to be able to join the commission in the Island of Barbados about the middle of February, but that, of course, will depend entirely upon the condition of the business of the Canadian parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the scope of this commission limited to British colonies, or is it to take in the South American republics?

Mr. FIELDING. It is limited to the British West Indies, because what we hope will be the result of it will be a preferential tariff in the British West Indies in favour of the products of Canada and, of course, that could not be arranged with foreign countries. It is, of course, too early for us to say much as to that, but we may hope that as a result of the inquiry Canada will receive a preference in the markets of the West Indies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the Canadian commissioners going to the West Indies?

Mr. FIELDING. This is our difficulty: The British commissioners proposed when they were here that we should go with them, but we had to say, that, having regard to our parliamentary duties, we could not go at once. At the first meeting which, I think, will be held at Jamaica about the middle of January, we shall not be able to be present. They will hold some further meetings and they have placed us under some sort of bonds to join them in the Island of Barbados on the 15th of February, or thereabouts. Whether or not we shall be able to go depends on the progress of business in this House.

Our treaty with France has now passed through its various parliamentary stages; it has received the approval of the French Chambers; it has received the approval of the parliament of Canada, and nothing remains now but the formal exchange of ratifications which may take place at Paris. We do not know at what date that may take place. Still, it is our desire that the ratifications may be exchanged as soon as possible, so that we will be able to receive the degree of increased trade that we expect to receive from that convention. We are aware that other nations are anxious to deal with us along somewhat similar lines. It has not escaped our notice that the German empire is also anxious now to approach Canada in a good spirit. It is an occasion when we need not dwell too much on what has happened in the past. We are aware that Germany is disposed now to enter upon negotiations with us, and we are also aware that there are two other European nations which are anxious to enter into trade relations with Canada. I refer to Italy and Belgium. In due course negotiations will have to be entered upon with these countries with the view of arriving, if possible, at some friendly understanding with them. Reference has sometimes been made in the House, and more particularly outside of it, to the disadvantage which Canada is said to suffer from the fact that the benefits of the French treaty have to go to certain other countries which give us nothing in return. At all events that is the way it is expressed. It is said that certain countries, by virtue of most favoured-nation treaties, made many years ago, are entitled to the benefits of this French treaty though they give us nothing in return.

There is a tendency to treat these favoured-nation treaties as something disadvantageous to Canada. I hesitate to accept that view. We do receive some substantial thing in return for the benefits we extend to these countries; we receive the guarantee that no other country will ever receive better terms than Canada receives, and that is of the utmost importance to us. No country is going to give Canada a monopoly of its trade. We may by a convention with any country receive some advantage for the time being, but every country will naturally claim its right to make a treaty with any other country. All that any country can reasonably ask from another country is that it shall be guaranteed the best terms that are given to others. Now, suppose we had no favoured-nation treaties; suppose we had none of these old treaties which we sometimes now complain of, what might happen? Let us take the case of one of the great nations which enjoys the benefit of one of these treaties. Austria-Hungary has an old treaty with Great Britain containing the most-favoured nation principle and by virtue of that treaty we are obliged to give to Austria-Hungary all the benefits of the French treaty, and it is often too hastily assumed that we get nothing in return. But, if there was no such treaty, Austria-Hungary would be free to make an arrangement with our neighbours to the south and to admit the products of the United States into her markets on more favourable terms than she would admit the products of Canada. Then, Canada would be obliged to make a special treaty with Austria-Hungary if she could, and she might or might not be able to come to terms. But while the most-favoured nation treaty remains in operation we have the assurance that neither the United States nor any other competitor of ours can receive any advantage in the markets of Austria-Hungary that will not at the same time come to us. Surely, that guarantee of the best terms that will be given to any foreign nation is something worth while as a return for the concessions we give.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to suggest that our market in that respect is increased by the provisions of the French treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. No, but if there was no such treaty and if we were to impose on the products of Austria-Hungary higher rates than we impose on the products of France, Austria-Hungary would naturally proceed at once to penalize us. The conditions that we have are such that at all times whenever any concession is granted by Austria-Hungary to any other nation we get the full benefit of it, and I really cannot see that we can expect more. I seriously think that it is a valuable concession that we thus obtain because it removes any necessity for our worrying over our relations with Austria-Hungary. The same would be true of the other countries, many of them not very important, which have the benefit of these favoured-nation arrangements.

There is one other country with which we have very close commercial relations. Of course our closest relations are with the mother country, which is our great market, but that comes to us so naturally that we hardly speak of it at all; we know we have our most valuable market in the mother country and our people appreciate it. There is, as I say, another great country with which we have close commercial relations and that is the United States. There has been some anxiety, perhaps some unnecessary alarm, in the mind of some of our Canadian people as to possible friction arising in consequence of the recent tariff legislation in the United States. But, after reading the most admirable message of

President Taft to Congress, a few days ago, I think that we can all feel that the United States government have a very correct appreciation of what is due to other countries, and to Canada particularly. I think the terms in which President Taft addressed Congress on that subject give us abundant assurance that he and his cabinet are desirous of continuing the close and friendly relations which prevail between the republic and Canada, and we for the present are not going to assume that there is any cause for anxiety as to any friction arising between the two countries.

We are approaching the time when we shall want to issue a gold coinage in Canada. That will necessitate some change in our Currency Act, and a measure dealing with that branch of our affairs will be brought forward at an early date. In the meantime I avail myself of the opportunity to present some information and to answer inquiry with respect to the operations of the Ottawa branch of the Royal Mint. It is well known that the objects we had in view in establishing the mint, were, first, we desired to make our coins in Canada, and secondly, we were influenced to some extent by the desire to have the gold of the Yukon and the Canadian provinces brought through Canada rather than sent away to the United States. It is said that trade follows the flag, and there are others who say that trade follows the gold, and if this be true, then, if you keep your gold in your own commercial channels you will influence your trade. Perhaps parliament had that in mind when both sides agreed it was desirable to establish a mint. Now, the mint will show a very handsome profit, but let me also say frankly that we could make a greater profit by having no mint; we could make a greater profit by having our coins made in the old country. But, the same reason which leads us to desire to make other things in Canada leads us to desire to make the coins of Canada within our own boundaries. We could save money by having our Dominion notes printed in England, but it was thought well some years ago to stipulate that they should be printed in Canada at an establishment erected within sight of the parliament buildings. Having provided that our note currency shall be made in Canada it was but a step in advance to say that our metallic currency should be made here as well. We have established what is called the Ottawa branch of the Royal Mint. There is the advantage in having it a branch of the Royal Mint that we shall be able to coin sovereigns which we could not do if it were purely a Canadian mint. Another thing is that it has enabled us, in the construction and equipment of the building, to have the great advantage of the skill and experience of the Royal Mint officials, which has given us a better building and equipment than we possibly could have obtained without the assistance of these gentlemen.

In connection with our mint there comes up the question of the deportation of foreign coins. A large proportion of the silver currency in Canada is foreign, chiefly American, and as there is a substantial profit on the coinage of silver, the presence of this large volume of American silver currency in Canada means that the profit on that finds its way into the treasury of the United States. We have, therefore, thought it desirable to take steps towards the exportation of American silver coins from Canada. Unfortunately, there is no reciprocity with regard to this silver coinage circulation. An American silver coin will be taken almost anywhere in Canada, but a Canadian silver coin will not generally be accepted in the United States, except perhaps along the frontier where there is considerable freedom of interchange. Now, if our American brethren were circulating a lot of Canadian coins and we were circulating a lot of American silver the deal would be square.

Mr. FOSTER. If we got into their $80,000,000 silver it would be more than square.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, if we will assume that an equal amount was being circulated in both countries. The fact is that while in any part of Canada you may be handed an American silver coin over the counter, once you get away from the boundary in the United States you will never come across such a thing as a Canadian silver coin in the transaction of business. We have thought it wise that we, the people of Canada, the treasury of Canada, should have the profit on the silver currency used in Canada. So we have taken steps to export the American coins. It has sometimes been suggested that we should prohibit the use of this coin. That would be a great mistake. There are points along the boundary where it is a great convenience to take the coins of one side or the other, and any attempt to interfere with their right to do so, would probably be embarrassing. So we do not interfere with that practice. Of course these foreign coins are not legal tender, but they pass freely. We have made an arrangement with the banks whereby they export all the American coin that comes to them to the United States. As that coin is removed from the country, naturally a market is created for our own coin and that gives increased employment to the mint and increased profit to the treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you keep it out?

Mr. FIELDING. You cannot keep it out, it will come back again, and where it comes back in the way of legitimate trade, while

perhaps it is not wise to encourage it, it is better to export it than to prohibit it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it come in any other way than in legitimate trade?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I think not; I think it is the passing to and fro along the boundary to some extent and then the large number of American visitors who come in every year, who are gladly welcomed—we hope more will come—all bring some coins with them, and to prevent in any way the free use of these coins would cause embarrassment. We do not propose to do so, but we say as soon as this coin comes in we will send it out, and we can afford to do it. We pay a small commission of three-eighths of one per cent to the banks for exporting it, this being only enough to pay them for the handling of the coin. I do not look upon the commission as a great inducement to the banks, but I look to them as good, patriotic Canadian citizens, to feel it to be their duty under this arrangement, not for the commission, but for the higher purpose, to see that whatever American coins come into a branch bank, shall not be paid out over the counter, but shall be retained and sent out under the arrangements that we have made.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister say to what points the banks sent them?

Mr. FIELDING. They may send it to and port in the United States, and on evidence that they have exported it and delivered it to a bank outside of Canada we accept the certificate and pay the small commission upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know the yearly cost of deportation and the quantity deported?

Mr. FIELDING. We had an arrangement several years ago which expired by lapse of time. We renewed it by order in council of the 2nd of June, 1909, and since that date there has been exported $432,865 on which we have paid a commission of three-eighths of one per cent.

We also make use of the mint for recoining worn silver currency. For some years we have been endeavouring to make the paper currency of Canada cleaner than in former years and I think we have succeeded, although perhaps the banks are still open to some criticism in that respect. It will be observed as a rule that the paper currency of Canada is now fairly clean. Having presented to our people a cleaner paper currency, we thought we should give them silver currency in better condition. There has been a large amount of worn silver currency in Canada, some of it quite thin and smooth. It is not a proper currency for circulation, but it has passed freely. A gets it and gives it to B and so on and the banks have paid it out over their counters. We think we may properly call in that currency and recoin it. This involves a small loss, because the friction caused by passing of the coinage diminishes its weight. However, the loss is quite small and we are able to give our people a fresher, cleaner and better currency, and I think they will approve of that.

I said that the mint is authorized to coin British sovereigns. It has done so to a small extent. It has a very small refining plant which enables it to do a little work along this line, and a number of people have presented gold which they desired to be converted into British sovereigns. That has been done, the mint receiving a fair payment for its services.

The actual expenditure in the construction of the mint, including site and buildings, up to November 30, 1909, has been $547,796.33.

It is estimated that for the refinery now under construction and its equipment a further expenditure of $67,000 will be required.

The estimated complete cost of the mint is $605,047.

The mint has been in operation for nearly two years, since January 2, 1908. In the first calendar year it coined 4,877,027 pieces. These included 636 British sovereigns coined for the owners of gold in the manner I have already mentioned.

In the eleven months of the present calendar year the mint coined 6,862,982 pieces. This included 13,161 British sovereigns coined under the conditions I have mentioned.

Parliament makes a grant of $75,000 per annum for maintenance. In 1908 this was more than sufficient, the outlay being only $71,997.32. The present year will absorb the whole annuity, and in view of the increasing amount of work the mint is required to do, it is likely the annuity will have to be enlarged.

The cost of operation has been:

1908..	$71,997 32
1909 (11 months)..	61,729 52

The total cost of operation for one year and eleven months has thus been $133,-726.84.

The revenue of the mint during the same period, including payment for all services rendered, amounts to $405,565.68.

The profits have thus been $271,838. This handsome balance will, of course, pay interest on the cost of construction and still leave a large sum to the credit of the mint. But, of course, as I pointed out, while we have this large profit on the operation of the mint, we could have had our coins made in the old country and have made a larger profit out of them. The judgment of the House, irrespective of party, was that we should have a Canadian mint. It is

one of the advancing steps of our Canadian nationality, and I believe it has met with the approval of the community at large.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister tell us how much it would have cost Canada to have had that same coinage made under the old system?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not made the calculation, but we certainly could have had our coins made much more cheaply in that way. We could also have had our notes made much more cheaply in England than in Ottawa, but just as the former government adopted the policy of having notes made in Ottawa, we have carried that policy a step further and have provided a mint for the making of coins here.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the minister would give a calculation of just what the difference would be?

Mr. FIELDING. I would be glad to give it, but in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of the House and of the country, it will not affect the argument. We all knew when we established the mint that we could have our coins made much more cheaply in England, but we elected to have them made in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Because the minister does not think it affects the argument, does he consider that the information should not be given?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly not. Of course this is a matter of opinion.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister to that extent believes in the national policy of the Conservative party?

Mr. FIELDING. Probably it is time that somebody believed in it, because I believe that the Conservative organs are repudiating it.

We have no tariff changes to propose on this occasion. It is not because we have entered a claim that the tariff is perfect. I have no doubt that wherever you have a customs tariff necessarily as full and intricate as ours has to be, there will be room for criticism, and certainly always room for demands for changes. But we are of the opinion that it is not in the best interests of the business of the country that there should be frequent changes. We believed that frequent tariff changes must have a disturbing influence on the business of the country and we wished to have it generally understood that where there has been a general revision of the tariff, as we had only two years ago, the government would not be disposed to make changes unless the need for them was very urgent indeed.

There is in our Tariff Act a provision which is alluded to in His Excellency's speech from the Throne; that is, the provision with regard to combines. Those who were in the House in 1897 may possibly remember that when the combine clause, as it is commonly called, was first presented to parliament, it proposed that in any given case where it should be established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that a combine existed for enhancing prices the Governor in Council should thereupon, upon their own motion, reduce the tariff on the article in question. It was in that form that the resolution was first submitted to this House, but afterwards it was represented to us that that seemed to be a dangeros power for the government to take to itself. At that time industrial establishments were possibly more sensitive than they are now as to the effect of the tariff. After consideration, that clause was so modified as to require a reference to a judicial commission to determine whether or not there was a combine enhancing prices; and only after that finding by the judicial tribunal was the government free to make a reduction in the tariff by executive act; and in that amended form the law passed. It is sometimes complained that because of the modification then made, the machinery of that combine clause is too slow and ineffective. It is said that the government have not provided sufficiently for the payment of the expenses to encourage people to take advantage of the clause; that too much is left to the individual and too little financial responsibility is put upon the public treasury. We are willing to meet this criticism. We shall at an early day propose a measure dealing with that subject, and its purpose will be chiefly to meet the criticism to which I have referred. It will provide that the government—not hastily or recklessly, because large interests are involved and must be considered—if there is a reasonable prima facie case that a combination exists for unduly enhancing prices, may provide all the expenses for conducting the inquiry, including the payment of counsel. That is the substance of the change, which will be proposed at a later stage.

With regard to the loans maturing, on the first of January next what is known as the 4 per cent Canada reduced loan of £6,443,136 falls due. This was originally a 5 per cent loan issued by the province of Canada in 1860 and renewed on the first of July, 1885 for 24½ years at 4 per cent. To meet this at maturity and to provide funds for our large requirements a loan of £6,500,000 of 3½ per cent stock at 98½ per cent was issued in London on the first of July last. An option was given to the holders of the 4 per cent reduced bonds and stock maturing on the first of January next to receive an equivalent amount of the new loan, and a cash payment of the equivalent of the difference between the

value of the loan issued and the value of the maturity on the first of January. The amount converted of the Canada reduced stock into the new loan was £1,847,418. In addition, some £2,000,000 of the 4 per cent reduced loan was held in its own sinking fund, leaving £2,498,749 to be repaid in cash in London on the first of January. The proceeds of the loan that I have just referred to will enable us to pay this amount. There is a further loan of £4,000,000 at 4 per cent issued in 1885, redeemable between 1910 and 1935 on the government giving six months' notice. As this is a 4 per cent loan, it was the intention of the government to avail itself of the option of redemption, and accordingly to give six months' notice on the first of January next. It would be good business to replace a 4 per cent loan by one bearing a lower rate of interest. But in view of the present disturbed condition of the money market, and I may add also the political disturbance, we have thought it advisable to postpone the giving of that notice until the first of July next. Further, on the first of October, 1910, a £1,500,000 4 per cent loan of 1875, guaranteed by the imperial government, falls due. In addition to these, there are two amounts of treasury bills, one of £1,000,000 falling due on the first of February, 1910, and another of £500,000 falling due on the first of July, 1910. In the ordinary course arrangements will have to be effected for meeting these obligations. As I have said before, the financial and other disturbances which have affected the money market in London have rendered it inexpedient for the present to undertake any such large operations by way of long term loans. It has accordingly been deemed wiser to adopt the expedient of short term bills, and negotiations have been carried on with the view of providing £3,000,000 for a period of six months on the security of treasury bills from the first of January next. The operation has been effected at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum. This will enable us to pass through the period of disturbed conditions in England, due to some extent to the high bank rate and to some extent to the political situation, and we shall then have time to consider whether it will be expedient to issue a permanent loan.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are the treasury bills issued in London or here?

Mr. FIELDING. In London. I have endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, to present concisely what I regard as the chief facts and figures necessary to the consideration of our financial position. I cannot hope that all I have said will be received with universal approval in this House, because I know that we look at some of these matters from different points of view; but as we have all the same good purpose in view, that of promoting the welfare of Canada, I am sure that we shall unite in expressing our satisfaction with the happy and prosperous condition of affairs in Canada today. It must be a gratification to every good citizen to see so many favourable signs in the outlook of our country. The check which came upon us a year or two ago may have served a good purpose. Happily it has proved but temporary; happily it has not remained with us; and already there is a rapid recovery. We have, as we all know, a country of magnificent resources. We have known it long; but we have needed two things—population and capital. Both of these things are now coming to Canada. Population is coming from all quarters of the earth. It is coming in a very large degree from the neighbouring republic, and we rejoice in the character of the immigrants that country is sending back to Canada. Population is coming also from the old world. We can well rejoice that this long desired growth of population is coming to us. We have also desired capital, and that is coming to us too. There never was a time when there was more interest in Canadian affairs throughout the world than there is to-day, or a greater willingness on the part of capitalists to invest in Canada. This is Canada's growing time. We have had growth in population, growth in wealth, growth in Canadian unity, growth in national status in the eyes of the world, growth in our sense of responsibility as citizens of a great empire. In all this growth we have reason to rejoice. But, what is better than all, we feel that this is but the beginning of greater things to come. To us as trustees of the Canadian people has been given the duty of moulding the destinies of the Canadian Dominion at a time when it has a formative character. Let us see to it, in the midst of our party strife, that at all times there rises above all the dominant note of a patriotic desire to do whatever is possible to promote the progress, prosperity and happiness of the Canadian people.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker: With the concluding remarks of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), I find myself, as I am sure do all hon. members on this side, in complete accord. It is a fact that sometimes party differences are exaggerated and party spirit leads to a one-sided and even unfair presentation of matters before the House. But when, apart from these things, we come to contemplate the larger questions of country and of empire, I hope that we may always be in a position to reciprocate the sentiment that has fallen from the lips of the Minister of Finance. I notice that the hon. Minister of Finance appeared a little more cheerful when he rose to present his bud-

get speech this year than on a similar occasion last year. Circumstances have somewhat changed, and what was presented to his mind last year, as being to a certain extent allied with doubt and uncertainty has partly cleared away. The hon. gentleman has had a respite, I hope it will be long continued. The country has had a respite from a comparatively short period of stringent finance and disturbed trade. I only hope that the Minister of Finance and the government with him, will improve the lesson taught by that even short period of financial stringency and will incline their hearts more to businesslike and economical administration of the country's affairs in the future.

Now, I am not going to follow the Minister of Finance through all the somewhat lengthy remarks which he has made, consisting very largely of tables of figures, but I shall endeavour to touch on a few of these points by way of passing remark. Reduced to colloquial language, the year 1909 may be described somewhat in this way: The trade fell off a little over $67,000,000; the revenue fell off about $11,000,000; the expenditure increased by $21,000,000, $7,500,000 on consolidated fund account and $13,500,000 on capital account; the surplus, which was counted on as being $1,500,000, fell to $1,000,000. At that time, the old method of charging bounties to capital interposed in favour of the Minister of Finance. The amount paid in bounties was $2,500,000, and this being charged to capital, he was enabled to count a surplus of $1,000,000. Had that, the amount paid in bounties, been paid out of revenue, as it was under the preceding government, the minister would not have had a surplus of even $1,000,000, but would have had a deficit of $1,500,000. It is significant that, although there had been previous monitions given in good time and somewhat strongly to the business men of the country and to every chancellor of an exchequer, the Finance Minister amongst other, warning them of what was approaching and would certainly come, we find the astounding fact that the estimates of Canada, provided by the Minister of Finance himself and his government, were the largest in the history of Canada, and that the expenditure came to the sum of $133,000,000, which is a little more than three times what it was in 1896 and high-water mark of public expenditure in this country. That is a significant comment upon the extraordinary way in which the minister settled himself to meet the storm which was to break—he did it by larger estimates, increased imposts (counting as imposts what is taken out of the pockets of the people) and increased expenditure. That, I think, was not a reasonable way. The minister might have added to the financial strength of this country very materially if he had done as every business man in the country did, as the chancellor of every exchequer that I know of did, as any prudent business man would do—curtail in the face of the storm that was yet to come and so save in that way what he could of the strength and credit of the country's finances. That he did not do. As a result, of that same year, there was an addition to the public debt of $46,000,000, the largest addition to the public debt which this country has ever seen, and which might have been cut in two—yes, might have been diminished even more than that by reasonable and not at all impossible economies in the administration of the finances by the Minister of Finance himself.

When we come to the year 1910, trade is gaining, the revenue is increasing; the expenditure—we do not quite know whether that will exceed or not. The Finance Minister professes to believe that it will not; I hope his prognostications in this respect will prove true. But, at least, there will be very heavy expenditures. Last year, there were large borrowings by the Minister of Finance, amounting to £25,000,000 or £26,000,000 for which this country went into the market within a very limited time. this year also borrowings will take place; and the result of last year's borrowings, the way in which and the time at which they were carried on, the result of the utter lack of any prudent foresight a year or a year and a half before, was that, whereas Canada's credit had so improved that her borrowing rate had declined to 2·8 per cent in 1897, the cost now has gone up to very nearly 5 per cent, a point beyond the average cost during the first fifteen years of the administration of the financial affairs of this Dominion.

When we come to 1911, the Minister of Finance has very little to say. The main estimates call for $127,000,000. There are to be additional borrowings; what these may amount to we do not know. Besides the additions to the debt of last year and of this year, there will be another addition in 1911.

Well, what, after all, has saved the Finance Minister? Has it been the exercise of any very great prudence of his own? Has it been the display of extraordinary skill and capacity in the management of the finances? Has it been any intrinsic merit from a business point of view of the administration of the government itself? Not in any sense, not in the least. What has saved the government and what has saved the country was pointed out by a gentleman who is not a Minister of Finance or the leader of the party, who is not at all a partyman in the position in which he makes the utterance. The vice-president and manager of the Bank of Montreal, in a very few sentences, hit the

nail exactly on the head. What has intervened, and what has brought about the change, and what has set this government and the Finance Minister on their feet again so far as the business of this country is concerned? Why, it has simply been the work and the product of the farmers of this country. The vice-president of the Bank of Montreal pointed out that in 1900 the product of the Northwest amounted to 32,000,000 bushels, in 1907 it had risen to 160,000,000 bushels, in 1908 it was 232,000,000 bushels, and in 1909, 313,500,000 bushels, That is the explanation of the whole matter; that explains exactly how the shortcomings and blunders of the administration have been, if not entirely offset, minimized and mitigated to the exceeding great relief of the country itself. There is an increase of 81,000,000 bushels in the Northwest alone in a single year. That is worth at least $50,000,000, and maybe more. The prices that are obtained this year were never better, and the increased prices received for the product, interjected into the veins of business, is what has really regenerated this country, and set us on again to a period of, we hope, continuous prosperity.

Now what particular praise and what particular honour are due to the administration for that? These increased products have come from the northwest provinces. We are not without memories—who was it that purchased and opened up that country? Who was it that put the first great transcontinental railway through that country, and so made possible transport facilities, and a habitation and a working place for the farmer? And where were these gentlemen in that period? To-day they are reaping the harvest, I do not object to that; thank God that the harvest is as generous as it is. But let no one run away with the idea that because this help has suddenly come as a manna from Heaven to these gentlemen in their great straits, therefore some mighty skill, some deep inborn ingenuity, some most powerful and wonderful exercise of business talents is what has lifted the country up and sent it again on its way rejoicing. For those farmers, what have these gentlemen done? Do not their clothes cost them more than they did under the old regime? Do they not have to pay more for their lumber for every shack and every house they build? Is not their hardware more costly to them than it ever was before? And when they come to the labour which has to help them to till their fields, when have they had to pay so much for it as they do at the present time? As to grain prices, of course the government can do nothing. In what sense then has this government's administration helped to lift the country out of the slough of despond, and bring it into the blessings of the promised land? So I say it is the innate quality and virtue of the soil of the northwest, it is the strong arm and the business head of the farmer in the northwest, it is the co-operation, with these as a sub-stratum, of the keen business intellect, and the ability of the business men of our country, it is the application of the skill and brawn of the artisan in our factories and our industries, to which is due the prosperity of this country, in spite of the extravagances and in spite of the laches of the government since they assumed the administration of affairs.

As to the debt, the hon. gentleman said very little. Perhaps there is not a great deal to say, perhaps it was best that he kept on very quiet ground in that respect; for if he had not, he would have been easily reminded of what these gentlemen promised to do when they were in the shades of opposition, and what they have failed to do since they came into power. Where is the reciprocity with the United States that the hon. gentleman was going to get six months after he attained power? Where is the approach to free trade, the goal to which my right hon. friend had declared he had set his face with great determination, and from which he would not recede until he had attained it? Where is the goal of free trade as it is in England under the administration of this Paul the Apostle, who but a few years ago was a raging Saul of Tarsus, going up and down, finding fault with and denouncing the policy of protection from one end of Canada to another? My right hon. friend, after the homily which was preached to him today, the strongest I have heard in this House in a great many years, I suppose still has his face pointed towards the goal of free trade as it is in England, with no possibility of getting nearer to it within his natural life.

Well, Sir, we were to have many other things. We were to have a market open for us everywhere. What markets have they opened to us? Some markets have been closed to us, in others the rates have been raised upon us. No foreign market in the world has yet been opened to us by this aggregation of all the talents in the thirteen years during which they have been in power. If it can be named, let it be named. Some of our own sisters, the sub-nations of the empire, have granted us, as we have granted them, certain preferential privileges; but outside of that, there is not a nation in the wide world, outside of treaties which had been made before, into which any ingress has been given by these gentlemen for the products of our country.

Oh, yes, there is the French treaty, not yet operative, but soon to go into operation. But the burden of the fat cattle which the Prime Minister a year ago

shouldered into this House with great pride and pomp, when he appealed to the farmers of this country as to what the French treaty would do for them, the burden of fat cattle has been dumped, the stockers are the only ones that are left, and they will have a jolly time geting into the French market, over a tariff of anywhere from $15 to $20 per head, and the uncertainty as to what interpretation of the tariff may be made by those who have the sole regulating power as to the entrance of our cattle into French ports. So we have not got very much from that. But we have loaded ourselves with $200,000 a year for a steamship subsidy to be paid to vessels running between this country and France; that is in ten years $2,000,000 which my hon. friend the Finance Minister did not take into account, and which has to be provided for.

Well, there are some other things that have not been done. The state of trade between the United States and Great Britain and Canada, remains unrectified. That condition of things was very severely censured by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his coadjutors in the olden times. They told us that it was neither patriotic nor loyal that we should be buying more from the United States than we were buying from Great Britain, and selling less to the United States than we bought from the United States. They loudly called for a tariff which would rectify that and put us in a better position. How do we stand to-day? In 1908 we bought from the United States $204,000,000 worth. They bought from us $90,000,000 worth, wherein the balance of trade aggregated the sum total of $114,000,000. In 1909 the unfavourable balance was reduced to $85,000,000, but the trade is now going up, and, as it goes up, the adverse balance with the United States will also increase. On the other hand, Great Britain bought from us a much larger amount than she sold to us, and gave us last year a favourable balance of trade of $55,500,000. Any one sees that the balance of trade which is favourable in the case of Great Britain, has to go to the extent of $55,500,000 to pay the adverse balance of trade against us from the United States, and it will still leave from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 to be paid for in some other way. The point I wish to make is that these hon. gentlemen have not rectified that grave condition of things which they censured in our time, but that under their administration it has been enlarged and aggravated to the degree which I have stated. To-day there is an adverse balance of trade with France of $5,000,000, with Germany of $4,500,000, with South America of $1,000,000, and with the West Indies of $3,500,000. The total balance of trade against us in 1908 was $104,000,000. It was reduced last year, because there were less imports, to $45,500,000. Now, though I am not going to say that Canada ought to be and that it is imperatively necessary that she should be always in a position of having a favourable trade balance, I say that when, under any administration and its policy, you have an adverse balance continually increasing, something is wrong in connection with that trade policy and it ought to be the duty and endeavour of the government to so arrange its policy that this adverse balance should be made as small as possible, that it should be reduced instead of constantly advancing.

My hon. friend said that they had not raised the rate of duties. His favourite response always is: Oh, you are the party of high duties; we are the party of low duties. With the preachment of the Minister of Finance to-day in advocacy of bounties, the highest form of protection, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who still, I think, believes that we have a revenue tariff in this country—at least, he takes occasion to reiterate it each year—will find it very difficult indeed to persuade his constituents that under the leadership of the Finance Minister the day of free trade has not for ever passed away in this country. Well, what about that immense reduction of duties? Here are just some facts taken from the reports of the ministers themselves. From 1879, when the protective tariff was introduced, until 1896, when the Liberal-Conservative government went out of power, the average rate of duty on dutiable goods coming into this country was 28·35 per cent. In 1909 the average rate was 27·46 per cent. So it is a fact that in the last year of grace, under the administration of these hon. gentlemen who have so lowered the duties—to listen to themselves—their duty is 27·46 per cent, as against an average of 28·35 per cent from 1879 to 1896. But taking into account, as I have a right to do, the bounty which is a special form of protection and which they take out of the treasury of the country, I find that in 1909 they have a rate of 28·72 per cent, and so they have actually reduced the rate of duty exactly 89-100ths of one per cent from the average of 1879-1896.

Now, I agree with my hon. friend in his statement with reference to the nature of the message which was sent to Congress a little while ago by President Taft. It was a reasonable message, it was a statesmanlike message, it was a message which gave, I think, to all countries the right to believe that whilst President Taft and his cabinet remain in power there will be no seeking for trouble with reference to the matter of discriminatory and compensating duties. I do not think a message could

have been fairer than his was on that point, and I quite agree with the Finance Minister in his characterization of what we may conclude from a perusal of it. At least, we will hope that it shall not be made an instrument of even menace to us in Canada. It remains, however, that the United States tariff, outside of President Taft entirely, has already penalized Canada with reference to her exports of both pulp and paper and has done that because of the conserving policy of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which are looking to the preservation of their forests. So much then in reference to the United States, although this fact remains, and we might just as well state it, that the tariff of the United States, as compared with the tariff of Canada, does not give to Canada that fair trade to which she is entitled.

There is another situation in the trade point of view which is extremely interesting at the present time. That is the situation in Great Britain. I am not going to discuss British party politics for a single moment, but I think it is well for us to keep a few facts in mind. It is not more than five years ago, certainly not more than six years ago, that the right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain first promulgated his view, and a view not entirely and completely formed at that time, of what he thought might be or ought to be the fiscal relations of the mother country with the different parts of the empire and of the different parts of the empire with each other. Not more than five or six years ago did that idea receive the countenance and support of a first rate British statesman. Five or six years ago a first rate British statesman promulgated that idea in the face of a free trade England which had been free trade for forty or fifty years, and there did not then seem to be any great probability that such an idea would prevail. But five or six years have passed and what do we find. So rapid has been the change in public opinion, so rapid the progress of events. so strongly has the question of empire and the treatment due to the different parts of the empire taken hold of the people of Great Britain and the empire, that to-day the South African colonies give a preference to the mother country, New Zealand gives a preference to the mother country, Australia gives a preference to the mother country, Canada gives a preference to the mother country, and we have at the present time in the mother country itself, one of the great historic political parties entering into an electoral contest in which the first plank in their platform is tariff reform, with the avowed purpose of using it to give to the colonies preferential treatment. That marks a rapidity of movement and change in the fiscal ideas of the mother country and the empire which one would scarcely have ventured to prophesy a few years ago. And whether the Unionists or the Liberals are successful in the coming election—and I do not suppose any one wishes to hazard an opinion as to which it will be—I do not think it is going too far to say that the time is appreciably near when the policy of Great Britain will be one which will enable her to give to the colonies a measure of preferential treatment in return for the measure of preferential treatment which the colonies have given to her. Now, while I have every sympathy with the Minister of Finance in his endeavour, if he makes an honest endeavour, to advance the trade of Canada with other countries, I think it will be wise to be very careful in these different negotiations that we do not tie our hands unnecessarily so as to make it more difficult for us to enter into that kind of partnership with the mother country, which, when the change comes in her fiscal policy which will enable her to do so, she will offer to us. Have we not everything to gain locally by an entrance into the markets of Great Britain on a preferred basis. It is not necessary for me to more than ask that question; no one will dissent. Not only have we locally much to gain but as believers in and lovers of the empire we know that the empire has much to gain by uniting its scattered Dominions more closely together.

In the way of evoking greater sympathy and greater practical interest, in the way of uniting more closely all the members of the empire one to the other and each to all we have very much to gain. Therefore I say that it is well that the Minister of Finance and the government should go slowly in making any entangling alliances for trade with other countries until at least we get more light upon what may take place in the future in Great Britain. Of course it may be said that we make these treaties subject to abrogation on certain notice, but it is equally true that it is more difficult to give notice of abrogation than it is to enter into a commercial treaty in the first place. Now, some people ask the question: Do you mean to say that any power exists which can make a tariff for Canada outside of the parliament of Canada itself, and are you willing to go into any arrangement of that kind. The question may be fairly answered in this way: There is no body which can make a tariff for Canada outside of the parliament of Canada itself, but that did not bar the parliament of Canada itself from giving preferential treatment to Great Britain, and to Australia, and to the West Indies, and to New Zealand, and neither will it bar the parliament of the United Kingdom, from giving to Canada or Australia or New Zealand or any other of the over-seas Dominions a preferential entrance into her market. There-

fore, the question of having to submit to some outside authority before you can have the advantages of preference is altogether visionary. Each component part keeps its absolute autonomy and independent power of deciding what its tariff shall be, each looks over the field and as its circumstances allow and its sympathies and its interests direct it gives to the other member of the family a preferred entrance in whatever manner it may deem wise. I do not know that any imperial preference man; I have never heard of one yet who has advocated that under present conditions any other method of fixing the tariffs under a preference shall be resorted to than that which I have just mentioned, and it certainly takes away all objections on the ground of autonomy. So much with reference to matters of trade.

Now, I was going to criticise the Minister of Finance a little with reference to financial matters, but I am not sure that it will do any good. Any way he may say that the horse has gone and that there is no use of now locking the stable door. That is true, but a man who loses something valuable because of not having locked the door is very apt to see that his doors are afterwards kept secure so that the loss shall not be repeated. It is in that view that I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance very briefly some things which he did not do and some things which he failed to do and some things which he actually has badly done in reference to this financial flurry which we have had. What then did he do? He knew as well as any man in Canada—he should have known better than any man in Canada—long before the latter part of 1907 and the first part of 1908 that this financial stress was coming upon the world and he should have taken two methods and employed both of them; first he should have anticipated by making his provision for the tremendous obligations which he had entailed upon himself and, secondly, he should have reduced his current expenditures and should have initiated a period of economy a year before he did at the very least. In those two ways, by making provision in time before the hurry and the strenuous condition of the market put him in the very worst position, and the other by not making extraordinary estimates but rather resorting to economical and less extravagant estimates he should have prepared to meet the stringency. In those two points I think the minister failed. As a result what took place? The minister says he has not damaged the credit of the country. I do not think that intrinsically the country has been struck a fatal blow in that respect, but this much is true that the Finance Minister, by his methods, has not improved the financial condition of the country. That he has not improved it is easily proved by the two facts to one of which I have alluded with respect to his loans. In the first place, he has paid and has been for the last year and a half paying the highest interest on loans that has ever been paid in the history of Canada. He has reversed the downward trend arising from the better condition of Canadian finances and Canadian business which showed from 1870 down to 1894, and reached the low figure of 2·88 per cent in 1897. He has reversed that and his rates have climbed until now he is getting very little money at 3½ per cent and is paying very close to 5 per cent for most of the money that he has borrowed of late and that he will likely borrow in the future. In the second place, see the extraordinary methods to which he had to have recourse in order to get his money. It is a fact that the loans from 1879 to 1894 on the British market made by Canada amounted to £26,943,000, while those made from 1897 to 1909 amounted to £20,831,398. The brokerage that was paid by Finance Ministers for the former loans amounted to £55,718. The commission paid on these loans amounted to £214,916. That was under the old times when Canada's credit was not supposed to be as good as it might be now with the great development of this country. The Finance Minister from 1897 to 1909 has gone into the British market for £20,831,398, £6,000,000 less than the preceding figure which I have mentioned. On that he has paid a brokerage of £60,988, and a commission of £347,330. He has paid more in brokerage, on a less quantity borrowed, by £5,270, and he has paid more in commission, on a less quantity borrowed, by £132,414. Added together he has paid $685,000 more for less borrowings than the amounts paid from 1879 up to 1894. And this, too, although he has during the later period had the advantage of a much more favourable brokerage contract made with the Bank of Montreal in 1892. That, I say, is an excessive increase, and the fact that he has had to raise his loans by such extraordinary payments is, I think, a very good argument to show that he did not find Canada's credit just as easy and as well established as he would try to make us believe. The following table will illustrate the above, it being borne in mind that 1897-1909 were Liberal government years:

Years.	Amount borrowed.	Brokerage paid.	Commission paid.
1879-1894	£26,943,000	£55,718	£214,916
1897-1909	20,831,398	60,988	347,327
Excess paid by Liberal government..		£ 5,270	£132,411

Total excess, brokerage and commission, $685,000.

There is no necessity of making a laboured criticism of the minister. That, I think, shows exactly in a nutshell the difficulties that he encountered, and I think I have given very plainly the reasons for which he encountered those difficulties. Will the minister and his colleagues having been given this respite through the grace of the farmers and of Providence, take any lessons and learn to guide their conduct by the experience of the past? I am afraid they will not. The Minister of Finance to-day indicated his intention of soon having, if he could, $100,000,000 revenue—and spending it all. He gave out the cheering news to his expectant supporters that he could now afford to be a little more free in the matter of general expenditures, and I noticed that that evoked a corresponding cheer. But I noticed that the Minister of Finance did not say a word to indicate that he intended to carry out what he hinted at last year and what was very strongly impressed on him from this side of the House, that in times of buoyant revenue he might well take pattern by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain, and lay aside a certain amount each year for the extinguishment of the public debt, that when things were prosperous and the treasury was full and the revenues were buoyant it was a good time to strengthen the reserves of the country by laying aside something as a sinking fund and to diminish our vast debt. To-day we are carrying a debt of $325,000,000. Next year that will be still larger, and the year after that larger than before, and it does seem to me to be a fair point to take that out of abundant revenues something should be done in order to diminish the public debt, give confidence to the lenders in the old country and at least make our acknowledgment of an obligation to pay the principal as well as to pay the interest on our borrowings. The country will also have to borrow during the succeeding year. I find that in 1910, some $38,500,000 are to be met in maturing loans; $14,000,000 of this will be covered by sinking funds which will leave about $24,000,000 or $25,000,000 to be borrowed. That is for maturing debt alone, and to that must be added the borrowings for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, whatever they may be, and I shall touch that subject later. In 1911, $8,555,000 has to be met as a maturing loan, and will have to be borrowed. In 1912, $30,500,000, and in 1913, $8,000,000 have to be met in the way of maturing loans. All that is in addition to what may be necessary to be borrowed for the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. The Finance Minister in his statement of debt made very little, if any, allusion to the obligations which Canada is under. My friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) by a question brought the minister's attention thereto.

The minister, however, set little store by it, for he did not consider it sufficiently important to make it an item in his budget. But it is true that Canada is under obligations, and increasing obligations in this respect. I find that for the Canadian Northern there are bonds of £1,923,287 at 3 per cent guaranteed, and for the same railway £1,622,586 at 3½ per cent, principal and interest, and, £5,200,000 is already guaranteed for the Grand Trunk Pacific; but, considering that we have to provide for a guarantee of 75 per cent of the whole cost of the Mountain Division, this obligation, before it is ended, will amount to a very large sum; and, although the Finance Minister, may not think so, into whatever market he goes, not only will the revenues and the expenditures and the public debt be taken into consideration, but every obligation that the government is under is scanned as well, and scanned zealously, and goes to make up the estimation of the credit of the country.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. R. Smith.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Ethier.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish now to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of expenditures, a matter in which, probably more than in any other, this government has made dangerous progress and has shown a disposition to completely go back upon all the professions its party made in their days of opposition with regard to principles, methods and conditions of expenditure. In making these remarks on the expenditures of the government, one cannot go so much into particulars as he would like; therefore I will confine myself to some general points. What first strikes us is the startling increase in expenditures from 1897 up. The Minister of Finance, this afternoon, in comparing the two administrations in relation to expenditure went on to show that the percentage of general expenditures provided for out of current revenue by the present government was greater than that provided for by the preceding government during their terms of office. It ought not to have

been difficult for the Finance Minister to give a very good reason therefor. His own accounts were before him and a mere glance at the columns would have shown him that the present government has taken from the people by means of taxation about twice as much as did the preceding government. This government, therefore, had nearly twice as much revenue at its disposal, and if they made just about the same proportionate charges to current revenue, the percentages which were mentioned by the Finance Minister would just about establish equality. In the twelve and three-quarter years during which this administration has been in power, it has taken $618,000,000 in taxation from the country. In the last twelve and three-quarter years of the preceding administration they took only $340,000,000. That is, the present administration has taken nearly double the amount in taxation that their predecessors did, and on the same principle and rule, they would disburse a much larger amount for what the minister calls capital and special expenditure. But the Minister of Finance spoke also of the conditions of the debt, and I would like to recall his attention and that of the House to a point which I made in a preceding debate. During the incumbency of the Liberal-Conservative government, $118,000,000 was added to the public debt. Of that, $10,000,000 was incurred in adding a very valuable asset to this Dominion in the form of 7,500,000 acres of land in the west at about $1.50 an acre. If you count the $118,000,000 of addition to the debt on the one side, you must look on the other side also and consider the assets. Now, the assets that represent debt in the Dominion of Canada are not, as a rule, productive. Many of them, instead of being productive, are the very opposite; they are wasting assets; they are continually depreciating and requiring not only the payment of interest on the first investment, but the cost of upkeep and maintenance. In this case, an asset of real value was added to the country in the form of 7,500,000 acres of land which, if it had been reserved to this day would, counted at the moderate price of $8 per acre, represent a value of $60,000,000. That, when pointed out, any fair-minded man would take into consideration. And, in connection with that, let me ask what live asset of any similar value has the present government added to the resources of this country by the addition of any similar, or even greater, amount to the public debt? They have been often in haste to get rid of the lands of this country by selling them at remarkably small prices to favourites of the government. Here was a case in which the land was bought for the Dominion, and has remained and remains to this day as an asset, an asset which has greatly increased in value, and it represents certainly at a moderate calculation the amount which I have named.

The expenditure of this country in 1896, for all purposes, was $41,000,000; in 1897 the expenditure was $43,000,000 a very slight addition; but in 1909 the expenditure has gone up to the enormous sum of $133,000,000, a little more than three times the expenditure of 1896. It is altogether easy, and just as futile as easy, to say that the expenditure increased because the country has grown. The country is growing, and the country's expenditure must grow. But here is a growth in expenditure which exceeds all corresponding growth in population, or in any other way that you may mention. It is an inordinate increase in expenditure. When you come to the column which represents the expenditures of the Liberal-Conservative party, you will find that in 1873, to commence with that date which was about the time the Liberal government came into power, the expenditure was $39,000,000. In 1880 when the Liberal Conservatives were again in power, the total expenditure was $34,000,000. Now from 1880 to 1896 were periods of growth, of expansion, of building large public works, and it takes in the beginning and the completion of the first transcontinental railway, namely, the Canadian Pacific railway. And yet if you run through the columns of figures, you will find that the total expenditure keeps along in the thirty and forty millions. In 1880, as I have said, it was $34,000,000; in 1887, $41,000,000, and from 1887 to 1896, the average total expenditure was only $42,000,000. The great works which had to be undertaken and carried out, in the way of the enlargement of the canals, in building the Canadian Pacific railway, in construction of the Soo canal, and in subsidizing and building other branch lines of railway, all that was undertaken and carried out, and yet the absolute total expenditure for all purposes only increased from $34,000,000 in 1880 to an average of $42,000,000 from 1887 to 1896.

Now there is no parallel between that and the expenditure by this government. The Finance Minister says, we are also building a transcontinental railway. So you are, and you have paid out to end of the financial year some $51,000,000 for it. But do not forget the fact that the Liberal-Conservative government built the Canadian Pacific railway, in so far as public aids were given, and that this increased the total expenditures by $62,500,000. but this government has increased the total disbursements from $43,000,000 to $133,000,000 in twelve and three-quarter years. Therefore, there is no possible parallel between the two.

Let me put it in another way. From confederation up to the present date the Do-

minion of Canada has expended 1,985 million dollars. All the previous governments up to 1897 expended 1,063 millions of that; this present government, in its twelve and three-quarter years, has expended 922 millions. That is to say, in twelve and three-quarter years this government has spent to within 70 millions an amount equal to what the whole Dominion of Canada spent in the preceding 29 years. Is not that going it some? It is a startling thing when you come to look at the figures; 922 millions in twelve and three-quarter years, 1,063 millions in the 29 preceding years. But great expenditures necessitate great taxation, great income, or that combined with great borrowings. So what is the record to-day with regard to taxation? This, that as regards receipts, 1,672 millions have been gathered from the Canadian people since confederation, 828 millions of this have been gathered in twelve and three-quarter years by this government, 844 millions was gathered in 29 years by all the governments preceding this. So this present government has gathered from the country, taking out of the pockets and earnings of the people, within 8 million dollars as much as was taken out of the pockets of the people for the 29 preceding years.

Now if you take the twelve and three-quarter years, what has been the average of population? Five and a half million people in twelve and three-quarter years has handed over to this government 828 million dollars, or an average of 65 millions per year. Now the Minister of Finance may make his divisions and calculations with regard to the net debt, and set forth how much it is per head. That proves nothing. The point is: What are you taking out of the individual taxpayer of this country? What are you taking out to-day? $11 to $12 per head, whereas in 1896 we took out a little less than $5.50 per head. This money you took out is money that comes from the man's earnings, it is so much abstracted from his capital. There ought to be no reason in the world for taking it except that it is absolutely necessary that the aggregate of the people of this country should be governed and, that they should pay for it. Yet you have taken this immense amount of money, $65,000,000 per year during the last twelve and three-quarter years, or a total of 922 millions, and in addition to that are the borrowings you have provided for.

Now when any man looks around, goes through the books, looks around this country and asks what we have got for the 922 millions of expenditure in twelve and three-quarter years, he finds it difficult to answer that question. What have we got that stands and is useful to this country, and is either productive or stimulating? What have you? It is a debated question as to whether the Grand Trunk Pacific, as regards the portion from Lake Superior junction to Moncton, is a stimulant to this country, or will be productive within very many years. But even that represents to the end of the present financial year only $51,000,000. What have you to show for the $922,000,000 less the $51,000,000, that has been spent in the twelve and three-quarter years? We cannot escape from the conviction that millions of it have been worse spent than wasted. We are in no condition to absolutely prove this, thanks to the repressive system of the government. By a mistake the government appointed a commission which went a little beyond its contemplated duty and lifted the lid in one of the departments. It showed a department without business methods, with the grossest extravagance and with a lack of conscience. Arguing from that this side of the House pressed for an investigation in other departments. Why not? The other departments are the stewards of the people, managing the money of the people. Was there any reason at all why the people should not know how that money had been used, how these stewards had managed? If they had managed wisely, if they had expended that money properly, the people would have seen that they had done so and would have praised them. What did the government fear? And yet with absolutely similar conditions, this side of the House and the people of the country were debarred entirely from auditing, in any kind of a fair way of examination by independent parties, the $922,000,000 which has been expended by this government in twelve and three-quarter years. Now, Sir, I wish to say a little more as to special expenditures. I take public works. The public works of this country, during the Liberal-Conservative administration, had expended upon them an average of $2,000,000 per year. When this government came into power, for a few years it made an expenditure of about $4,000,000 per year. Then a change took place and I am going to ask the House, in the first place, to listen to a table, which will be printed in 'Hansard,' as to the progress of expenditures on consolidated fund account in all of the departments and then make a few more extended remarks in reference to one or two of these departments. The table is as follows:

CONSOLIDATED FUND EXPENDITURE.

—	1896.	1909.	Increase.
Miscellaneous.	$	$	p. c.
Administration of Justice	758,270	1,240,364	63
Agricultural and Statistics	210,877	1,403,569	665
Civil Government	1,396,628	3,283,265	135
Fisheries	427,250	951,728	123
Geological Survey	52,668	247,659	370
Immigration	120,199	972,326	700
Quarantine	95,247	121,665	30
Indians	880,408	1,307,245	50
Legislature	904,687	1,543,327	70
Light Houses, &c.	466,057	2,721,801	500
Mail and Steamship Subsidies	534,916	1,684,683	200
Militia	1,136,713	5,221,644	360
Ocean & River Service	181,451	1,201,804	560
Pensions	86,080	191,532	120
Public Works	1,299,768	12,300,184	850
Scientific Institutions	81,669	553,921	570
Collection of Revenue.			
Customs	896,332	1,994,951	122
Dominion Lands	119,908	548,607	357
Inspection Staples	2,576	160,184	6,000
Post Office	3,665,011	6,592,386	175
Public Works	159,460	625,034	280
Railways and Canals	3,725,609	10,780,125	190

PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND.

	Miscellaneous.	Collective Revenue.	Total.
	$	$	$
1896	1,299,768	159,460	1,459,228
1909	12,300,184	625,054	12,925,218
Increase	11,000,416	465,574	11,465,990
" p. c.	850	280	785

Average Expenditure 1873-1883		$ 1,300,000
" "	1883-1900	2,000,000
" "	1900-1904	4,000,000
" "	1905	6,765,000
" "	1906	7,484,715
" "	1908	8,721,326
" "	1909	12,300,000

In eight and three-quarter years, $57,000,000 have been expended on miscellaneous public works alone. I say that this expenditure is inordinate. It is indefensible and you cannot point with your finger to the compensatory advantages, to the compensatory product of stimulus or of use to warrant the expenditure of this amount of money. Not only are we startled by the great increase in these expenditures, but, Sir, there are other things that might be said about this expenditure on public works. It applies to a great many expenditures but particularly to the expenditure on public works. In the first place there is no plan upon which these expenditures are made. There is no setting down by a competent authority, or competent board, and taking into account the amount of money it would be wise to spend, taking into account the needs of the services for which alone the money should be spent, taking into account the localities which are to be served and in the line of precedent. There is no such thing as that at all. No country in the world proceeds to its expenditure upon public works on the haphazard and secret plan on which this Dominion of Canada proceeds. There is absolutely no publicity in the matter. It is a matter between the candidate, or the person pressing for the expenditure and the minister who has charge of the expenditure. The expenditure is warranted by the government before the House or any body else outside of it has any knowledge of the thing at all.

Once the government comes down with these estimates it is impossible in 99 cases out of 100 to change an estimate in the least. In the United States, where we think they have been pretty extravagant, no congressman can get an appropriation for public works by simply going to a minister and buttonholing him. He has to submit his resolution that it is wise to have a public building built in a certain place; he has to substantiate that before a responsible committee and that committee has the oversight of the whole amount that is to be expended during any one year. Congressman A or Congressman B does not get $20,000 for a post office by going to the minister and persuading him to put it in the estimates; he has to go before the committee, which has the examination into all the appropriations for all public buildings, and which considers the reasons for the expenditure and then decides what amount of money will be expended at any particular place. Then and not till then does it go into the estimates. But worse than all that, we had a singular instance in this House the other day; worse than I have ever known it before; we had a proposal which was well understood and heard by the Minister of Finance who to-day prided himself upon being a trustee for the people and of sitting here in that capacity. What was this proposal? It was to spend $20,000 or $25,000 of the people's money. What for? For a post office. What was the postal revenue of the place? $700 in the year all told. The question was asked of the Minister of Public Works: Has the Postmaster General asked for it? The answer was:

No. The Minister of Public Works buttonholed by somebody puts in an appropriation of $20,000 or $25,000 for what he calls a post office in a place where to-day there is a postal revenue of $700 annually, and where the present postal accommodation is rented for exactly $38 a year. And when the Minister of Public Works is questioned he admits that no post office authority has told him that they need a post office in that place to carry on their business. Is not that a perfectly outrageous way of proceeding? Is there any other sane legislative body in the world that would do that kind of thing? Who should be the judge of the necessity for a post office? The post office authorities themselves and nobody else. The post office authority is absent in Europe, his officers are present here, but neither he there nor one of his officers here has ever signed a scrap of paper asking for the erection of a post office in that town. There was another proposition brought into the House by the Minister of Public Works to build a new examining warehouse in the city of Quebec. It was to cost about $500,000. He wanted a vote of $50,000, he thought it would be best to change off the old and get a new site and if so this $50,000 was to go towards the building. The Minister of Public Works proposed to get a vote of $50.000, which would authorize him to proceed to spend if he thought it was best, $500,000 for a customs building. The Minister of Customs came into the House and it was brought out in the course of the questioning that the Minister of Customs had never asked for this building, that he absolutely knew nothing about it, except that the old building had had a fire in it and that it must be repaired in order that his men could do their work. These are not isolated cases, they are pattern cases. Over and over again this session and last we have cornered the Minister of Public Works in his appropriations for buildings, and we have had him admit time and again that the Minister of Customs never asked for this and the Postmaster General never asked for that, and the departmental administrator knew nothing about it. And when he was brought to book the Minister of Public Works justified the action by saying that every country seat ought to have a building costing from $20,000 to $25,000. Well, the meaning of that plainly is that the government is not erecting public buildings for the use of the service but for patronage purposes, sticking up one in every county town whether it is necessary or not. That is the system upon which this immense expenditure in the Public Works has grown up chiefly, until it is to-day $12,000,000 under the administration of the present minister. Does not this House think that before a public building is erected the departmental head of the department which requires the use of it ought to express an opinion upon its necessity? Does not the House think there ought to be some board which would take all these matters into consideration and appropriate these moneys for public buildings? Look at the iniquity of putting up a $25,000 building somewhere in the country where there is a yearly revenue of not more than $700, and not asked for by the Postmaster General, and not required for the needs of the postal service. What does it mean? It means that the trustee Minister of Finance sitting yonder allows to be taken out from under his key where he has it in charge $25,000 of the people's money for a mere matter of paltry petty patronage; that is what it means, nothing more and nothing less. On the other hand you have a city like Lethbridge, which has a postal revenue of $20,000 and more, which has absolutely no decent place where people can get their mail matter, and yet there is no post office building there, good or bad, and there is no proposition to put one there. But, because the member representing Lethbridge happens to be on this side of the House he must go chasing around for ever looking for the just rights of his city. Well, neither the member for Lethbridge should have to chase around looking for suitable accommodation for the postal service in his city nor should the other man get a post office in his village for patronage purposes, but, when such buildings are necessary in the public interest the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General should consult together and decide first that the building was necessary, and in the second place, the kind of building suitable for the conditions of the public service in that particular place. Where are we to come out at if we keep going along in this way? One can learn much by keeping his eyes and his ears open in this House. I heard a minister state in the House the other day that $27,700 was expended for a piece of dredging and he believed there was more dredging to be done there which meant more cost. What are you getting? A channel from five to eight feet deep. Who is using it? One gasoline launch and one steam vessel—but there was a great paucity of information as to what particular amount of business that gasoline launch and that steam vessel were carrying on. There will be probably $40,000 or $50,000 of the people's money for which those gentlemen are trustees expended for what reason? Any broad purpose of commerce? No, I venture to say expended where no men of a corporation would dare to expend the money which was given to them by their shareholders

and justify it to their shareholders when they met them. I could go on and give examples of that kind of thing for hours upon hours. Examples of this are in our estimates through and through, they are in our public accounts and have been for years. I think this thing ought to be mended, that the government itself, for very shame's sake, ought to provide some business-like method of constructing its public works and ought to at least have a consultation of the heads of the departments that are nominally and in practice to be served by the construction of these works. As an example we may take a little item for dredging for which some $42,000 or $45,000 have been paid. This is for a little place down in New Brunswick, a portion of a small lake. I believe they got five feet of navigation, perhaps more. I know the place well, and no business man will go there and tell you that you should have spent one red cent upon dredging in that locality, it is absolutely thrown away, given to a friend of the government—and to a friend of the government who puts his money in large quantities into the support of the government and the support of organs which support the government. I am willing to make this challenge to the Prime Minister, to pick out any three business men, add to them an expert, send them down there and let them report to him; and I am willing to stake my reputation that their report will be that no trustees of the people's money who have a proper regard for their duties would have allowed a single dollar of that kind of expenditure. Will the government take the challenge? But I turn off from that very fertile subject, I hope we shall hear more about it before this session is over, and I come to anotner point.

If there is one thing that these hon. gentlemen pride themselves on more than another it is their business management of the affairs of this country. I have heard them boast that their management is a business management, and I have heard their supporters boast, sometimes, thinking it to be true, that their course of administration in a business point of view was a marvel of business ability and of business methods. I want to adduce just a few examples of what these gentlemen have undertaken and of what they have done and what they have failed to do—just one out of maybe a hundred pertinent examples that might very well be called to mind.

First let me take their management of the Yukon Territory and ask whether it has been a very brilliant phase of their administration? These gentlemen came into the possession of an awakened and partly explored Yukon. They entered upon its administration and declared in this House over and over again, that they were going to make the Yukon pay for the Yukon, dollar for dollar, and would make it even a source of revenue. Let us go to the record and see what happened. In 1901 this government had a revenue of $1,993,982 from the Yukon and made an expenditure of $1,254,156, leaving a surplus for that year of $739,826. From 1894 to 1900 there had accumulated a surplus in the Yukon management of $940,769. That is, at the end of 1901 this government had a surplus of $1,680,595 in their hands as a result of the previous management and previous conduct of the Yukon. What happened afterwards? Come down to this present year, take the whole of the operations from 1894 to 1909 and you find that the total net deficit amounts to $2,236,367. Taking all that came in and all that went out they have expended in the Yukon $2,236,367 more than they received since 1902. But in 1901, they had a surplus of $1,680,000. From 1901 to 1909 they got rid of that surplus and they landed in a deficit such as I have named so that they got away with $4,916,962 in their management of the Yukon in eight years. Is that brilliant management? You had about 30,000 or 38,000 people there in 1901. How many have you to-day? Eight thousand—I think I would be nearer if I said 5,000. You had an income in gold of $22,700,000. What have you now? Two and a half millions or two and three-quarter millions, something like that. Yet the very last year of your administration there, whilst you got a revenue of $572,650, you took care to spend $837,015 and made a deficit that last year of $264,365. Is that brilliant business management? It costs to-day, according to the figures I have read, nearly $170 per head of the people of the Yukon to administer it for a single year.

Let us take another instance. There was the Stickeen-Teslin railway arrangement. This government entered into a straight and fast contract just on the eve of the assembling of parliament. Parliament looked into that contract, parliament did not approve of it and held it up. Force was strong enough to put it through this House, but force was not strong enough to put it through the Senate. As a result it did not go through parliament, and after the government got their majority in the Senate they did not attempt to put it through. What happened? They had to pay $282,323 to Mackenzie & Mann for breach of contract or for damages. That money went out from the hands of these trustees and what good ever came to the country from it? Wouldn't it have been better if they had brought the proposition down and threshed it out in the House before they made the hard and fast contract which bound them in the end to pay these dam-

ages? Was that brilliant management on the part of a board of trustees? Then there was the Drummond Counties railway. Their own minister came to this House with the sanction of his colleagues, and told this House: 'I can buy the Drummond Counties railway for $2,100,000 or a little more.' This House questioned the justice of the payment; the other House not only questioned it, but examined into it, and held it up for a year. The next year their own minister, with their sanction, bought the same property under better conditions for $800,000 less than he wished us to pay for it the year before. Was that brilliant trusteeship? If the shareholders had not got in on that transaction we would have been out from $800,000 to $1,000,000 more than we are.

Then there comes the Quebec bridge. This is fresh in the minds of all. The Quebec bridge, from the very moment of its inception, was known to be on a great line of traffic, a most important link between the north and south shores of the St. Lawrence, between the great west and the farther east. What happened? To the company which never put in more than $200,000 of stock, which only paid up a fraction of that, until and after it was forced to years later by the government, they made advances and loans of nearly $7,000,000. They omitted the slightest precautions of having proper supervising engineership. The bridge fell down one fine day, and some 75 people were drowned. The government woke up. They woke up in two ways. In the first place, they paid to this company, which gambled on the prospect of making a lot of money out of the transaction, by controlling a line that was necessary, and terminals which were to be added to it. They paid them back in full all the stock they had subscribed for. They paid them five per cent for the time they subscribed for the stock until they got their money. They then added ten per cent of a bonus, so that they would not have any wounded feelings, pocketing the $7,000,000 of loss. They then brushed up and looked into the matter in a businesslike way, and since then they have spent $100,000 on examination and engineering, owing to the loss occasioned by their failure to supervise and provide proper engineering ability at an earlier stage. They now have found out that what their company had passed as sufficient foundations for the Quebec bridge are not sufficient, and a $2,000,000 contract is invoked for better piers, new abutments and better foundations. There is $9,000,000 gone before you commence your superstructure. What that will cost I do not know; but putting it at $5,000,000, that makes up an expenditure of $14,000,000, of which over $7,000,000 is an absolute loss—why? Because the work was begun and carried out in a fashion that no trustees for any estate or corporation would have descended to for a single moment.

Then there was the Newmarket canal, which is a euphemism for the Aylesworth ditch. There are the trustees—they face me now. The trustees are taking a million and a quarter of the moneys of the estate for which they are trustees and are putting it into the Aylesworth ditch. No water, little population, no traffic—an absolute waste, and the worst kind of a waste, because it lies in plain, open sight. If they wanted to make a spectacle like that, why didn't they do it away from the settled portions of the country, where it would not have been seen every day by people who travel? In the bottom of his heart the Minister of Railways is ashamed of it. The Prime Minister, who is the head trustee, has never deigned to show what is to be carried on that canal when a million and a quarter of money is to be put into it. They have been challenged over and over again, and yet none of them has the backbone to stand up now, before more than $300,000 has been spent, and say: ' we made a mistake, we have sunk $300,000, but, by George, we will not sink the other $900,000.' Whilst in the west, I took an automobile trip down the Red river to see a very notable, noted, or notorious work, called the St. Andrew's lock. There you have a very fine work. The total cost of it, I believe, is to be over $600,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. A million and a half.

Mr. FOSTER. Six hundred thousand dollars has been spent now.

Mr. BRADBURY. Over a million.

Mr. FOSTER. It is worse than I thought it was. Supposing we put it at a million or a million and a quarter. Has the Prime Minister ever seen it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not had that privilege.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Prime Minister ever inquired into it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very weak reply. The Prime Minister is head trustee for the people of Canada. Will he now justify his conduct as head trustee for the people of Canada in sinking a million and a quarter of money in the St. Andrew's locks? Of that amount, $200,000 is for a highway bridge, for which no vote was ever taken, and that bridge lies there in its naked steel splendor, thirty-five or forty feet up in air from the road on either side. I want to ask the Prime Minister, as head trustee for the people of Canada, to tell me to-night if he can get any three business men in the city of Winnipeg to put within his hand any justification, on the traffic

that exists at present or on the business which may be expected in the near future, for the expenditure of a million and a quarter of money on that work? It is one of the finest pieces of concrete masonry and steel that I ever saw; but where is the business to come from? It is an absolute waste of public money at the present time. Was that brilliant work, when the head trustee himself does not know a thing about it? Who does know? Somebody; and somebody ought to have told it.

Take another example on a rather different line. Was it a particularly brilliant piece of business when these trustees of Canada's state took it into their heads one fine day to sell 250,000 acres of Saskatchewan valley land—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughs. That shows how serious a question he considers this to be—for $1 an acre, one-half in scrip? What was the plea offered to the House to justify selling for that small amount? That it was arid land, nearly desert, and not fitted for settlement. I passed through that region this summer. Of all the regions in the west, you will not pick out many that, over a greater length and breadth, comprise such good lands as these, lands of greater production, greater fertility.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear the applause; repeat it please—or actually yielding larger crops. Along that line I conversed with one man who had raised 30,000 bushels, and he told me that his neighbour probably had 5,000 more than he had. Now, these hon. gentlemen opposite say: 'Hear, hear, hear, hear'. But is it within the range of possibility that lands that five years ago, were desert and unusable for cultivation, have changed their quality and capabilities and have suddenly blossomed into fertility? If so how does it come about? There have been dry and partly desert lands that were made to blossom like the rose by the application of the principle of irrigation. But no irrigation was applied to these lands, the soil was just as good when the sale was made as it is to-day. And on the records are the opinions of the government's own trusted employee, there to be read for all time, that that land was good land and that if experimented upon it would prove itself to be good land. When the land was sold, these records were before the minister who made the sale. And the land was not even put up at auction, but was sold at private sale for $1 per acre, partly scrip. And to-day the value would average, along the length and breadth of this tract, probably $10, $15, even $20 an acre. There was at least $2,000,000 which should have been an increment to the public treasury, absolutely squandered by these trustees.

Well, is it necessary to mention the 'Arctic', with its expenditure up to the present time of $400,000 with its large feeding operations, its great stowage capacity, the quantity of words that have been used about it contrasted with the minimum of benefit that has come from it?—and the reminder of it ever before us in the form of an extraordinary tablet put up somewhere between here and the library, commemorating the adventures of one Captain Bernier.

And what shall we say of the Port Colborne arrangement?—and now I would like the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) for fear I would go wrong. As I read the record the Department of Public Works spent on that work $904,459, and the Railways and Canals Department spent $1,700,000 besides. If these figures be correct, we find that the country has there an investment of over $2,600,000. Will any one tell me what is going on at Port Colborne by virtue of that expenditure of $2,600,000 of the people's money? I am wrong if I did not hear an intimation not long ago from the Minister of Railways himself—it may have been in this House—that the time had come when the Welland canal should be deepened, that it was a necessary work and must be done. And when asked whether Port Colborne would be of much use there after, I think his answer was what it self-evidently would be. But what purpose, in the production or transport of this country, is now being fulfilled by Port Colborne which would justify $2,600,000 of the people's money being put into it? At ten per cent, which is a small allowance in the case of such works for interest and depreciation, this represents a burden of $260,000 a year upon the people. But it is manifest now that the thing was built before all the circumstances and conditions were taken into account. And, as it stands, is it a particularly brillant achievement for this government? I hope it may pay for its cost and its maintenance, but that it has paid up to the present time, or ever will pay, is, I think, exceedingly doubtful.

Let us then, come to the Intercolonial. Now, the Intercolonial is above ground, not to be washed away by the sea or its roadbed taken from it except at the will of the government itself. There it is and there it has been for years. From 1893 to 1896, under Liberal-Conservative rule, the net deficit on that road was $25,354, an average of $6,438 per year. The capital expenditure in that period of four years was $981,485, an average of $245,371. This government comes in and takes hold of the Intercolonial. They have men of business capacity among them and know how to manage railways, they are a business govern-

ment. And what is their record? From 1897 to 1903, the net deficit of the Intercolonial was $350,303, an average of $50,040. In 1904, the deficit was $900,751. From 1905 to 1909, the net deficit was $2,330,000, an average of $446,000 a year. In that time, $33,100,000 has been expended on capital account, an average of $2,550,000 a year. The last year of its operation has shown a deficit of over $800,000. This is shown more clearly in tabular form:

I. C. RAILWAY.

Deficits and Capital Expenditure.

Years.	Net Deficit..	Average per Year.	Capital Expenditure.	Average Capital Expenditure per Year.
	$	$	$	$
1893-96.	25,345	6,438	981,485	245,371
1897-03.	350,303	50,040		
1904....	900,751	900,751	33,100,000	2,550,000
1905-09.	2,230,000	446,000		

This period of 1897 to 1909 we have described to us in panegyrics of praise by the Minister of Finance no later than this afternoon. It marks the highest level of Canadian development, trade and prosperity. Yet, during that high-water-mark, this Intercolonial railway has been so mismanaged that it had eclipsed all its previous records for deficits and all previous records for capital expenditure. The deficit is of the enormous amount I have mentioned. What is the trouble? It certainly is not brilliant management. But there is another point to be taken into account as illustrated by the following table:

I. C. RAILWAY.

Statement of Capital Cost, Carrying Interest, Deficit and Total Burden.

(12¾ Years Liberal Administration.)

Year.	Capital Cost.	Interest on Capital Cost at 4 p.c.	Deficit. for Year.	Total Burden for Year.
	$	$	$	$
1897....	50,000,000	2,000,000	59,940	2,059,940
1909....	81,540,000	3,261,600	800,952	4,062,552
Increase in 12¾ years.	31,540,000	1,261,600	741,012	2,002,612

In 1897 when these gentlemen took hold of the railway, it had cost up to that time $50,000,000. The burden of carrying it at four per cent interest was therefore $2,000,000; the deficit that year was $59,940. The burden upon the people therefore was $2,059,940 that year. Now this government has been in up to 1909, and what happens in 1909? The cost of the railway is $81,540,000 on capital account; four per cent interest on that is $3,261,600; the deficit, $800,952; the total burden, $4,062,552. Does it not startle you when you think about it?

Now what happens in Australia? A paragraph in the press of to-day says that in Australia, where the government owns the roads, a sparser population by far, many more difficulties, yet the earnings this last year were over $20,000,000; the net revenue was $8,600,000. They paid all interest, all pensions, all running expenses, and put $1,143,837 to the credit of the railway in the consolidated fund.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. gentleman will give the Intercolonial the Australian rates and conditions, we will give him a surplus of more than $1,000,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter has been in the absolute management of this government from 1897 onward. What kind of a plea is it for the minister to rise now and say: If we had done so and so, we might have had so and so. They were free as the trustees of the people's property they were managing that road, and this is the way they have managed it. But it is not all because the rates are not as high as the rates are in Australia. I bring the Prime Minister, the head trustee, as witness. What does he say in the city of Toronto? He says we have had good Ministers of Railways on both sides of the House, and there has always been a deficit. Why? Because the system under which it is managed is vicious. It is not the fault of the minister, it is the fault of this system. Yet with plenary power these gentlemen have managed that road from 1897 to 1909, and they have not changed the system. I will tell the minister where his deficit comes in, or I will give him an authority to which he will pay attention. He cannot discuss the authority in the way of disparagement, it would not be proper, neither do I think it would be just. Here is a gentleman who knows and who says:

The Intercolonial is administered by the members for the different counties through which the road runs, or rather by the election workers of those counties. Patronage is the real cause of the deficit under all regimes. In the first place, the member is besieged and he in turn lays siege to the minister. If such and such a one does not get a situation he is sure to lose 25 votes or more in such and such

a parish. Those who know anything, and have taken part in electoral contests, realize quite well that a great number, most, in fact, of those who seek to obtain these situations have never been able to make their way in business, or to make their way in the world. There are perhaps exceptions, but it is the general rule. Then there are the contracts, the purchases—

For instance, the Lodge purchases, the Pearson purchases, the Merwin purchases, and all that kind of purchases.

—the tariffs, all of which are regulated from a political point of view. Last year, for instance, (1904), we had the general elections, and they must have cost the Intercolonial at least $500,000.

Who is the author? J. Israel Tarte. Does the Prime Minister scout that author?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When did Mr. Tarte say that?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1905, when I believe he was a trusted colleague of my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, he was not at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. Had he just been turned out? Was my right hon. friend just then in a mode of disciplining ministers who had an unfortunate penchant for stating the honest truth? Men like the Minister of Customs were going around saying we had a revenue tariff; men like the Prime Minister were declaring that we were on the road to free trade as they have it in England; men like the Finance Minister were half and half, always apologizing, always in the line of defence. But Mr. Tarte was honest. He said to his colleagues, you know you are practising protection, is it a sin for me to tell the people that we are? Do you so discount and disparage honesty as to make me a deceiver before the people? I will not do it, I will tell the truth. He told the truth, and he ceased to be a member of the cabinet; he was disciplined. Yet to-day Mr. Tarte has his revenge. If his spirit seeks these halls, and if that spirit understood the fervid and suppliant speech of the Minister of Finance this afternoon, his argument for the righteousness of bounties and the efficiency of payments of that kind, then at least Mr. Tarte has his revenge.

Now suppose we go a little further. From 1897 to 1909 the net deficit has been $3,481,000 under this government and besides they have added $33,000,000 capital expenditure. But this does not take in the Prince Edward Island Railway. The Prince Edward Island railway has a record much the same, although not to so large an extent.

The following tables are illuminating:

P. E. I. Railway.

Statement of Capital Cost, Carrying Interest, Deficits and Total Burden.

Year.	Capital Cost.	Interest at 4 p.c.	Deficit.	Burden.
	$	$	$	$
1897....	3,740,000	149,600	87,046	236,606
1909....	8,259,033	331,360	89,010	420,370
Increase in $12\frac{3}{4}$ years.	5,559,033	181,760	1,964	183,764

P. E. I. Railway.

Statement of Deficits and Capital Expenditure.

Years.	Net Deficit.	Average Deficit.	Capital Expenditure.	Average Capital Expenditure.
	$	$	$	$
1893-96.	294,500	73,600	Nil.	Nil.
1897-09.	989,720	76,100	4,508,461	347,000

In brief, the deficit from 1897 to 1909 on the Prince Edward Island railway has averaged $76,100 per year. The capital expenditure has been $4,508,461, an average of $347,000 each year. The capital cost of the road was $3,740,000 in 1897; the interest on it at 4 per cent would be $149,600, the deficit was $236,606. In 1909 the capital cost was $8,259,033, the interest $331,360, the deficit was $89,001, the burden $420,370, showing the same sinister gain in the burden of that railway under the management of the Minister of Railways.

Now if we ask ourselves why it is that the Intercolonial cannot be made to pay, is there anything in its circumstances that prevents it? Look at the Intercolonial. It passes through a well populated country. It has on its line, commencing with Sydney and Halifax, the towns in Nova Scotia, with St. John and the towns along the north shore, coming up into Quebec, and making its terminus in the city of Montreal, favoured with population, favoured with business which, taken in connection with its tourist capabilities, certainly make it a road which ought to pay at least its working expenses, and the improvement put upon it. No interest paid, no dividend paid, $33,000,000 of capital expenditure and a deficit of $3,481,000—even under these conditions of no interest and no dividend. It is

simply a plain matter of business management. It can be made to pay, only this government does not seem to be working in that line. Then, what has happened? Not content with running the Intercolonial railway in that way, these gentlemen have come down and they have pledged $26,900,000 of the people's money to build a parallel and competing line of railway from the city of Quebec down to Moncton. What is your $26,900,000 railway going to do there? Going to take through traffic? What does the Minister of Railways say?—we cannot make the Intercolonial railway pay because we cannot hitch it on to the through traffic. But the way to make it pay is to establish a competing line and put $26,900,000 of the people's money into that competing line ! That is one way to make it pay. Would the trustee of an estate manage the estate in that way? I do not believe it and I do not believe that the people in this country have yet got down into their minds the extravagant, aimless, unbusinesslike way in which this government that pretends to business management, has been carrying on the affairs of this country.

If the House will bear with me a minute more I would just like to touch the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is the last child of my right hon. friend and a boy whom he expects to grow up, live for ever, and bestow constant praises upon his parent. I think I do not hazard any statement that is extreme when I say that the manner in which the government went into the construction of this railway did not argue foresight, business management or common prudence. What engineering or other knowledge had they of a large portion of the route which they determined by drawing a line on the map was to be followed by that railway. In reference to the Quebec-Moncton section, what necessity in the world was there for putting $26,900,000 of money there instead of taking $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 and putting the present Intercolonial railway in a first-class position, quite sufficient to carry all the traffic that would follow in the wake of this development? But, if there is one thing more than another in which these trustees have failed in their duty to their stockholders it is in this that their information was so faulty that it deceived their stockholders. The chief trustee and his lieutenant the Finance Minister, came before this House and the people of the country and declared that you could build that section of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg for $51,000,000, or a little more. Is there any doubt about that? When the Prime Minister was questioned as to how he knew that, what information he had, he said they had mountains of information and he pledged his word to the people that that was a fair calculation of the cost. I have put some questions on the Order Paper. I have, the result of those questions here from the Minister of Railways and Canals and they show that from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction the total expenditure will be $20,984,690, that from Lake Superior Junction to Quebec, $66,473,171 is the estimated expenditure, of which twenty-seven and a third millions have been already spent. That makes $87,457,361 from Winnipeg to Quebec. Then from Quebec to Moncton the total cost, as given by the Minister of Railways and Canals, most of it spent, some estimated, is $26,935,902, which makes in all, $114,393,763, which is the latest estimate after half of the expenditure has been made, or may be a little more as the total cost of that portion of the line. Contrast that with your $51,000,000, which was estimated by the right hon. gentleman and by the Minister of Finance and put forward in circular form to the shareholders and stockholders and upon which circular information shareholders and stockholders voted them the power to carry out the expenditure. Is that brilliant management? is it honest management? I am talking about honesty in this way, that before a trustee or director will commit his stockholders to a large expenditure he should regard it as his bounden duty to know the ground upon which he stands. Did these gentlemen know the ground upon which they stood, did they take any pains to find out the ground upon which they stood? Because they did not they mislead their shareholders and stockholders and I say it was not honest treatment in the true sense of the word which demands that before you draw your shareholders into an investment you must exhaust all proper measures for getting information upon which your plan is presented to them. Well, Sir, that is not all the cost. I am not going into the calculation of interest, but it strikes any one that the interest calculated by the Minister of Finance and adhered to by the Prime Minister on their small computation of the cost will be doubled and more than doubled on this actual fulfilment of the cost; so that you have to add probably three times as much for interest as you would have had to on the lesser computation of cost. Then you have the Quebec bridge, which has to be considered now as part of the line, and at least $14,000,000 will be necessary for that, which makes the cost of that connection from Winnipeg to Moncton $128,800,000. To this add several millions for terminals at Quebec and Winnipeg. I ask the business men of this country whether they consider that this is brilliant, businesslike administration? It would be sufficient in a company to have these directors succeeded quickly by others and I am not sure that it would not go even much farther than that. One thing I noticed when I was in the West, and it is this: There is a whole area of country up there

that they call the two-track country. What does it mean? The Prime Minister, when he advised his directors and shareholders to go into that project told them that this was to open up new territory, to use his own words at Winnipeg, it was to plunge into new territory: what it really means is that from Winnipeg to Edmonton and, maybe some distance beyond, lines of railway cross and intercross for hundreds of miles and you never are practically out of sight of the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific railway and in many cases you can drop a pea from your car window on to the track of the Canadian Pacific railway. There is an extensive country into which the farmers are rushing to use their brawn and their muscle to till the soil, and there are two railroads with elevators here and elevators across the street, a double set of railroads and a double set of elevators, and no competition notwithstanding that. What an outrageous thing it is that when that section of the country was absolutely provided for by lines of railway already running, or existing under charter and being built, that Canada should have spent millions upon millions of dollars in paralleling lines of transport which were already quite sufficient for the country through which they passed, to the neglect of other equally fertile country which is without a mile of railway. And to the latest day of Canadian history, as in a less degree no man will pass by the Newmarket canal without curling the lip of scorn, so Sir, there is one monument which is certain for all time to my right hon. friend—it is the fact, that when he had large power, and large confidence, and the people's money in his hand, in that great northwest which longs for new avenues of transportation in territory not served by railways, he had seen fit to parallel for 800 miles or more existing lines of railway. Is that business management? And, in view of all these things which I have mentioned and which are but one hundredth part of what one might mention, I put it to the House, and I put it to the people of the country, whether it is not time for a change?

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). We have had to-day the statement of the Finance Minister, from which we learn that the surplus that now may well be estimated for the present year is $16,500,000, that the expenditure has been reduced to the extent of as nearly as may be the same amount, that the addition to the public debt has been $17,500,000 and only that, notwithstanding that $20,000,000 have been expended this year on the Transcontinental railway. We have the statement of the Finance Minister to-day that the net public debt of Canada is now, not $50·82 as in 1896, but $45·85, a decrease per capita of $4·97. That, Sir, is a most satisfactory statement, it is a statement upon which we may well congratulate the Minister of Finance and his colleagues in the cabinet, who are indeed a trust company, who realize that they are, as the member for North Toronto has said, a trust company; not a Union Trust Company, but a real honest, well managed trust company having at heart the good of the people they represent. I say, Sir, that the people of this country will offer their congratulations to the Minister of Finance to-day, and it is not the first time he has deserved congratulation. He has gotten into the habit of offering to us, year by year, such welcome financial statements as we have just heard from him. When I say that he has acquired the habit of giving us such financial statements, it reminds me of one of Harry Lauder's popular songs in which the singer represents himself as going home to his good wife under the influence of too much Mountain Dew, and the wife began to upraid and scold him, and she said: 'Mon, its gettin to be a habit wi ye;' and the reply was: 'Na, its no a habit, its a gif.' And so I say that with the Finance Minister these prosperous budget speeches are not so much a habit as a gift. Not only has the Minister of Finance the gift of presenting such statements, but he has the much higher gift of so regulating and conducting the financial affairs of Canada as to bring about and maintain the conditions which make it possible for him to deliver such a statement, year after year. The member for North Toronto has endeavoured to assail that statement, to detract from its value and to lessen its influence upon the people of Canada. The member for North Toronto is clever. With all the cunning of an Indian juggler, with all the keen imagination of a poet, with all the inventiveness of the author of Gulliver's Travels, with the ability to paint words as none other but he can, he has endeavoured to detract from that financial statement and from its true value. But facts are stubborn things, and the facts which the Minister of Finance has given us to-day cannot be controverted and their influence cannot be lessened in the mind of the people even by the remarks of such as the member for North Toronto. The words of that hon. gentleman have fallen harmless as the smallest sized bird shot as we hear it pattering down from the rocky walls of an impregnable fortress or from the impregnable sides of an ironclad; his words have made as little impression as the clapping of the desks by the ever too ready auditors who sit behind him. I was much interested in the speech which was delivered by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) to-night. I heard it last year I heard it again this year; it is indeed becoming familiar. In his remarks last year the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was exceedingly

sarcastic and he accused the Minister of Fnance of lacking in boldness and courage. I quote from 'Hansard' of the 20th of April last:

He (Mr. Fielding) is hopeful. He gives a wonderfully precise forecast for that year. Here we are already in the year 1909-10 and yet the only forecast the Minister of Finance can give us is that he hopes there will be a reasonable percentage of increase in the revenue over that of last year, while with reference to the expenditure he did not even hazard a guess as to what it would be. Former Ministers of Finance have been a little more daring than that; they have at least, when they were near the end of a year, made what they considered a forecast of both revenue and expenditure and they put their forecast to the test.

The hon. member (Mr. Foster) in these words accuses the Minister of Finance of a lack of daring. Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is an exceedingly modest man considering the long series of successes he has had; he is not given to boasting even of what he has done, let alone what he expects to do; he is not given to hazarding wide guesses. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has well said that former Finance Ministers have been a little more daring. We know, Sir, you and I know, the people of this country know, at least one former Finance Minister who was much more daring in the way of prophesy and hazarding guesses. He loomed up large as a lion when making a prophesy at the beginning of the year, but at the end of the year when he was explaining why the prophesies had not been fulfilled he became rather of the size and the gentle disposition of the household kitten. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) speaking again last year said:

It would have seemed befitting in a Finance Minister who was careful and prudent to have made his provision when the danger was coming, to have drawn his sail when the storm was about to burst.

I do not blame the hon. member for having been rather mistaken in his guess last year. I do not blame him under the circumstances for seeing signs of a storm, but what does seem strange is that this year he should have repeated the word and have alluded to a storm. Wild fancies as to what may happen are one thing, and halucinations that possess a man as to what has happened are quite another thing. The storm about to burst? Where, Sir, has been the storm? Where on the ocean of Canadian finance has there been any great troubling of the waters, and has it not all been a tempest in the little brain of the hon. member for North Toronto? Storm, Sir! Where has there been the snapping or the breaking of a mast? Where has there been the rending of a single sail, the loss of a single anchor? Not a man overboard, not an ounce of cargo lost, the sea to-day as smooth as glass, the sun shining brightly and not a cloud in the financial or commercial sky of Canada.

Talking about finances, I find that the public debt of the United States at the end of 1907 was $878,596,755 and at the end of 1908 it had increased to $938,132,409, an increase in one year of over fifty-nine and a half million dollars. That was at the end of 1908. What progress is being made in the United States to-day? I read this article from the 'Weekly Times' of London, of November 5, an extract from a letter written by their Washington correspondent:

Two and a half months ago the Payne tariff came into effect, but already it is clear that the new rates will fall far short of extinguishing the deficit for the current fiscal year. From the beginning of the year—July 1—to October 27 the deficit on ordinary expenditures and disbursements amounts to $26,000,000, a reduction of only $13,000,000 on the unusual deficit for the same period last year, although it must be remembered that the Payne law came into effect only on August 5, and that the minimum rates under the special treaties continues in force. The customs receipts have been increasing, but ordinary disbursements are also increasing. For the current year up to October 27 the disbursements were $241,425,000 against $227,702,000 for the same period last year. Moreover, the customs receipts are expected to show a decline next month. As the working balance of the treasury is only $27,000,000, a prolongation of the deficit is expected soon to compel a recourse to a loan to meet current expenses.

So that in that great republic to the south of us, having an area not larger than ours, having a population ten times as great as ours, having had large capital and a population of the same blood as ours to develop their resources, even at this day they have to make a loan to meet current expenses.

I think it is a matter of congratulation that we have received the statement we have heard to-day. The hon. member for North Toronto says that last year in place of having a surplus of a little over $1,000,000, if the bounties had been charged to revenue there would not have been a surplus but a small deficit. This the Finance Minister frankly pointed out and stated in his address. The hon. member for North Toronto contends that these bounties ought to be charged to revenue, although the Finance Minister has well and logically argued that if subsidies to railways are properly chargeable to capital account, as they have always been under this government and the preceding government, upon the same principle these bounties ought to be charged to the same account. I do

think myself, and I say frankly, that it would be better if both railway subsidies and bounties were charged to revenue account. But I want to know whether if the system of bookkeeping were changed in that respect our friends on the other side of the House and their supporters would be frank enough, would be honest enough to explain the difference in the method of bookkeeping to their electors as they went among them during a campaign. I doubt if they would.

Almost tragically the hon. member for North Toronto says: What has saved the Finance Minister? The Finance Minister has not been in any very particular danger. What has saved the country? Neither has the country been in any great danger since 1896. But listen to the reply of the hon. member for North Toronto to his own question. He says that the farmers have saved the Finance Minister and have saved the country. To a large extent he is perfectly right, to a large extent the farmers have saved the country. But they do not deserve all the credit; the sailors, the fishermen, the miners, the lumbermen, the factory hands, all deserve some share of the credit, and were it not for the farmers and these other men who toil we would not have, admittedly, the country we have to-day. The hon. member, and this is a repetition of the old story, has asked over and over again who purchased and opened up the great Northwest? We admit that the northwestern country was purchased by a Conservative government. We admit that during the regime of the Conservative party the Canadian Pacific railway was run through that northwest country to open it up. We give them all the credit to which they are entitled for the purchase they made of that northwestern country, and we give them such credit as they are entitled to for the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. We are told, they were told, at the time they were undertaking the building of that road, that it could be built more cheaply, that other people were willing to build it at that very time at a lower price, at a less cost, and without the villainous arrangement as to taxation that was coupled with the bargain they made. They took the dearer rather than the cheaper bargain, and we have been paying for it ever since, and as far as taxation is concerned will pay for it, I suppose, while the world lasts. Yet they are entitled to a degree of credit. Sir, who put the farmers in that country? Our friends opposite purchased the country and then left it lying almost a waste. To whom is due the credit of developing that country? I claim that this government deserves the credit for putting into that great western country the very farmers of whom the hon. member spoke to-night, I think I can prove it by his own words. Talking of the Yukon he says: When you went to the Yukon you found 38,000 people there; to-day you have a population of 5,000—and he blamed the government. Sir, if the government are to blame because the population of the Yukon is less to-day than it was, then on the same reasoning they are entitled to credit because the population of the Northwest has increased so greatly. But he says the farmer who grew the grain, who saved the country, has to pay a great deal more for the clothes he wears, for the lumber he buys, for the labour he employs.

Now, let us take the hon. gentleman for once at his word. The farmers have to pay more for the clothes they wear; what does the manufacturer of the clothes say to that—does he object? The farmer has to pay more for the lumber he buys; does the sawmiller object? The farmer has to pay more for the labour he employs; does the labourer object? Accepting the argument of the hon. gentleman, that this government is to blame for increasing the prices the farmer has to pay, by this very act this government has enabled the manufacturer of clothing and the manufacturer of lumber to get better prices for the goods they sell, and has enabled the farm labourer to get better wages. What kind of a man does the hon. member for North Toronto think the Canadian farmer is? How big does he think is the heart of the average Canadian farmer? The Canadian farmer—the hon. member for North Toronto will not, I am sure, deny it—is receiving to-day larger prices for his horses, his cattle, his hogs, his wheat, and his dairy products, than the farmers of this country ever received before, since Columbus discovered America. The farmer is able to pay higher prices for the goods he buys, and is able to pay a reasonable wage, as in the old Tory days he never was able to do. And the Canadian farmer is not only able to pay higher wages, but is large hearted enough to be willing to pay them to the man who helps him in his work. What is the government doing for the farmers who have been taken into that country? It has provided transportation; it has surveyed the lands of the northwest; it has provided post offices and mail routes; it is helping to develop the mines and minerals of the country; it is attempting to preserve the forests and to practice reforestation; it has established experimental farms. This government has not only taken the farmers into that country but is providing for them while they are there.

The next question the hon. gentleman raised was the balance of trade between this country and the United States. In his conclusion he forgot and omitted one important item, that is, the $60,000,000 of cold

cash that American farmers alone have taken into that western country during the last seven months, and he has forgotten the probably $60,000,000 more in farm stock and household goods which they have taken with them.

The hon. gentleman next advised the government not to tie their hands, in order that they might be able, when the time comes, if it does come, to accept a preference at the hands of the mother country. If this was given as a word of caution and advice, we take it in the spirit in which it was given. If it was rebuke, it was one that we were not entitled to, because one of the conditions of the French treaty is that it may be cancelled at any time upon twelve months' notice.

The hon. gentleman endeavoured to make a point against the Finance Minister because the government of Canada is paying to-day a higher rate of interest than it paid some years ago. That is no evidence of carelessness or bad financing for the price of money and the rate of interest rises and falls as does the price of wheat. If the hon. member could prove, as he did not attempt to prove, that Canada is paying to-day a higher rate of interest than other countries similarly situated, he would have made out his case.

The hon. gentleman next accused the govenment of wasting money because of the payment of underwriters for underwriting government loans. As to that. I quote from the Colonial Office journal, published in England, for July of the present year. The editors of that journal, who are well acquainted with the various systems of finance, say:

> It is the practice now-a-days on the issue of colonial loans and others of a like kind to get them underwritten. The underwriters, in consideration of a commission, which is usually 1 per cent, undertake to take so much of the loan as is not subscribed for by the public. Governments would, of course, not sacrifice 1 per cent, if they could get money without employing underwriters, but experience has shown that on the whole they gain by doing so. Only a very small part of a loan is applied for by the real public at the time of issue. The ordinary investor buys stocks and shares at a moment when he has money available, which is not often; it is the professional who examines the morning newspaper and makes use of the few hours, which are often all that is allowed, to come to a decision and send in his application. If the issue is readily taken up so that the price is likely to go to a premium, the list must be closed early, as otherwise on the news getting about a vast number of applications would be sent in with the object of getting advantage of the premium, and this would be unfair to the genuine applicants. The result is that the success depends practically on the view which the market takes of the deal, and this is largely a matter of the influence of the financial houses interested.

So that upon this high authority we find that the system now in vogue by all governments requiring to borrow is that of the employment of underwriters, as has been done by the hon. Minister of Finance.

The hon. member for North Toronto complained that we are not in this country creating a sinking fund to meet our maturing loans, as is done in England. If it were possible to have such a sinking fund, I would be very glad, but it is not fair to argue that Canada, a new and undeveloped country of large extent, has the same opportunity to create a sinking fund that is possible in an old, well developed, wealthy country of small area like Great Britain

The hon. member next sang the old song about this government taking more in taxation from the people of Canada than the preceding government did, saying that this government took $11 a head while the old government had taken only $5.50. The hon. member has already stated that this government has raised the wages of workingmen and the prices received by manufacturers. And in that he is quite correct; a workman to-day is just as easily able to obtain $1.50 per day of wages as under the old Conservative rule, he was able to obtain $1 a day. Therefore, he receives—the hon. member said because of the action of this government—about $150 more in wages in a year than he did under the old regime. And he has to pay $5.50 more according to the hon. member in yearly taxation. Well, he has made a fairly good bargain; he has made about $144.50 through having this government in power instead of continuing the old government. It is an old argument, one that has often been made and will often be made again, that this government takes more in taxation out of the people than the other government did. But the hon. member (Mr. Foster) admits—he did not admit it cheerfully but merely because he had to, nor did he admit it to the extent that the facts justify—that this government, leaving out the question of bounties, is exacting a lower rate of duty than the former government did. If a man to-day goes to any store to make a purchase, he finds that the goods have been subject to a lower duty than the same goods under a former government. And, Sir, does this government compel any man to buy two coats where formerly he bought only one or to buy two pair of shoes where formerly he bought only one? But, because as the hon. member has stated, that man receives higher wages and so is able to buy his wife a dress that, in the old days, he could not think of buying, or is able to buy a suit of clothes for himself more than he formerly bought, he, by that transaction, voluntarily contributes more largely to the revenue of the country.

I have said that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) delivered much the same speech to-night as he did a year ago. He used one argument exactly the same as that he gave last year. In calculating the increase of the debt under the Conservative party from 1878 to 1896, he said we ought to deduct from the total the price of 7,500,000 acres of land that they got back from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, I am perfectly willing to allow the hon. gentleman that credit. He has given us to-night the same argument exactly that he did a year ago, with the exception, that a year ago he began that part of his speech by saying that the Conservative party from 1886 to 1896 increased the public debt by $35,000,000; to-night he says that from 1879 to 1896 they increased the public debt by $118,000,000, otherwise, the speeches were the same. His argument being the same, let me read to the House the argument I then made in reply: I quote from last year's 'Hansard':

The hon. member for North Toronto admitted that the Conservative party in ten years from 1886 to 1896 had increased the public debt by $35,000,000. But then he argued that while they had increased the public debt by $35,000,000, for $10,000,000 of that they had received 7,500,000 acres of land, and he said if that 7,500,000 acres be worth $3 an acre, it makes a total of $22,000,000 to be deducted from the $35,000,000 by which they had increased the debt.

I say I am perfectly willing to admit that, But let me go further:

But he maintained that the land was worth more than $3 an acre, he said: 'If you calculate its value at $6 an acre, it makes $45,000,000 which will exceed the whole addition to the public debt.'

I am willing to admit that also.

I am perfectly willing that the hon. member should make that argument, I am perfectly willing to accept his figures and his statement, but I would ask him, were he here, where the lands came from that they purchased for $10,000,000. He would state that the 7,500,000 acres was part of 25,000,000 acres that the Conservative government had given to the Canadian Pacific railway for nothing at all. I would say to him: I am perfectly willing that you should give your party credit at $6 an acre for the 7,500,000 acres you thus obtained, but if I do you must be willing to be charged at the same rate with the 46,000,000 acres that your government gave away while in power to persons other than actual settlers, and so while I credit you with $42,000,000, I charge you with $276,000,000, and I do not think the hon. member would make the account look any better for his party.

I said then, Sir, that, on his own reasoning, I would charge his party with 46,000,000 acres of land making a total of $276,000,000; but, Sir, the price of land has gone up. To-night, the hon. gentleman fixes the price at $8 per acre. On that basis, I should have to charge him for the 46,000,000 acres $368,000,000. Now, I suppose, if the hon. member lives for another twenty years—and I hope he will, for he is, I think, the greatest asset that we on this side of the House have—he will come to charge us for that 7,500,000 acres of land, I suppose $50 an acre. If he does, on his own reasoning, I shall have a very large account indeed to charge to the Conservative party.

The hon. member next—I think I am not unparliamentary when I say—had the nerve to talk about the land that this government had given away to parties other than actual settlers. I might have expected that from some body else who did not know any better, who did not know the history of the Conservative party and what they had been guilty of, but I hardly expected it to come now from the hon. member from North Toronto. Why? Because, in the eighteen years that they were in office, his government gave away land to persons other than actual settlers representing a total of 46,000,000 acres, and at the same time they gave to the actual settler only 7,900,000 acres, or a little more than we have given to the actual settler in the first seven months of the present year. The hon. member next spoke of the investigation that took place in the Marine and Fisheries Department. That too is an old story, often repeated and often to be repeated no doubt. He told of the iniquity and corruption that had been discovered by the investigating commission. It is true the commission said there was corruption in connection with the Marine Department. They said there had been corruption in connection with the Marine Department ever since confederation and for every one of the three hundred and sixty-five days of every one of the eighteen long years during which the Conservative party had been in power.

An hon. MEMBER. So they are growing worse.

Mr. MILLER. My hon. friend has not read the report or he would not say that. But the commissioners did give the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries credit for making an honest effort to improve the condition of affairs in his department, a credit which these gentlemen did not give to any minister who had preceded him. The hon. gentleman said they wanted to go into all the departments and they were not permitted. Sir, we have a Public Accounts Committee before which any charge can be taken and investigated. What has been the custom of our friends on the other side? To make a charge, and they always took care that it was a serious charge, they always took care to make it loudly, they always took care to advertise it all over Canada as soon as they had made it, and

before it had been investigated; but when the Public Accounts Committee met and they had an opportunity to investigate their charges they had so wrongly made and so wrongly circulated before they were investigated, when I say they were given an opportunity to investigate, they had other business, oftentimes they did not even attend the sittings of the committee, they threw up their hands, and said in effect that they had accomplished all their purpose when they made their charges and got them in the newspapers.

The hon. member then speaks of a certain place where some $40,000 has been spent in dredging for the accommodation of one launch and one little steamer, and that, he said, was a piece of political rascality, of political iniquity. Sir, I do not know that we can come hastily to that conclusion. If there is a place where any considerable number of people live, they may be humble people, they may not have much political influence, they may be poor fisher folk, they may be poor tillers of the soil, but if that one steamer and that one launch is the only means they have of getting to market, or of communicating with the outside world, then I say that that expenditure is justified. This is a government that has spent a great deal of money in endeavouring to benefit every class of people, those who till the soil, those who go to sea in their fishing boats, and those who dig minerals in the mines.

I suppose we will not for a long time hear the last of the Quebec bridge. Now what are the facts? The Quebec bridge was built, and the Quebec bridge fell down. The Quebec bridge was built according to plans and specifications that were drawn up by men who were recognized and generally admitted to be the best bridge building engineers on the American continent, or in the world. The engineers who drew the plans and who drew the specifications for the Quebec bridge, were recommended to this government by whom? By Mr. Schreiber, the government engineer, a gentleman who was the faithful employee of the Conservative government by whom he was appointed, and who has continued, I believe, to be the faithful employee of this government. When that bridge collapsed, what did the world say, what did the engineering world say? They said: This is a matter of great concern to us, this is a matter of great concern to every man in the engineering profession. That bridge, they said, was planned by men that we believed to be experts, by men whom we believed to be the very best bridge engineers in the world, and if that bridge, built according to their plans and specifications, has collapsed, it simply means this, that that gigantic bridge, a very long bridge, much longer than most of the bridges that had hitherto been built, was wrongly designed, why, it means that our whole theory of bridge building is at fault, our engineers are wrong, we will have to revise our plans and adopt new methods. No blame, Sir, can be attached, and no blame will be attached by men who are acquainted with the facts, to this government for the misfortune which befell the Quebec bridge. Such charges as that are only made in the absence of any real and true grounds of complaint.

The Newmarket canal is characterized as the Aylesworth ditch. I am sorry the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not in his seat. We used to know that as the Newmarket canal. Upon a certain occasion the member for York, the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) gave the hon. member for North Toronto perhaps the greatest castigation ever received by any man in this House, and ever since then this canal has been known as the Aylesworth ditch. It is not a public work of any less value because you call it by any such name as that, it does not lessen the importance of the work. Now, Sir, there was vigorous cheering, there was vigorous desk pounding to-day, when the hon. member mentioned the Newmarket canal. Sir, I venture to say that not one man in twenty of those who sit behind the hon. member and who cheered him, ever saw that canal or know a single thing about it. I talked to a man to-day who was telling me, and I am sure honestly, what he thought. He said that that Newmarket canal would be of very great advantage to the section through which it runs. For my part I do not know anything about it. I say frankly, Sir, that I am just as ignorant of the Newmarket canal, of its method of construction, of the country through which it runs, or the way in which it will answer the purpose for which it is intended, as the majority of the members who applauded my hon. friend.

Then the building of the St. Andrew's lock was criticised. I do not know anything about the St. Andrew's lock except what I have been told. And I wonder how many members on the other side of the House know anything about the St. Andrew's lock. But I am told by a man who knows much more about it than the hon. member for North Toronto, that the building of the St. Andrew's lock opens up to the city of Winnipeg 350 miles of waterway.

Sir, when in the most harrowing terms, the member for North Toronto was picturing some of the sins and iniquities of this government, I almost felt like believing him for a moment. I do not often feel that way when he goes on a tirade of that kind. But when he mentioned the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and found the fault he did, I said: Well, any intelligent man who would tell that story over again and

endeavour to get this House or the people to take any stock in it, is scarcely entitled to any credence. There was one member, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who, I noticed, although a close political friend of the member for Toronto, did not applaud very vigorously when the Saskatchewtn Valley Land Company was mentioned. What are the facts, recounting them briefly? Nobody regarded that part of the country given to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company as being of any value. My hon. friend from West Toronto considered it to be of no value, and would not accept it as part of a land grant to which his company was entitled. The government sold the land to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and on what conditions. They said: We will sell you this land at a very low price per acre, but only on condition that you will place settlers upon it, a certain definite number per township, on the lands that we so sell to you. Now, Sir, we are giving away lands in the west for nothing to people who will come and settle upon them. The hon. member for West Toronto was one of the chief stockholders in the railway that ran through that tract of land, and I understand that for a stretch of sixty miles there was no railway station on that line. Why? Because the owners of the railway said: Nobody can cultivate that soil with any profit, nobody will settle upon it, it will never yield a crop, and it would not pay us to put a railway station there. When they were pressed to do so by the Saskatchewan Land Company they said: We will, on condition that you pay the salary of our station agent; and only by that means was a railway station established. With what success did the government endeavour to settle that country? With this degree of success that they brought into that country, at very great expense and with the exercise of a great deal of energy, people who understood how to till and cultivate such soil. With what result? The hon. member for North Toronto admits that to-day that country blossoms like the rose, that to-day that country, once a barren district in which nobody had any confidence, is now one of the most fertile parts of the northwest; and, Sir, that it is admitted generally by the people of the west that one of the very best and most enterprising acts of this government, one of the acts of this government attended with the very best results, was the sale of that land upon the terms upon which it was sold to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. We have it upon the evidence of the hon. member for North Toronto that it is now good land, that it is now fertile and productive, and I say, Sir, that the hon. member for North Toronto is no mean judge of northwest land, because in his day he has bought and sold northwest land to a large extent. The people in that neighbourhood, knowing the history of that transaction, knowing the land and knowing what has been made of the land, have sent to this House members to support, not the party of the hon. member for North Toronto, but the party that is sitting behind the Premier and the Minister of Finance to-day.

The hon. member for North Toronto made some tart remarks about the Intercolonial railway. I will not say anything in defence of the Intercolonial railway tonight, because, in the first place, I do not think it is necessary and because, in the second place, I believe that before very long the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) will present a report to this House that will be as displeasing and as discouraging to the hon. member of North Toronto as it will be satisfactory and pleasing to the people of this country. I recommend the hon. member for North Toronto to go to the library, take down 'Hansard' and read from a debate that took place in this House some years ago respecting the Intercolonial railway in which he will find the words of his former leader, Sir Charles Tupper, to the effect that the Intercolonial was never intended to be a paying road and was never expected to be.

Now, I want very shortly to speak of some of the things that have been and are being done by the several departments of this government, or, at least, by one or two of them for the benefit of the people of Canada. I want to speak for a moment of the forestry work that is being prosecuted by the Department of the Interior. The Forestry branch was established in 1899. The first appropriation that this government made for the work was in the years 1900-1 and the appropriation in that year was $10,000. That appropriation has grown from year to year until last year and the year before the appropriation was $100,000. In this forestry work the department employs a staff of about forty people. In the United States, for carrying on the same kind of work, they employ permanently a staff of about 2,000 people and their annual appropriation has risen until at this date it is $4,640,000. The forestry branch is endeavouring to ascertain the extent of the forest wealth of our country, and it is preserving the forest from fire through the efforts of the fire rangers and by enlisting, through the missionaries of the country, the sympathies of the Indians. They are also assisting in the reforestation of the western country, and in the reforestry of the western country there are difficulties to be met with that are not known to us in the east; in the first place, the comparatively light rainfall, in the second place, the exposure of young trees to great winds and storms, and in the third place, the

compactness and hardness of the soil. Notwithstanding these difficulties the department last year gave away to 2,010 applicants, 2,570,000 trees for planting. The applications for this year are largely in excess of those of last year, and from the time of the founding of this forestry branch 14,500,000 trees have been given away free to settlers of the west for planting upon western plains. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the changes in the regulations for the sale of timber as made in the month of December, 1907. By these new regulations it is enacted, first, that every sale of government timber shall be by auction, second, that there shall be a cruising and survey of every limit before it is put up for sale and, in the third place, that there shall be the fixing of an upset price. The form of the timber license provides that the licensee, first, shall not cut trees less than ten inches in diameter at the stump; second, shall leave seed trees as directed by the forestry officers; and third, shall dispose of the debris as instructed.

Now, let me say a word as to the iron and steel bounties. It was, last summer, my privilege and pleasure to visit Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I confess that I had not been particularly in love with the payment of bounties. The iron and steel bounties have averaged, I believe, a little over $1,000,000 a year for the time this government has been in power, making about 15 or 16 cents for each person in Canada per annum. When in Nova Scotia I availed myself of the opportunity of seeing large iron and steel works in different parts of the province. I had the opportunity of going through one of the large works, conducted by a director of the company, and when I saw the works in operation, and when I saw the effect of the works, I will readily admit that I was glad that this government had encouraged the iron and steel industries by the payment of bounties. I realized that the men who, at great risk, had put a wealth of capital and a wealth of intelligence and enterprise into those great industries were indeed helping to a considerable degree in the building up of the nation. I realized that the lusty workmen in these factories, who were pouring the molten metal, who were shaping large masses of iron under steam hammers, who were rolling it into greater lengths and turning it in their great lathes were assisting to utilize and develop the natural resources that a generous Creator had placed upon, under and convenient to Canadian soil intending them to be used for and by the Canadian people. As I saw large thriving towns and growing cities that had before the establishment of these industries been sleepy villages, fishing hamlets and market centres for the small surrounding district of farming country I realized that a great deal had been done by the building up of these industries. As I saw these workmen engaged in large numbers in these works it occurred to me, as it would to any one, that these men must be fed and clothed, that these men were buying the boots and shoes, the cottons and woollens that were being made at the benches and upon the looms of other Canadian factories. I realized that these workmen must be fed from the product of Canadian farms and Canadian pastures, and I realized too that these workmen buying that which they had to buy and these manufacturers importing that which they had to import must be adding largely to the customs revenue of the country. Perhaps I was influenced a little bit in looking favourably upon the iron and steel bounties by words that had been uttered by the hon. member for North Toronto and which I read in the 'Hansard' of 1894. The hon. gentleman said:

> On the one hand the duties on iron have been and are relatively high, on the other hand there is the patent fact that unless there be a sufficient inducement in the way of protection or bounty given for the manufacture of iron it will be impossible in this country as it has been found impossible in all other countries ever to rise from the production of raw ores which abound in this country, to an independent and self contained manufacture of the larger portion of the iron needed for the consumption of the country.

I possibly have been influenced to some extent by these words of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) and Sir, while I was glad that the iron and steel bounties had been paid, when I saw recently in the newspapers that one of these companies whose works I had seen had declared a stock bonus of 20 per cent, and when I read the words of the general manager of one of these companies which I shall quote, I came to the conclusion that the time had now come when the iron and steel bounties ought no longer to be paid. Sir, I do not want the people of this country to be prejudiced, I do not want the people of this country to too hastily draw conclusions because of the payment of a 20 per cent stock bonus, I want it to be understood that this 20 per cent stock bonus was in the place of annual dividends which had been withheld and not paid. But notwithstanding that the stock bonus was only the equivalent for honestly earned reasonable dividends yet when I read the words of Mr. Cantley, the general manager of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, I came to the conclusion which I have already referred to. Referring to his company Mr. Cantley said:

> It is already in an unusually advantageous

position having its own iron ore and the coal and being in no way dependent upon any other concern. The company's output of coal was larger than ever this year and the deposit both of coal and iron ore at Wabana are practically inexhaustible. Everything in connection with our property is encouraging and with the improvements in finances the company can go ahead and work out its own destiny to greater advantage than if it were in a merger.

I take these words from the 'Monetary Times' of December 4, 1909, which publishes the annual address of the general manager at the last meeting of this company. Now, Sir, the Nova Scotia Iron and Steel Company are not, I fancy, in any different position than the other iron and steel companies of the Dominion. I think the language used by Mr. Cantley is language that no man need be ashamed of; it is the language of a man who has self reliance and self dependence. I believe that a man who at the annual meeting of this company can say: 'We are now in a position to work our own destiny independent of any merger' will be willing to say: 'We are now in a position to work out our own destiny without any iron or steel bounties from any government.' And Sir, I trust when the term expires, as it will expire next year, for the payment of iron and steel bounties that it will not be renewed. Unless I change my mind more than I think I will, I shall be utterly opposed to their renewal.

We have made a treaty recently with France. As to the commercial advantages to be derived from that treaty I will say but little because it is a matter that has been already fully discussed. There is one thing I do wish to say to the farmers of this country, and when I say it I am simply repeating what has been stated by the 'Farm Journal' published at Winnipeg. That journal has referred to the considerable benefit which will accrue to the farmers of Canada from the negotiations of the French treaty, and it does not speak of it in terms of praise because of the advantages for the shipment of stockers or fat cattle, but it says that the manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canada will be so largely helped by that French treaty, and their trade will be so increased and extended that they will put up much larger factories with greater capacity, giving a greater output, and that having that increased capacity and output, as a consequence the price of agricultural implements all over Canada will be largely decreased.

But, Sir, it is not so important because of the trade advantages that are likely to accrue, although there will be trade advantages, but it is because we always receive an indirect benefit when we make a trade treaty with any other nation in as much that we get their friendship. And if we suffer no material loss I think it is worth while to make such a treaty with our neighbours whomsoever they may be even if the only good result to us is the good will of the persons with whom we treat. Sir, we have made a treaty with France; I trust that when that treaty has been gotten well out of the way that this government will be willing to embrace the first opportunity of making a treaty with Germany. I believe we will derive advantages from the French treaty, but I also believe that our advantages would be still greater from a German treaty; greater because Germany is not such a great agricultural nation as France, that it is more of a manufacturing nation, that it will consume more of our products. In that respect a reasonable trade treaty with Germany would help us even to greater advantage than a treaty with France. Sir, I am not in any way blaming the government, there certainly can be no blame attached to it, for the imposition of the German surtax. There was nothing else for them to do under the circumstances. But if Germany is now willing, as we are told she is, to approach this government in a friendly way and ask for closer trade relations, I trust the Canadian government will not be reluctant to meet them. When we were discussing the French treaty one gentleman on the other side of the House objected because of a knitted goods factory at some place, and another hon. gentleman opposite objected because of a glove factory at some other place. Sir, if we are to regard ourselves as nation builders, if we are to regard ourselves as trustees having the development of a great country in our charge, we must look at these matters from a broader point of view. Such views may be all right to be held by members of a municipal council if the area of the municipality is not too great, but these are not the views that ought to be entertained by nation builders.

In considering a proposed German treaty and the conditions existing as between Germany and Canada I desire to make some reference to an article in the 'Empire Review' for November, 1909, edited by Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke. After explaining and describing the conditions as they are to-day between Germany and Canada, the editor says:

There can be no doubt that the trade between the two countries has materially suffered by the altered conditions, and in the best interests of Canada it is unfortunate that the tariff committee of the association of Canadian manufacturers have reported against the remission of the surtax on German manufactures. Obviously the line for Germany to take is to withdraw the reprisals and then for Canada to withdraw the surtax. If this were done the position would revert automatically to the status quo. It appears Germany is willing to do her part but the tariff

committee do not see their way to accept the olive branch, giving as their reasons,—

Now follows, in quotation marks, the resolution of the Tariff Committee of the Manufacturers' association:

that the feeling amongst Canadian manufacturers against the negotiation of a tariff treaty with Germany has of late been strengthened by reason of the strong anti-German sentiment manifested in England and that from an imperial point of view it would certainly be unfortunate if at this juncture Canada were to strengthen the hands of Britain's most dreaded commercial rival by granting concessions which would be the means of transferring to that rival trade which is now being enjoyed by the mother country.

The comment of the editor is as follows:

But unsound as the commercial side of their policy is, the reference to 'the strong anti-German sentiment manifested in England' is still more unsound. There is no strong anti-German feeling here in the sense that is implied in the tariff committee's report. A section of the press and of the public are, it is true, still opposed to all things German, but the opposition politically is fast dying out. Commercial antagonism there must always be, but if Canada is to wait until all commercial jealously disappears before coming to terms with Germany she will postpone her arrangement till the Greek Kalends. If I might offer a suggestion to the Canadian government, it is this: 'Agree with your adversary quickly,' and leave all question of anti-German sentiment in this country out of your calculations.

We are now an important and a somewhat influential part of the British empire and I suggest that this government, not in any undignified way, but in a thoroughly business way, let it be known to Germany that we prefer trade rather than battles. If we do that I think it may have some influence in continuing peace rather than in bringing war. When we speak of a trade treaty with Germany, our friends on the other side of the House will say, as they said of the French treaty: What will the United States say. Sir, I was surprised to find our friends on the other side of the House ask such a question as that. I remember reading of men who were sent many long centuries ago to investigate a situation and to report, and on their return they said:

And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.

If our friends on the other side are bound that before they make any bargain with any nation, they must obtain the censent of the people and government of the United States, then I say to them that so long as a people regard themselves as grasshoppers in their own sight they will be sure to be regarded as grasshoppers in the sight of the other fellow.

One thing more and I have done, and that is to refer shortly to the question of immigration. I shall not quote long figures, not even the figures I have prepared. I shall not speak so much as to the number of immigrants coming into the country just now, but rather as to the character of the immigrants we have received. I observe, Sir, that last year and for the first seven months of this year—and I think there is no change in that respect from the years preceding—more that seventy-five per cent of the immigrants we have received in Canada have been from Great Britain, Ireland and the United States. A large number of the remainder of the immigrants who have come here have been from the northern portion of Europe, from Germany, Sweden, Norway, Holland, and other portions of northern Europe, whose people are as good a class of immigrants as can be got to come to any country. I have said that the immigrants who have gone into the United States have been of an altogether different and inferior class. I say this because we have repeatedly heard it argued in this House that the United States have been getting a better class of immigrants than we in Canada because of the greater care that has been exercised by the people of the United States in the selection of their immigrants.

I wish to read shortly from an article in the 'Popular Science Monthly' by Dr. Albert Alleman, of Washington, District of Columbia. He says:

The people of the 13 colonies, the builders of the American union were almost exclusively of the Anglo-Saxon race. The immigration which set in after the war of independence and continued during the greater part of the nineteenth century, was composed of people not dissimilar from those early colonists. They came from the British Isles, Scandinavia, Germany and the smaller Teutonic countries. But during the last twenty-five years the number of immigrants from those regions has steadily decreased and has now sunk to very small numbers, while the immigration from Italy, Hungary, Greece and Russia has increased from year to year during the same period of time, and, of late years, has assumed truly enormous proportions.

Again in the same article, he says:

Broadly speaking we have two great classes of immigrants, those that came before about the year 1885 and those that came after that year. The native home of the former was northwestern Europe and the bulk of them belongs to the so-called Teutonic, or Scandinavian, or the northern blonde race; the latter came from the Mediterranean basin and eastern Europe, and present a number of racial types.

Later in the same article, he says:

About the middle of the ninth decade of the last century,—

That would be about 1885.

—an entirely new immigration began to set in. The new arrivals came from southern and

eastern Europe, from Italy, Greece, Hungary, Bohemia, Russia. Hailing from an entirely different region of Europe, they differ completely in their racial characteristics from the earlier immigration.

Here is sufficient evidence that Canada in the last twenty-five years has been receiving a class of immigrants vastly superior in every way to the immigrants who have, in the same time, been going into the United States.

A word as to the immigration from Japan. We all remember the great turmoil that was raised in this House and out of it a couple of years ago because of the great influx of Japanese immigrants. At the last election, in a certain section of this country, people were stampeded against the government of the day because of the fear of a yellow peril, which fear has since been shown to be purely without reason. The number of immigrants coming from Japan into Canada in 1907-8 was 7,601; in 1908-9, it was 495; and for the first seven months of 1909-10, only 186. It will therefore be seen that the fears of the people who were influenced to vote against this government in the last election because of the Japanese immigration and the failure of this government to stop it, were entirely groundless and these people will surely have learned the lesson that they had better in future trust the statements of the government rather than—I was going to say—the fabrications of our friends on the other side of the House. The immigration from the United States in 1908-9 was 59,832. In the first seven months of this year it was 65,755, or 6,000 more in seven months of this year than in the whole twelve months of last year. While this American immigration is a matter on congratulation for us, it is a matter over which the American people are very much alarmed. I was reading a few days ago an article in the Breeders 'Gazette' of November 24, 1909, a leading agricultural paper published in Chicago, in which it is said:

An extraordinary gathering was the Land Congress in Chicago last week. The farm was the keynote, the farmer the man of the hour. Governors, senators, congressmen, land commissioners, scientific agriculturists, dry farmers, railroad immigration agents and others responded to the call in surprising numbers.

Again further on:

It was a notable gathering and not the least valuable of its influences is that directed against the loss of our farming population to Canada.

The 'Country Gentleman,' a leading agricultural paper published in Albany, New York, in its issue of November 25, last, says:

60,000 Americans went to Canada last year and took with them $60,000,000 to buy wheat lands in Canada.

In its issue of December 2, 1909, the same paper says:

The American emigration to the Canadian Northwest, after having some time ago aroused attention, has begun to excite alarm; and an association has been formed in Chicago to check it, with the motto, 'Why go to Canada' The immediate occasion for concern is the announcement that the northward current has continued to flow this year all through the fall, instead of letting up as usual. In August, September and October 13,781 American settlers arrived in Winnipeg, 48 per cent more than were received in those three months of 1908. It is said that 500,000 Americans have crossed the border in the last ten years.

Referring to the motto of that Chicago congress, 'Why go to Canada?' I ask myself the question: Why do these American citizens, the very cream of the American farming population, and why do men in such large numbers from Britain and from the best parts of Europe, come to Canada? They come to Canada, in the first place, because of the natural advantages, the cheap lands we have to offer. They come, in the second place, because of the confidence they have in Canadian laws and the way in which we enforce our laws. They come in the third place, because this government, the Minister of the Interior, his deputy, the superintendent of immigration, and the Interior Department generally, have advertised in the most businesslike way the advantages which our country has to offer. So I say again that this government is entitled to the credit of bringing into the country the farmers who, the hon. member for North Toronto says, have saved the government and the country. Again I congratulate the Finance Minister upon the splendid budget which he has been able to present to-day and the splendid conditions which have enabled him so to do.

Mr. SPROULE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 15, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate l'Institut de Notre-Dame des Missions.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand this 12th report, it is a report allowing the application of the company seeking incorporation as the St. Lawrence Power Company to be put through without the proper notice having been given. Am I right in understanding that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that the report of the examiner of petitions will go to the Committee on Standing Orders.

REGULATION OF HORSE RACING.

Mr. WALLACE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 81) to regulate horse racing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. WALLACE. This is a Bill dealing with horse racing in Canada. The object of this Bill is to limit the length of race meetings in Canada, which will stop gambling at least to a certain extent. We do not desire at all to interfere with the legitimate sport of horse racing, and this Bill does not interfere with it, but there are many race tracks at which race meetings are held for forty, fifty or sixty days. These tracks are not being operated for the sport of it at all but for the gambling end of it. We want therefore to limit horse racing to thirty days in the year divided between fifteen consecutive days in the spring and fifteen days in the fall there being a proviso that between spring and fall meetings there must be an interval of at least forty days.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. WILLIAM CULLUM.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. Has William Cullum been appointed an inspector of boilers under section 572 of the Canada Shipping Act? If so, what was the date of his appointment?

2. Did the said William Cullum before his appointment receive a certificate from the Board of Steamboat Inspection, as required by section 573 of said Act?

3. If so, what was the date of such certificate, and by whom was it signed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1. Yes, June 1, 1908.

2 and 3. Yes, as the result of an examination held by the Board of Steamboat Inspection at Victoria, British Columbia, in March, 1898. The Chairman of the board, Mr. E. Adams, issued his certificate on May 12, 1908, that Mr. Cullum was qualified under the Act.

TONNAGE TAX ON CANADIAN VESSELS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE:

1. Have any representations or complaints been made to the government relative to the imposition of a tonnage tax upon Canadian ships operating on the Great Lakes entering United States ports?

2. What is the amount of this tax, by what law imposed, and how collected?

3. Was there any reciprocal arrangements as to freedom from any tax of this kind in force until this year? If so, when was this arrangement made, the nature of it, and by whom?

4. Does this tax abrogate the arrangement made also as to the reciprocal free use of the canals?

5. Is it the intention of the government to impose a similar tonnage tax upon United States ships trading on the Great Lakes to Canadian ports?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. No.

2. Two cents per registered ton, not to exceed in the aggregate ten cents per ton in any one year. This tax is imposed by section 36 of the new United States tariff and is collected by the collector of customs at the port of entry.

3. Yes, under the authority of an order in council of the 21st of November, 1884, application was made to the United States government for the abolition of all tonnage tax on vessels entering a port in the United States from any port in the province of Ontario. On the 31st January, 1885, president Arthur issued a proclamation exempting vessels arriving at a port in the United States from any port in the province of Ontario, from the tonnage tax of three cents per ton, not to exceed fifteen cents in any one year.

In consideration of the privileges enjoyed by the Ontario vessels in ports of the United States, the collection of Harbour Masters' fees from United States vessels arriving at ports in the said province was waived by the Dominion government.

4. No.

5. The collection of the fees imposed under section 862, of the Canada Shipping Act, which has been waived since 1885, was resumed on 1st December, 1909.

PERMANENT FORCE—ENTERTAINING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are there any regulations governing entertaining allowances for the officers of the permanent force? If so, in what manner are

such allowances made, and to what officers?

2. Has the officer commanding Quebec district been entitled to or in receipt of such allowance? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. No regulations on the subject. Entertaining allowance is granted to the following officers and messes:

The officer commanding maritime provinces command, Halifax.

Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery mess, Quebec.

Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles mess, Winnipeg.

The allowances at Halifax and Quebec have been granted in consequence of the necessity arising for entertainment of British and foreign men of war, and in view of the fact that, prior to the garrison at Halifax being transferred from the imperial government to Canada, the officers commanding received similar allowances.

At Winnipeg, owing to the very few officers in the mess, it is impossible for them to maintain their position in a proper manner without some assistance.

2. The officer commanding Quebec command at Montreal is not in receipt of an entertaining allowance, and it is not considered necessary at that station.

PERMANENT FORCE—SCHOOLS OF INSTRUCTION.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What is the establishment of the royal schools of military instruction, below mentioned, and how many certificates have been issued from each, during the last financial year, to officers, non-commissioned officers and men, of the active militia, respectively: Royal School of Cavalry, Toronto; Royal School of Cavalry, St. John; and the Royal School of Instruction, Winnipeg. Royal School of Artillery:—Horse and Field Branch, Kingston; Heavy Branch, Quebec; Coast Defence Branch, Halifax; Coast Defence Branch, Esquimalt; Royal School of Infantry, London; Royal School of Infantry, Toronto; Royal School of Infantry, Quebec; Royal School of Infantry, Fredericton; Royal School of Infantry, Halifax, and the Canadian School of Musketry, Ottawa?

2. How many provisional schools of instruction were formed during the last financial year, and how many certificates were issued therefrom?

3. What amount was paid out on account of provisional schools of instruction during the period above mentioned to officers, instructors, etc., of the permanent force, lodging and subsistence of members of the active militia attending such schools for instructions, respectively?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. The establishment of the separate units of the permanent force which constitute the schools of instruction, in addition to performing the other duties allotted, by law, to the permanent force, and the number of certificates issued is as follows:

—	Establishment.	Certificates granted.	
		Officers.	N. C. O. and Men.
Royal School of Cavalry, Toronto	90	44	9
Royal School of Cavalry, St. John.	95	34	17
Royal School of Instruction, Winnipeg	90	129	118
Royal School of Artillery, Kingston	285	21	81
Royal School of Artillery, Quebec	197	5	10
Royal School of Artillery, Halifax	411	8	27
Royal School of Artillery, Esquimalt	80	2	6
Royal School of Infantry, London	75	35	34
Royal School of Infantry, Toronto	85	58	11
Royal School of Infantry, Quebec.	80	73	39
Royal School of Infantry, Fredericton	80	19	14
Royal School of Infantry, Halifax.	600	22	50
Canadian School of Musketry, Ottawa	....	15	32
Schools of Signalling	....	28	203

2. There were, in addition, 28 provisional schools of instruction conducted at various local centres by the Royal Schools of Instruction above mentioned during the last financial year, from which a total of 606 certificates were granted.

3. Permanent force—

Officers and men—lodging and subsistence	$1,402
Active militia—	
Officers and men—lodging and subsistence	1,814
Horses and forage	4,936
Total	$8,152

ESTABLISHMENTS OF CANADIAN MILITIA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are the establishments of the Canadian militia, including the permanent force, fixed annually by the Governor in Council?

2. If so, are they based upon the appropriation made by parliament for the period concerned?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. They are based on the appropriation voted by parliament, but provision is also made in the establishments for the authorization of new units to anticipate the growth of the force.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are any Ross rifles Mark I, at present on issue to any corps of active militia, or to any

rifle clubs? If so, to what corps and clubs, and how many?

2. In view of the defects discovered in Mark I, does not the government consider that a serious set-back might be given to the developing cadet system by any issue to cadets of rifles of that pattern?

3. How many Ross rifles Mark I, were accepted from the manufacturer?

4. In view of its defects, and the fact that it is widely considered unsafe for use, does not the government consider that it would be sound policy to scrap the issue and write it off the books entirely?

5. In view of the difference in length of barrel, weight, attachment of barrel and receiver, twist of rifling, change in pattern of locking bolt and safety catch, trigger action, bayonet attachment, and backsight, will the government explain the process through which any previous pattern of Ross rifle was converted into the pattern known as Mark II**?

6. Did the contract for the supply of 500 rifles Mark II** call for their conversion from any pattern already manufactured, or did it call for the manufacture of 500 new rifles at an increased cost over existing contract rates, against which cost an allowance would be credited for such parts of the Mark II pattern as could be utilized in the manufacture of the Mark II**?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. List of changes No. 255, published with general orders, May 1, 1909, authorized the issue of Ross rifles Mark I. to selected units, rifle associations and cadet corps, to be designated. These rifles have been issued in accordance therewith, and they are expected to be all issued during the ensuing calendar year.

2. No serious defects have been shown to exist in Mark I. rifle, and the only danger of a 'set-back' in the growth of the cadet movement consists in such unfair and persistent attacks upon the rifle as are involved in questions of this kind.

3. 9,000.

4. Such slight defects as were found to exist have been remedied, and the allegation that the rifle 'is widely considered unsafe for use' is not believed to have any foundation in fact. Any such impression, however, that may exist is largely due to the persistent efforts of the hon. member to discredit the rifle. To do what the hon. member apparently proposes would be both wasteful and ridiculous.

5. The process to which the hon. member alludes has been simply one of evolution such as many other service rifles have undergone.

The present British service rifle, for example, differs from the original Lee-Metford rifle in length of barrel, weight, nature and twist of rifling, pattern of safety catch, trigger action, method of loading, bayonet attachment, pattern of backsight, pattern of foresight, clearing rod, magazine, attachment of barrel to stock, cover for barrel, and many other details too numerous to mention.

6. Contract called for conversion from existing pattern, viz., Mark II.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a question of order. I notice that in the answer given by the hon. minister he went beyond the purport of the question by alleging that the disrepute attaching to this rifle was due to the efforts made by my hon. friend (Mr. Worthington) who put the question. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is quite out of order, and I would ask that that part of the answer be expunged.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then I would ask that the question be eliminated. The hon. member who put the question—I did not take exception to his doing so—has made certain statements as to the alleged fact that defects existed and that in the public mind the rifle is considered unsafe for use. These allegations are possibly improper in a question, but I answered according to the law of scripture that we are bound to answer a fool according to his folly.

Mr. MONK. If the question was out of order exception should be taken to it, but the answer certainly was out of order.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. If there is anything out of order about it it is certainly the answer. If any one can tell me how you can build a Mark II rifle into a Mark II** when the length of the barrel is an inch and a half longer in a Mark II** and the rifle much heavier, I would like to know it. The only process of conversion is by giving an order for 500 new rifles and paying for these rifles and charging the difference up to the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the point of order is insisted on I will look into the matter. The rule is of course, that no argument of any kind and no allegation can be put into a question. I am under the disadvantage of not having seen this question until it went on the Order Paper.

Mr. MONK. What about the answer?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the question is irregular and is ruled out of order there would be no answer.

DRILL HALLS OR ARMOURIES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

In the construction of drill halls or armouries, or the leasing of sites for camps of instruction, in how many and what instances have municipalities, regiments, or individuals, contributed to the cost of the same in the way of concessions, sites, or moneys, and to what amount since 1904?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As the information required by the question is

lengthy I would ask the hon. member to move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question stands as notice of motion for a return.

MILITIA INSPECTION PAY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

Are the rates of inspection pay fixed by article 43, Pay and Allowances for the Militia, drawn by officers of the permanent force appointed inspectors of cavalry, artillery, infantry and signalling, during the periods employed on inspection duties only, or for all days on which they draw regimental pay and command pay?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

Inspection pay is paid to inspectors of cavalry, artillery and signalling for every day they hold these appointments.

There are no inspectors of infantry.

PEACE RIVER LAND COMPANY.

Mr. MONK:

1. Have the lands which form part of the grant by the Crown to the Peace River Colonization and Land Development Company, been disposed of in any way, or are said lands in the possession of the government without any reservation whatever?

2. Have the said lands or any of them been dealt with in any way since the cancellation of the grant to the Peace River Colonization and Land Development Company?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. Several homestead entries have been granted within the tract, otherwise the land is in the possession of the government without reservation.

2. No; except in so far as homestead entries may have been granted.

SUTHERLAND RIFLE SIGHTS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has delivery been made of any of the 36,000 sights contracted for by the government with the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, the period for which was extended from March 15, 1908, to September 15, 1909?

2. (a) If so, how many, and (b) what payments, if any, have been made thereon?

3. Does the contract price for such sights include the placing of the same on the rifles?

4. (a) If not, by whom is the work of changing the sights to be done, and has any contract been made therefor? (b) If not, what is the estimated cost?

5. If delivery of sights has not been made, has the time been further extended, or has the contract been cancelled?

6. Has any other sight been contracted for or taken into consideration?

7. If so, what is the proposed cost of the sight, and placing the same on rifles, and by whom are sights to be supplied and work of changing sights on rifles to be done, including all expenses incidental thereto?

8. Has any offer been made by the Ross Rifle Company in this connection? If so, of what nature, and the cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. (a) 35,000.

(b) The entire quantity delivered has been paid for. Total payment $42,000.

3. No.

4. (a) Regimentally, or by the armourers of the Canadian Ordnance Corps.

(b) At no expense to the public.

5. Answered by 1 and 2.

6. No other sight has been contracted for, but the department has constantly under consideration sights which are submitted to it by inventors.

7. Answered by 6.

8. No.

DOMINION GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the name, cost, date of construction, place of construction, and gross tonnage of each of the steam vessels now owned by the Dominion government?

2. What are the names of those built in Canada?

3. Were they all thrown open to Canadian competition? If not, what ones were thrown open?

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

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

6. What price would each of the said steam vessels have cost if the government in each case had paid the current Canadian customs duty chargeable on vessels constructed outside of Canada?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. As this question involves the preparation of a good deal of information I would ask my hon. friend to put it as a motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

WATERWAYS TREATY.

On the order:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, documents and papers not already brought down touching the treaty with the United States of America, known as the Waterways Treaty, or any modification thereof.—Mr. Borden.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume the government still desires this to stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved:

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest and facilitate busi-

ness for the answers to all questions put by members under rules 36 and 38 to be submitted in writing without being read. That Wednesdays after six o'clock p.m., be taken up with consideration of the estimates.

He said: If I am not encroaching on the work of the committee appointed by the House to consider the rules, I may say that the people of the country as well as a great many members who are now listening to me are strongly in favour of the procedure that the questions should be answered in writing, published in 'Hansard,' and not read in the House, or any change which will shorten the sessions. It is well known that very seldom are the answers heard by those who are any distance from Mr. Speaker, and as a rule the members know they can get it in the 'Hansard' next morning and so they do not listen. In the Imperial House of Commons, on whose rules ours are based, they have such a rule as I now propose, in force for a number of years. If any hon. gentleman desires that a question should be answered orally then an asterisk is placed before the question on the Order Paper, but otherwise the answers are given in writing. Last Thursday there was an hour and ten minutes of the time of the House absolutely lost in answering questions and reading petitions. I contend, Sir, that five minutes before six, for the good of the subject which an hon. member wishes to have introduced, is worth an hour afterwards, because what is said after six o'clock, is very seldom taken note of by the press of this country as their columns are filled up by that time. I hold Sir, that the press of the country is the cradle that rocks the idea into shape. It has been said that I pay to much attention to editorials in the press, but I wish to say here that I do not believe that any one can pay enough attention to the importance of the press. They are the brainiest men in the country and they have studied for years the feelings of the people. From one end of Canada to the other, the press on both sides of politics has discussed this matter in leading editorials, some a column in length, and all in favour of a revision of the rules. In Redlich's study of the British constitution, the only real authority on legislative procedure and a very able work—I am sorry the author was not an Englishman—it is stated that the understanding of the rules is that it shall not be made a party matter, but as something due to the country. The purpose of that part of the motion that Wednesday after six o'clock should be devoted to the estimates is that while those who are not concerned in the estimates set down for that evening could still devote it to social purposes, the time of the country would not be lost.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, there are two suggestions made in the motion of my hon. friend, and I suppose that he will agree with me that since only yesterday the House adopted a committee for the purpose of revising our rules, it would be preferable that this motion should be sent to that committee instead of being dealt with by the House. So far as I am concerned, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of my hon. friend's first suggestion, that is, that the answers to questions should not be read in the House. But there may be some answers which, for the purposes of public convenience, should preferably be given orally to the House, those to which it is desirable that public attention should be drawn or as to which the country would like to be informed. In that way the information would very likely get into that cradle of which my hon. friend has spoken. With regard to taking up the estimates on Wednesday evening, this would involve a departure from the present rule, which was adopted at the time of the last revision some years ago, making Wednesday evening a free evening. I think the members of the House have been rather in favour of that change; the freedom given to them on that evening has been very much appreciated. I do not know whether we would meet the sense of the House if we departed from that rule and forced the House to sit on Wednesday evening. If the House sat, I do not know exactly what my hon. friend means—whether that the House should mechanically take up the estimates without members having the privilege which they now have of bringing up any question or moving an amendment on the motion to go into Supply. Is that the meaning of my hon. friend?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware whether this would be acceptable to the House or not. That privilege is more for the protection of the opposition than the government. If we sat on Wednesday evening, I do not know that the government would have any objection to taking up the estimates without an opportunity being given to move an amendment; but this is a question which particularly concerns hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, I would be entirely opposed to any such proposal as that which I gather is the intention of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis), in the latter part of his motion; I am speaking of the last paragraph of this resolution. There would be no object in doing any such thing unless the privilege of bringing up public matters for discussion on the motion to go into Supply were abused. I do not think any hon. member of this House will say that that privilege has been abused or

is abused at the present time. To adopt a rule of mechanically going into Committee of Supply would cut off a safeguard and a privilege that has been sacred to parliament for eight hundred years, and it ought not to be taken away without very grave reason. So far as the other part of the resolution is concerned, with regard to the mode of answering questions, I am entirely in accord with what I understand to be the object of the hon. gentleman and what I understand to be the view of the Prime Minister. There are certain questions which it is desirable in the public interest to answer orally, perhaps not a very great number. With regard to that, the English practice might very well be adopted in this House. I concur entirely in the view the Prime Minister has expressed, that, as a committee has been constituted to revise the rules of the House, the motion of my hon. friend from West Huron should go to that committee, which will no doubt take it into consideration. I am very glad that my hon. friend from West Huron, although I am not able to concur in one of his proposals, has bestowed some attention on this matter, and I have no doubt that the result of his investigations will contribute something of value. I presume there will be no objection on the part of the committee which has been constituted to hear my hon. friend or any other hon. member who desires to make that committee acquainted with his views concerning the lines on which a revision of the rules should proceed.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. If the hon. member for West Huron has in mind the doing away with the Wednesday evening recess, I must certainly, speaking entirely for myself, take the strongest exception to such a proposal. I plead guilty to having had most to do with the bringing about of that change. I was not on the committee, but took the trouble to go to several members of the committee to urge that it should be brought about. I am thoroughly persuaded that it has worked well. I think it is in the interest of the business of the House that there should be one evening of the week when members are free to engage in social affairs, to entertain or be entertained, or to rest if they wish to rest. I am certain that the exceptions taken at the beginning of that new rule were not well taken, and I venture to believe that in the light of experience the House will agree that it is wise to retain the Wednesday evening recess. This is a hard-working House, that is, to the members who are willing to work. Between the work of the committees and the work of parliament, every man who does his duty here will do it quite as well if he has the Wednesday evening recess. It is certainly in the interest of good relations between the members, it is in the interest of many things that make, I think, for the advantage of our parliamentary institutions, that the Wednesday evening recess should be retained, and I do make this personal appeal to the committee that they will not agree to abolish that Wednesday evening recess without the very fullest consideration.

As to the question generally, I think the committee should give some consideration to the point whether our questions are not too broad, too long and too cumbersome. Very many questions put on the Order Paper might, I think, properly be ruled out of order, but we on this side of the House do not wish to take that point. Many questions ask for information which an hon. member could get for himself by walking into the library or asking a sessional clerk to compile it. Many questions are long, they call for long answers and again and again ministers occupy ten minutes in reading an answer to a question. The proper procedure for obtaining information of an extended character is not by a question but by a motion for a return. Again, I think very many questions travel away beyond the line of what is the proper business of the House. I only make these remarks to suggest that the gentlemen who are on that committee may consider whether they cannot keep the questions within better bounds, and I think that if that were done my hon. friend would find that the time occupied would be much less than it now is.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker, no doubt there is a great deal in what the Minister of Finance has just said about the Wednesday evening recess. At the same time, there is a large number of members of the House who feel that if the House sat on Wednesday evening greater progress would be made with the work, and there is a large number of members who come from very long distances to attend the session here in Ottawa to whom getting home a week or two earlier is a matter of very considerable importance. A number think that many members might devote Wednesday night to social entertainments but there would still be plenty of members left to go on with the business of the House. On Monday nights,and more especially on Friday nights a number of members are away, but at the same time the business goes on and very good progress is made, very often better progress perhaps than if all the members were present to take part in the discussion, because if there is anything that we are troubled with on both sides of the House, it is the tendency to long speeches. I am glad to notice that in the last year or two there seems to be an improvement, and the members generally are speaking more

shortly than a few years ago. It seems to me, however, that if the House would sit on Wednesday nights it might be an advantage, and I trust that when the committee come to revise the rules they will give this question their full consideration and see if it is not possible to revert to the old practice of sitting on Wednesday night. Of course as to what business should be taken up, I think it would be better if we just went on in the ordinary way, rather than confine the work of that special evening to Supply. That, however, is a matter that could easily be decided on later. As to the other part of the proposition that the answers to questions be handed in in written form, I am sure there can be no two opinions on it. Just this session we have seen a great deal of valuable time wasted in reading answers that very few members could hear and would have to read in 'Hansard' anyway. I trust that at least that part of the resolution will be carried out.

Mr. F. D. MONK. I agree with the Minister of Finance that it would be a great pity to obliterate the weekly half holiday, if I may so call it; but it seems possibly it might with advantage be changed to another day. It has often occurred to me that if we could stop at six o'clock on Friday it would be better.

An hon. MEMBER. Then you would have to eat fish dinners.

Mr. MONK. I find the provision of fish in Ottawa is very generous and I would be satisfied to get on with a fish dinner if the House did not sit on Friday night. I think that, without abolishing the half holiday, it might be changed to advantage.

I rose particularly to refer to a remark of the Finance Minister as to circumscribing the field of questions. I would be sorry to see the committee, that is doubtless going to perform a useful work, place any limit on questions. Some of them may appear to be useless, but they have always held in England, since the mode of questions existed, that the utmost latitude should be accorded and as a matter of fact one is surprised at the number and the strange character of the questions that are sometimes put in England. Members there have been known to ask why the walks about the parliament grounds were not cleaned, why the corridors of the House are not properly swept and a large number of other questions which may appear to the casual observer to be useless; but in spite of that no attempt has been made to circumscribe the field of questions. I hope that this committee will find some means of limiting discussion, without, of course, coming to the question of closure, which was brought about in England by extraordinary circumstances that have no reason to exist in this country. With that reservation, it seems to me that we might advantageously keep along the line of the English rules in regard to discussion and the division of the work. Some years ago I remember that this question was amply discussed in this House on a motion by Mr. Charlton, which I warmly seconded then. The right honourable the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expressed the hope when that motion was presented to the House that we would ourselves, with time, correct the abuses that existed then. Experience seems to have proved that without a change in the rules those abuses cannot be eliminated. I therefore hope that this committee will take up the work seriously and make some improvement in our mode of deliberation.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. I certainly believe in having an evening of rest in the middle of the week. Members of the House are obliged to work harder than perhaps any other class in the community and we have nobody agitating for an eight hour day to govern our work. I think, Sir, if the hon. member who introduced this motion would introduce a measure of some kind to make compulsory the attendance of members during the time we now sit, it would merit a great deal of consideration, and I certainly would do everything I could to support it.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec County) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, this is a question of much interest especially as regards the younger members of the House. Judging from certain statements which have been made, it seems evident to me that our predecessors here were more diligent workers than we are. It may be that conditions existing at the time favoured them in that respect. However, it would seem to me that this resolution, which has for its purpose to devote Wednesday evenings more particularly to a discussion of the estimates, is somewhat unusual, and would tend to revolutionize an order of things which has been in existence for some time, and at any rate ever since I have been occupying a seat in this House.

We should not devote Wednesday evenings to a study of the estimates, but to the fulfilment of certain social functions which in a certain sense are just as necessary and just as important as the discussion of the estimates. Members of the House are not very well acquainted with one another. As a matter of fact, it is not through the at times acrimonious discussion of Bills that we are likely to arrive at a just estimate and appreciation of one another. Some more appropriate place of meeting is required. I have the honour to belong to a race whose traditions of amiability and sociability are well known and appreciated

throughout the world. And it would be no matter of surprise to me were it to be shown that this interruption of warfare on Wednesday evenings was initiated at the suggestion of some compatriot of mine. For it has always been understood among peoples of latin race, and especially among people of French origin that diplomacy has not the floor of parliament for its only vantage ground, but that there are other places and other means at its disposal whereby rancour may be mellowed down and harmony and conciliation enthroned in its place.

Now, I believe that these special meetings of Wednesday nights held outside this Chamber, though still within the precincts of parliament, have oftentimes afforded an opportunity to hon members to understand one another more thoroughly and gain a better appreciation of their various artistic and social accomplishments in the course of conversations and exchanges of views which would have been out of question during a regular sitting of the House. That is what makes me say that it would be a mistake to do away with these social confabs of Wednesday evenings.

There is still another reason, it is this. We have not the training of our predecessors as regards parliamentary practice. That should not be lost sight of, considering that the difficulty of grasping all that is going on here is constantly increasing. Of course, old parliamentarians are familiar with the workings of government; they are in a position to expedite their business in much less time than we the newcomers could do. It requires more than the ordinary tension of mind to go over the innumerable orders appearing on the Paper, to keep up with the work carried on by the committee and follow the protracted discussions which go on from day to day and are taken down in the official reports. Add to that the daily correspondence, the calls to be made in the various departments, and you will acknowledge that the task imposed upon us is a heavy one. It seems that the old members should take all that into account and show some sympathy for us. For all these reasons, I consider the mid-week holiday a very desirable thing and which should not be done away with.

That viewpoint of the question should appeal to members who live more through the mind than through the heart, for I think that good legislation must be the outcome of a co-operation of both.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, I rise to express myself as favourable to the resolution which has been placed on the Notice Paper by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis). The first part of the resolution says:

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest and facilitate business for the answers to all questions put by members under rules 36 and 38 to be submitted in writing without being read.

I cannot see what objection any member of the House can have to that part of the resolution. For I know, from my personal experience here, that very few of us hear the answers of the questions, but have to read them in 'Hansard' afterwards. A large amount of time would be saved almost every day by having these answers handed in and printed for the benefit of hon. members and of the country generally. With respect to the latter part of the resolution——

That Wednesdays after six o'clock p.m. be taken up with consideration of the estimates.

——from my observation during the short time that I have been here I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that at least one-third or one-half the time of the House is taken up in Committee of Supply. I cannot see, personally, why a large part, or the whole, of these estimates could not be referred to some smaller committee to be dealt with, and only the contested items taken up in the House. I would not urge that if I thought it would interfere at all with the liberty of criticism on the part of opposition members. Every contested item could be reported to the House, and, in that way, everything in the estimates that it is desired to discuss in the House could be brought before the House in exactly the same way as it is to-day. A great deal of the time now taken up in the discussion of the estimates might be used more advantageously for ourselves and for the people if devoted to some other purpose. With respect to the Wednesday evening sitting, I would favour the taking up of some estimates or other government business during the evening. I come from a place far distant from Ottawa—not so far it is true as other members of the House come—and there are a great many of us to whom two or three weeks at home in our own private business would be a great advantage. There are many wealthy men in the House of Commons, and also a large number who have been here for many years and to whom it has become second nature to be here, and these men do not seem to care how the sessions are prolonged. But I think I voice the sentiments of the members who have to come from a long distance when I say that we do not want to be here any longer than we can help. We want to remain here long enough to assist the government in transacting the necessary business, and when that is over we want to go home. Speaking as one of the younger members, I have no hesitation in supporting this

resolution, and I believe I shall be supported in my expression of opinion by other members who reside a long distance from Ottawa, and to whom, as I have said, two or three weeks at the end of the session is worth something in their private business.

Mr. LEWIS. What I intended in the latter part of that resolution, although, perhaps, not so clearly expressed as it might be, was to do away with the Wednesday evening holiday and use the time for the work of the House. We come down here to work, we do not come for social purposes; and Wednesdays and Thursdays are the only two days of the week when most of the members are here.

Mr. FIELDING. Why not take another evening?

Mr. LEWIS. Take Friday evening if you like. I speak without political animus; it makes no difference who are on the treasury benches. The fact is that the main part of the estimates is left until Friday night when there is almost no one here. And, without taking away the rights of the opposition in any way, if Wednesday evening were taken up with the work of this House, it would shorten the session considerably. Starting in November, and ending before Easter, we should have only one holiday for the men from a distance to wait through. Circumstances are changing in Canada. We have more and more members coming from places distant from Ottawa and this fact should not be lost sight of. I say here openly, and no man can confute my statement, that we take up a longer time doing the work of this country than is occupied in similar work in any other country in the world. The Imperial House, upon which this House is patterned, takes less time than we do, and we have nine provinces each with its legislature doing a great deal of business which is absolutely done by the one parliament in England.

There is another matter that we should not lose sight of. While we are only seven millions of people, the questions that come before us are more important not only to ourselves but to the world, than the many questions coming before the legislature of the great country to the south of us or before the parliament of the mother country. The reason is that we are the last great country of the world; we are founding a nation; our work is not for ourselves alone, it is pregnant with futurity, and we cannot tell what will be the outcome of the proceedings of this House. It is easy to understand that a great manufacturing concern, let us say, can be brought into successful operation only by some great genius, but when it is once set in operation it can be run by any sound business man. Great Britain, the United States and other great countries are each like a great manufactory that has been brought to efficient operation; ordinary business men can manage their affairs. But we here are laying the foundation; our country is yet in the embryo stage. We have the greatest uninhabited arable territory of any country in the world, and we are directing the affairs of that territory not only for the present generation but for a mighty population of the future, our own descendants and those of others who are yet to come to Canada from other lands. It is of the utmost importance that we should have here in this parliament the best men of Canada. But, if we take up eight months, as the Toronto 'Globe' stated, in doing work which could be done in six weeks, we cannot get the best men of the country to come here. I am not finding fault with one side or the other. Some people say that the difficulty is in the obstruction of the opposition and some say that it is in the delay of the government. I do not believe that, except in some instances, either of these things is the real cause. The real cause is in the procedure into which we have drifted from time immemorial. We have not made changes to meet our changed condition. In the mother parliament they do make changes some of which are applicable to this country and some are not. I ask, if any evening of the week is to be taken up with social duties, let it be Monday or Friday when many members are not here. Sir, I am informed that this motion cannot be referred to the committee of which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has spoken. I ask leave to withdraw it on the understanding that the matter be brought before the committee and given due consideration there.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, documents, petitions, reports and correspondence with reference to, or in any way concerning the appointment of a government weigher at Montreal.—Mr. Armstrong.

For a return showing a list of all experts, technical advisers, and special officers generally, engaged by the government in connection with the naval defence programme and its execution, giving names, special qualifications, duration of engagement and rate of remuneration, as well as the total amount expended to date under the above; also amounts expended to date for articles, books, instruments and objects of all kinds in connection with said naval defence programme—Mr Monk.

For a return showing: At what places in the several provinces armouries and drill halls have been erected, and when they were erected; the total cost of the site in each case, and when and from whom purchased; the

contract price of each building, and to whom and when the contract was awarded; the total cost of each building; in what places armouries and drill halls are being constructed at present, and the cost of the site, from whom and when purchased, the estimated cost of the building in each case, and to whom, when and at what price the contract was awarded, and the names of places other armouries and drill halls are to be built by the government in the near future.—Mr. Edwards.

For a copy of the pay sheets of the employees on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien for the months of May, June, July, August, September, October and November.—Mr. Verville.

For a return showing the names of the two hundred and twenty-one members of the House of Commons, as provided for in 6-7 Edward VII, Dominion Statutes, 1907, chapter 41, section 1, excepting only such seat or seats as have fallen vacant.—Mr. Campbell.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a copy of petition of right and pleas offered in defence in the case of the suit of the North Atlantic Trading Company vs. the King, in the Exchequer Court, and of all the correspondence as well as reports and petitions which led up to the government granting a fiat to the suppliant; and a copy of all letters having reference to the said claim now sued upon from the time of the final payment in the said North Atlantic Company.

He said: The North Atlantic Trading Company has always had a great fascination for members of this House who sat in the previous parliament, because there is a mysterious element in the history of that company or association. The government entered into a contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company on the 28th of November, 1904. I will not go into the details of that contract, because it is in a sense irrelevant to the object of this motion. But I may say generally, for the information of members of this House who were not in the last parliament, that under the terms of that contract the company known as the North Atlantic Trading Company undertook, under conditions that are set out at length in the petition of right which it has made in the Exchequer Court, to bring to this country immigrants from different parts of Europe, particularly the north western part, from Germany, German Switzerland, Finland, Holland, Scandinavia and parts of Russia. Under the terms of that contract the company was to receive $4 per head for every immigrant, farm hand or domestic servant, and half that sum for children. Now after the company had begun the performance of that contract, questions arose in this House as to how far the company was carrying out its obligation, and whether we were justified in paying to the company the very large sums of money which they received during succeeding years up to the date of the cancellation of its contract. Who were the members of that company? What was the company? Strange to say, in spite of the strenuous efforts made in committees of this House and before parliament itself, after the company had received over $300,000 in bonuses and for other causes resulting from the contract, we never were able to find out who were the members of that company or with whom we were dealing. What requires to be emphasized is the fact that the government at all times, and even on the eve of the cancellation of the contract which the company admittedly was not performing to the satisfaction of the country, even then the information which members of this House sought for was steadfastly refused by the government and in the committees of investigation. That is probably what aroused the curiosity of the House and of the country, and explains the natural curiosity which arises at the present moment when we find that after having paid nearly $400,000 to the company, and made what was alleged to us in this House was a final settlement in payment of what was due that company under the contract, a payment of over $36,000, here, when we thought we had buried for good and all that company which had left such a painful impression upon this House and the country, we find that the company is alive and well, and has obtained permission of the government to sue the government for a sum exceeding $70,000 for damages resulting from the cancellation of the contract, which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior told us when the last payment of over $30,000 was under discussion, was a final payment to the company under the terms of the contract, and was approved by the Department of Justice.

This gives one justification for saying that we will be haunted by that company and its claims until some other government succeeds this one. You cannot lay the ghost of the company by any form of exorcism that I know of. It cannot be laid with bell, book or candle. The ghost must be a Ruthenian or Scandinavian one, but certain it is that we cannot get rid of the claims of the company even by making a substantial payment after the cancellation of the contract and observing all the formalities which would seem to be necessary to rid us of what was deemed by the House and the Minister of the Interior at the time an incubus and a deception upon the country itself. I have stated that information was refused when we investigated the payments made to the company. The House, under the direction of the right hon. the First Minister, I am constrained to say, strengthened and upheld our own public servants connected with the Department of

Immigration, whom we had summoned from Europe, brought here from England, and of whom we asked, as representing the taxpayers of this country—a very natural question: Who are the people to whom we are making these payments which we desire to investigate? The question was put in two of the important committees of this House. I put it myself to Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, in the Immigration Committee, and Mr. Smart, who admitted that he was well aware of the names of the parties constituting this company, positively refused to give the information. He was upheld by the chairman of the committee, the matter was brought before the House, and here my right hon. friend, knowing himself from confidential communications, no doubt, who the members of the company or syndicate were, made the extraordinary offer of communicating these names privately to the leader of the opposition, but refused to uphold the right for which we contended that we, representing the taxpayers of Canada, were entitled to know with whom the government had been dealing and was dealing then. The same thing happened in the Committee on Public Accounts where the payments were under revision. There the question was put, if I mistake not, by my hon. friend on my left, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). At any rate, the question was put to whom?—to Mr. Preston, the superintendent general of immigration in Europe, who knew all about this syndicate, this company, this party of contractors, having organized them himself, and he—a very strange public officer having that mild appearance referred to by the poet of the man who fearlessly scuttled ships and cut throats—positively refused to give the information asked for, and I remember particularly his coolly telling my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in either one or the other of these committees, because the question was put in both of them: You may be a very good watchdog, but you will not find out who the members of that syndicate are. Who were the members of that syndicate? We do not know. We never were able to discover, and at the present moment the government, in pleading to the action brought in the Exchequer Court, declares that it ignores who the members of the syndicate are. That is one of the allegations of the plea. Yet the right hon. gentleman, Mr. Preston, questioned in both committees that I have referred to, and Mr. Smart, then Deputy Minister of the Interior, who was in Europe at the time of the organization of the syndicate, and who seems to have taken an active part himself in the organization of that syndicate, knew who the members of the syndicate were. All the circumstances surrounding the organization of that syndicate gave rise to suspicion and seemed to indicate something which was altogether irregular, but at the time these matters were being probed before the committees here, the government cabled to the Canadian High Commissioner in London in regard to this syndicate and we found out that we were dealing with a company intended to shelter the real interested parties, a company that Mr. Preston, if you please, the superintendent general of immigration, the main actor in the organization of this scheme of immigration, had incorporated, not in London, not in the countries where he was going to operate, but in one of the Channel Islands —the Island of Jersey. He had incorporated a company with a small capital, composed of, I believe, his son-in-law, or his father-in-law, a hotel clerk and a bar-keeper or livery stable keeper, but both he and Mr. Smart told us in the committees that these were in reality prête-noms, the shadows of the real interested parties and that these real interested parties refused to give their names. They were upheld in what we contended at the time was a rebellious position as public servants, but they were upheld by the vote of the majority of this House. On the other hand, it now appears from the plea of the government, and also from the allegations of this petition of right that that company, incorporated under the circumstances I have indicated, the Island of Jersey, really never was the actual company in this scheme of immigration at all, but that the promoters of the scheme formed a commercial association whose business place was in the city of Amsterdam, and I am led to believe by such parts of the pleadings as I have read that the contention is to-day that if you have settled, you have settled with the wrong party. You may have dealt with the Jersey association, but in reality the real party entitled to be paid and entitled to claim damages for an amount exceeding $70,000 is the Amsterdam legal partnership with whom you now have to settle. Which of the two is it with whom we have settled? To whom have we made payment? Who are the parties really entitled to claim? Even at this late date when I thought we had gotten rid of that company, these are matters upon which we should like to be reassured by the Minister of the Interior. I find at page 1928, volume 1, 'Hansard,' 1907, that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked as to the amounts paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company as shown in a return to an order of the House dated November 28, 1906. The question he put was:

> Are there any accounts still unadjusted or any claims for compensation. If so, what are they and for what amount?

In that question my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) referred to a return in reply to a

motion made by my hon. friend from Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) on the 9th of January, 1907, from which it appears that even at that date we had paid to this company over $306,000, and to that question the reply of the Minister of the Interior was:

Yes, there is under adjustment the balance of an account amounting to $31,804.18, on account of 6,536 immigrants.

Well, that account was adjusted and it seems to have given rise to a controversy which the House will find in the Auditor General's Report for 1908, volume 2, page K—103. I may say that we appear to have paid in the year 1908 to the North Atlantic Trading Company, as a balance, not $31,804. but the sum of $36,901.50, and referring to that payment the Auditor General writes to the deputy Minister of the Interior under date of September 10:

I am in receipt of your application of the 6th inst., for the issue of a payment in favour of the Bank of Montreal, for letter of credit cheques issued by your department during the month of November, 1907. On examination of the cheque list I find that immigration cheque No. 1322 was issued on November 29 in favour of the North Atlantic Trading Company, for $36,901.50, in final settlement of their claim. Before passing your application I would be pleased to have the vouchers in support of this payment.

The deputy Minister of the Interior replies to Mr. Fraser, the Auditor General. stating that this sum of $36,900 was a final adjustment of all claims under the contract. I do not wish to detain the House unduly. There are in the 'Hansard' debates of last parliament a great number of references to the manner in which this company acted and as to its inadequacy to the fulfilment of the task we had expected it to perform. There is a long discussion as to the absolute right of the House to obtain the information which under the ruling of the majority was refused us. I do not wish to recall that discussion, but what I wish to point out particularly is that when the contract was cancelled the Minister of the Interior announced in the House, that he had been advised by the Department of Justice that he had an absolute right to cancel the contract. The minister was asked at the time by the hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) if he was fortified by the opinion of the Department of Justice and he said he was and that he had that opinion in writing and was ready to lay it on the table of the House. We expected many useful changes in regard to immigration when the present Minister of the Interior took over the department, and we have his statement that the company was unsatisfactory and that it was time we should cease dealing with it in any way. Then, after the payment had been made and in answer to several questions put in different shape by my hon. friend from Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) we had the statement of the minister that we had finished with this company. But, last summer it appears anew upon the scene and it finds that it can chisel the ratepayers of this country out of another large amount for damages by a claim, which in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior had no existence whatever at the time he cancelled the contract and finally settled with the company. What is the explanation of this? In order to obtain a fiat the suppliant must have presented a petition of right and as I understand it, a fiat is not given by the government unless it finds there is some justifiable ground for granting it and that the petitioner has really some valid right to urge. I believe the matter is then referred preliminarily to the Department of Justice. Did the suppliant in this instance obtain from the Department of Justice an opinion at variance with the previous one given by that department: that the cancellation was unduly made, and that we had no right to cancel that contract although it is laid down in express terms in the contract that we had the absolute right to cancel it if we found it was unsatisfactory. I must assume that the Minister of Justice found there was a prima facie case and therefore advised the Crown to grant a fiat. The Crown did grant a fiat and now we have a suit for over $70,000 damages pending over the country. I think we must watch that suit with the very greatest care because, having obtained according to the contention we made at the time, large sums of money from the public treasury, which this company, mysterious and unknown, was not entitled to, I think we are in a fair way to see a renewal of these depredations and I hope we will take the proper means to prevent them.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). If the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had been to obtain information or to secure examination of the papers referred to in his notice of motion there was no difficulty about his attaining that object by moving his motion in silence, as there is no objection in the world to the production of any or all of the papers referred to. But, from the fact that it has not pleased the hon. gentleman to take that course I cannot come to any other conclusion than that the principal object of putting this notice of motion upon the Order Paper was to discuss again the old question of the names of the shareholders of this North Atlantic Trading Company. I am free to say, so far as I am concerned, that I do not know, and I have not the slightest interest or the slightest curiosity to know, who those people are. I do not think it makes the slightest difference to any man in this

country, whether he is a member of this House or not, and I think the hon. gentleman will find the effort to arouse interest in that question rather a failure when we consider the extent to which that struggle was made prior to and in the course of the elections of a year ago. The people of this country have had this question debated and discussed from every platform, in every schoolhouse, and in every newspaper, and they have expressed their opinion of it by the verdict they gave at the polls.

Now, we have here an ordinary business contract, which was entered into some five years ago between the Minister of the Interior representing the Crown, on the one part, and an ordinary incorporated company, on the other part. I am not discussing, and, in view of the terms of this resolution or of the question presented by the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I do not see that it is in the least degree pertinent to discuss, the policy of that business arrangement. That has already been fully enough debated pro and con in this House. I am not discussing whether or not it was a good contract, if it had been carried out in accordance with its terms. The question which the hon. gentleman has again raised in his remarks, is the composition of the company—the names of the individuals who form it. Well, I venture to think that the composition of that company is of no more concern to any man in this country than the composition of any other business or trading company. The hon. gentleman is himself a lawyer; but whether he were a lawyer or not, every business man understands that once a company is incorporated there is brought into being a new legal entity—artificial, but none the less actually existing—which is absolutely apart from the individuals who may from time to time compose it, and which makes its contracts, binding upon such property as the company owns, irrespective of who the stockholders from day to day or from month to month may be; and I conceive that it is of no more interest to any body, except as a matter of political curiosity, who the shareholders in the North Atlantic Trading Company may be, than it is who the shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may be. The shareholders in the North Atlantic Trading Company may change in number or in individuality from day to day, just as readily as the shareholders in any other incorporated company; so that the individuals who composed that company at the time of entering into this contract five years ago, may be and probably are, not one of them, the individuals who composed that company when application was made for leave to present a petition of right, suing the government for damages in connection with that contract. The hon. gentleman has told us a good deal with reference to the proceedings in the action which has been taken; and the remarks which he has made demonstrate very distinctly that he needs no examination of the pleadings, as is asked for by this motion, to furnish hon. members with any information which he does not already possess. Those documents are filed among the records of the court; they are open to any one who chooses to pay a trifling fee of a few cents to examine them; copies may be had by any one who is sufficiently interested in the matter to ask for copies from an officer of the court. They are in every sense of the word public documents upon the files of a court, and there was no need, so far as obtaining information is concerned, to ask that they be brought down to this House in the shape of a return. There is not the slightest objection to making a set of copies and laying them on the table, and there is no objection to discuss, if it is in the public interest to do so, either here or elsewhere, the averments on either side, made by the parties to the suit. The application for leave to present a petiton of right with respect to this contract was made in the ordinary course by the North Atlantic Trading Company, alleging itself to be a company regularly and duly incorporated, presenting its application to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, in accordance with routine, referred the application to the Department of Justice, in order that the Minister of Justice, as His Majesty's Attorney General for Canada, should pass upon the question and make a recommendation to His Excellency the Governor General as to whether or not that petition of right should be acceded to. The hon. gentleman says that the company, or those who were entitled to be paid under this contract, have already been paid the amount due them, and that there appears to have been some mistake on the part of the government in having paid the wrong people. If the hon. gentleman has read, as I presume he must have read, the framed petition, if he has attended to what the cause of action and claim is, he will readily have seen that it has not the slightest reference to the payments which have already been made, but that on the contrary the claim is in respect of unliquidated or unascertained—so far as the amount is concerned—damages occasioned to the company, according to its assertion, by reason of the fact that the contract was ended before the expiration of the full time for which it was entered into. The contract called for payment to the company of a certain sum for each immigrant brought to this country through or owing to the exertions of the company. When the contract was terminated by the Minister of the Interior, the company made its claim for a certain amount in respect to each immi-

grant which it had brought, crediting the amount which it had received from time to time, and claiming payment of the balance.

The amount of that balance was ascertained and was adjusted satisfactorily, so far as amount was concerned, between the Department of the Interior and the company; the amount agreed upon was paid and received by the company, and there was an end of any claim in respect of moneys earned under the contract. This petition of right, this action which has been brought by the company, concerns an altogether different thing. The company having received from the government the amount which they claimed to have earned, and there being no dispute between the company and the government in respect of the amount of that claim, the company took the position that as a matter of law, upon the true meaning of the contract, the government had no right to terminate it before the expiration of the full number of years for which it had been entered into. That was a question of law upon the language and provisions of the contract in regard to which different men may have different opinions. The Department of Justice gave to the Department of the Interior their opinion, whatever it may be worth, that the legal right to terminate the contract existed, and that the government was not responsible for damages for having put an end to that contract before the full term of years for which the contract had been entered into had expired. The company's lawyers took a different view: the company was advised by its legal agents that upon the true construction of the contract there was no right to put an end to it until the expiration of the full term of years had taken place and the company, taking that position after it had received payment of all the moneys which it had actually earned under the contract, claimed payment of unearned moneys as damages by reason of the fact that they had, as they contended, not been permitted by the government to complete their contract to the full end of the term.

What would my hon. friend have? A petition of right is presented; the Attorney General is called upon to say to His Excellency whether or not His Excellency should endorse that petition with his fiat that right be done. Was I to take on myself to settle that question because I have a strong opinion about it in my own mind, and because looking at it as a lawyer would with the best judgment he was able to bring to bear upon the question, I was of the opinion that that claim would not succeed in the courts? It would be an intolerable state of things if a man who had a valid legal claim or a claim which he thought was valid, a claim which his legal advisers told him in their opinion would succeed in the courts, should be refused the right to litigate that claim because the Department of Justice thought a good defence to that claim existed. Accordingly this claim, being one that, to say the least of it, is an arguable one, a claim which the legal officers of the company assert the company in their opinion possesses, I gave my advice or recommendation to His Excellency, that the matter ought to be litigated. I have seen no reason to change that opinion. I think that I would have been entirely wrong if I had arbitrarily said to this company or to any company under the like circumstances, that I refused to permit them to bring their complaint before the courts of the country for decision. The company then, having obtained, upon my recommendation, the fiat of His Excellency, filed in the Court of Exchequer its petition of right, claiming damages for what it alleged to be a breach of contract. To that petition of right the department filed its statement in defence, setting up reasons which, in our judgment, afforded an answer to the claim and apparently those reasons were considered by the legal advisers of the company to be at any rate formidable, because they then, for the first time, took the position in their reply to the defence of the government, that they were desiring to sue not for the benefit and in the name of the company incorporated, but in the name of an individual syndicate of co-adventurers. That is the present position of the suit. We have answered that, if this suit is not brought by the incorporated company and for the benefit of the incorporated company, it is not brought by the entity with whom the government entered into a contract, it is not brought by the legal entity to which alone was given the fiat permitting a suit to be brought and, taking that objection, the legal proceedings have been ever since at a standstill. What the result of these legal proceedings may be, no man is able to foretell and I am not desirous of discussing. I have taken the legal position which I think is the correct one. I think that the statement in defence which was filed by the Department of Justice on behalf of the government was felt by the advisers of the company to be a complete and perfect answer, and that this latest shift in the position has been a desperate effort on the part of those who were advising the company to better their position if by this complete departure from the attitude they had previously taken, they may possibly be able to do so. It does not appear, as my hon. friend has stated it does, by the pleadings in this action, that the government has made a mistake and settled with the wrong person. There is nothing in the pleadings in this action which would give warrant to any such statement or argument; quite the con-

trary. The payments which were made on the part of the government in settlement of the claim for moneys earned were made to the company which asked for them, were made to the company with which the government had entered into its contract. Those payments could not lawfully be made to any person else and the company is very far from claiming that those moneys which were so paid were paid to the wrong person nor is anybody else claiming that these moneys which were so paid, will have to be paid over again. Nobody is taking that position and the idea that the hon. gentleman has presented in that regard is entirely an imaginary one for which not the slightest foundation in fact exists. The whole situation is that which I have described. The company came as a company and plainly stated it was the incorporated company which was desiring to sue the government and leave was given to that company and to nobody else to bring that suit. Thus far, at any rate, nobody else has asked permission to sue, nobody else has endeavoured to make any claim in respect of this contract upon the government. And, so far as I am concerned, I am quite unable to see how there would exist any pretense for any person else than the incorporated company making any claim whatever in respect to this transaction. It is quite correct, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that the Department of Justice advised the Minister of the Interior, before he put an end to this contract, that, under the terms of the agreement, he had a legal right to take that course. The Department of Justice, I may say, is still of that opinion. That is the question to be determined in this suit, and it may possibly be—I may say may very possibly be—that the Department of Justice has made a mistake as to the law, just as any other lawyer may make a mistake. I have never found any lawyer infallible in giving an opinion on a question of law. But, although I say that with absolute sincerity, I am not at all of opinion that in this case any error was made in the advice which we gave to the Department of the Interior, that there did exist the legal right to put an end to this contract in the way in which an end was put to it. I am of opinion, therefore—whatever that opinion may be worth—that this action which has been brought by the company will not succeed. If I am wrong in that respect, it is only another instance of not a few which I have known in which a legal gentleman has been mistaken. That, however, is the position of this matter so far as the litigation is concerned. I may say that I know, personally or officially, very little else about the matter. This was a contract entered into before I became a member of this House; it was in existence when I took charge of the Department of Justice; the dealings with it, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, have been of the ordinary business character in advising another department of the government as to its legal rights under an existing contract. And, in dealing with that matter and in giving that advice, from first to last, this subject has been dealt with and that advice has been given without the slightest regard to or the slightest thought of who the individual men might or might not be who are interested in this company.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) tells us that it is of no moment to this country, and not even a matter of curiosity to him, who may or may not have been members of the syndicate that he speaks of as The North Atlantic Trading Company. Now, I think that if there was one thing that was brought out clearly before the committee it was that there was no corporation, no company in existence until Mr. Preston formed one in the Island of Jersey, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has mentioned. The people who entered into these contracts with the government were a syndicate, a number of ticket sellers, not a corporation. It was never pretended that they had formed themselves into a company. And, although the Minister of Justice may have thought that it is of no moment, not even a subject of curiosity, I think it is a matter of moment to the people of this country, and will certainly be a subject of curiosity to hon. members on this side, whether, from the very outset, two gentlemen connected with the Department of the Interior were or were not in collusion with that syndicate to reap part of the rewards that the syndicate were getting to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. That is not a subject to be treated lightly, I think, in the way the Minister of Justice seeks to treat it; it is a genuine subject of inquiry and one that, perhaps, may have a bearing on this litigation. There were two men particularly connected with the negotiation of this contract with the syndicate. One was Mr. Preston who represented the Department of the Interior in England and the other was no less a gentleman than the deputy minister of the Interior. Both of these gentlemen were in England when the bargain was made; both of these men knew who the persons were that formed the syndicate, and both have persistently refused to tell who these people were. Why is that? It was not a company such as had been spoken of; as I have said, it was simply a combination of a few agents, ticket-sellers on the continent, who were making a good thing out of the very valuable contract with them which had been made by Mr. Preston and Mr. Smart. Now, what is the connection

of Mr. Preston with the syndicate? When he was brought from England to give evidence, he persistently refused to tell us who the persons were. He refused at the last moment to tell us anything, and to this hour we do not know from him one word about these people. Mr. Preston found, toward the latter part of the life of that syndicate, that the inquiry was getting very warm, that we were asking here who formed this company. Mr. Preston's difficulty was a rather serious one when asked who formed the company, for there was no company at all. So, Mr. Preston prepared himself for investigation here by getting his son-in-law, who was a solicitor in London, and, I think, his father-in-law also, and a hotel-keeper and two or three clerks, to lend their names to an application in the Island of Jersey to form this corporation, the only corporation that exists. He did all this off his own bat, apparently, and carefully concealed his connection with the business. It was not until after persistent demands in the committees of this House that we induced the government to telegraph Lord Strathcona for the names of the people concerned, and then for the first time we found out that the only corporation that existed under the name of the North Atlantic Trading Company was a company formed in the Island of Jersey by these relatives or connections of Preston and their clerks, and that about £100, apparently, was all the money that had been put up. That came out at the last moment; and I think it was a fair subject of inquiry, even for the Department of Justice, to ascertain how far this Mr. Preston was in collusion with these people. If he was not in collusion with them, and they with him, why did he form the corporation and cover this thing up? Surely, that is a proper subject of inquiry and the government ought to know the whole truth to defend themselves against this claim that is made upon the country.

I will not take up time by going over all the evidence that was got with great difficulty out of Preston, but I will say a word or two about the deputy minister. Mr. Smart was with Preston in making this arrangement with the syndicate. Mr. Smart was the gentleman in the department who settled the accounts and passed the claims of this syndicate for the great sums of money which they received. Mr. Smart left the government service, throwing up a large salary and an honourable position to enter the service of the company. He was asked: Had he been in correspondence with the members of that syndicate while he was still in the government service, and he admitted he had been. He was asked if that correspondence led to his employment by the syndicate, he admitted that it had. He was asked to produce his letter books containing that correspondence, and he told us that the books were burned. I mention these few facts—I am not going to take up time by going over the whole story, it is a very long one. But I ask the members of this House whether, where two officers of the Department of the Interior had such relations with the syndicate, are not those relations a subject to be thoroughly investigated in the course of these legal proceedings?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One or two words before the motion is put. Although it is quite true, as the Minister of Justice has said, that the pleadings in this case are of record in the courts and may be inspected by any hon. gentleman; still it is a very proper thing that they should be laid upon the table of the House in order that the House may be seized, in the first place, of the nature of the claim, and in the second place, of the nature of the defence which the government has put in to that claim. I do not observe, in looking over a copy of the statement of claim which I have under my hand, that the Minister of Justice is quite accurate in his description of the nature of the claim. The company does not, so far as I am able to understand, take the ground that the government had not a right to cancel the contract by notice; but the company does take the ground that there was no information in the possession of the government to justify them in giving that notice; in other words, that the reason assigned by the government for the cancellation of the claim in the notice which the government gave was a false reason, and was false to the knowledge of the government at the time it was put forward, and that for that reason the cancellation of the claim was in law, null and void. That is in effect the statement made by this company. But in their claim filed in court I do not observe any statement denying the right of the Crown, under proper conditions, to cancel the claim under the terms of contract. Quoting from the statement of claim I observe this:

4. The said notice of 14th April, 1906, was given and the decision of the Minister of the Interior therein referred to was taken without any previous notification or intimation to the suppliant that it was failing, or had failed to carry out its obligations under the said agreement of November 28, 1904, and without giving the suppliant any opportunity of defending itself against the charge of having failed to carry out such obligations.

5. The decision so taken by the said Minister of the Interior to cancel the said agreement was taken ex parte and without any investigation being made by the said Minister of the Interior, to satisfy himself that the suppliant was failing to carry out its obliga-

tions, and the said Minister of the Interior had before him no evidence or information establishing or tending to establish that there was or had been any failure on the part of the suppliant to carry out its obligations under the said agreement.

6. On the contrary, ever since the execution of the said agreement of the 28th November, 1904, until the said notice of cancellation was sent to the suppliant on the 14th of April, 1906, the suppliant had in fact carried out and fulfilled all its obligations under the said agreement, and had expended in the carrying out of the work called for by the said agreement more money than it had actually covenanted to expend under the terms of said agreement.

7. The decision of the said Minister of the Interior was not a bona fide exercise of the powers conferred on him by clause 12 of the said agreement, but it was unreasonable, unfounded, capricious and unjust, and the action of the said minister in that regard and in the cancellation of the said agreement by the said notice of 14th April, 1906, was against the principles of natural justice and was illegal, null and void.

That in short amounts to this, that the reason put forward by the government in its notice cancelling the contract was not a true reason, but it was false, to the knowledge of the government at the time it was put forward, and therefore, being contrary to natural justice, was null and void in law, and that the contract was never properly cancelled. So I cannot agree with the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice of the effect of the pleadings in this case.

Now that the Minister of Justice says that this was an ordinary company, just like any other company, and to be treated just as any other company would be treated, in respect of any contract entered into by that company with the Crown. 'It was an ordinary company.' Let us look at one or two circumstances in regard to it. In the first place, it undertook, by the terms of its contract, to make a yearly expenditure of between $15,000 and $20,000, and it had a cash paid up capital of about $243. In the second place, as has been observed by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), it was composed of a hotel keeper and three or four clerks, got together by a solicitor closely in touch with a prominent official of this government, and was incorporated in the Island of Jersey, I think, where such incorporations can, under the law, be carried out without too much publicity; and in the third place—mark this in connection with the assertion of the Minister of Justice that this was an ordinary every day company, that this was an ordinary every day contract—that company entered into this contract with the government of Canada six months before that company had any corporate existence. The Minister of Justice regards this as an every day affair. By his own pleading put upon record in the Exchequer Court of Canada, he sets out that the corporate seal of the company purported to be attached to that contract, and the company purported to enter into that contract in January, 1904, when, as a matter of fact, that company did not acquire any corporate existence, or become incorporated, until June following. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that this is an every day contract, and an every day company and that there is nothing in all these circumstances which should excite the curiosity of any member of this House, or call for any special information to be brought down in connection with the contract. Sir, there never was a more extraordinary and outrageous condition of affairs in connection with any government contract than that which has been disclosed and admitted upon the floors of this House in connection with this very contract. The Minister of Justice, if he knows anything at all about the matter, ought to be the very first one to admit that.

He tells us that the fiat was granted in this matter because there was an arguable case, because the company's advisers believed, although the Minister of Justice did not believe, that that company had a valid claim against the government of Canada. I would like to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister if that is the principle upon which this government has acted in the past since it came into power in 1896? My right hon. friend and every member of the cabinet, knows that this is not the principle upon which they have acted in many cases. I can recall to the attention of my right hon. friend ten or twelve cases at least in which a fiat was asked against the government of Canada, and under very similar conditions, except that the contracts were in those cases ordinary every day contracts for the carriage of mails —I can tell my right hon. friend that although the legal advisers of those men whose contracts had been cancelled by the government under a similar reservation of power contained in the contract itself, believed they had a valid claim, we vainly pressed session after session upon the floor of this House that these men should have the right to bring the Crown into court and to have the courts of the country determine whether the government possessed the right to cancel that contract. And because those contracts happened to have been made before 1896 the government refused then, and has refused up to the present time, to those men the right to implead the government in the courts of this country, and to have it determined by the courts whether they had just cause of action against the Crown. But they had a very different regard for the North Atlantic Trading Company, a much more tender regard. As soon as the North

Atlantic Trading Company come to the Minister of Justice and to this government with their claim for $71,000 for damages, although they had been paid $36,000 which we were assured across the floor of this House was paid to them in full, a fiat is granted, while other men, to whom I have alluded, under circumstances which would better justify the granting of a fiat by the government of Canada, have still gone without justice, and have gone, as far as I am aware, without any opportunity whatever to make good their claims in the courts of this country. It cannot, therefore, be possible, under these conditions, for the government, or the Minister of Justice, or any other minister of the Crown to say that the North Atlantic Trading Company has been treated as every other suppliant has been treated, because the reverse is the case and the reverse can be proved from the records of 'Hansard' and from the records of the Department of Justice.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure that the country, as far as its memory of the question that is now before the House is concerned—I mean the question as it has been discussed, not as it has been asked—will think that this parliament has very little to do on this day of the year, in this important session, in spending its time discussing a matter which has been the subject of discussion during so many previous sessions of parliament and during so many sittings of the Public Accounts Committee, a matter of business that has been dead and buried for three years, a question which is now before the Department of Justice and before the courts for settlement, even after the motion has been agreed to on the part of the government. However, the subject has been understood. I think, by the country, and now the position, as it appears to me, is something like this: An Englishman, a very large man, was subject to chastisement very frequently by his wife who was a very small woman, and being asked why he permitted such a little woman to thrash him, the large man replied: It pleases she, and it doan't 'urt oi. If it pleases our friends opposite to discuss the North Atlantic Trading company, session after session and month after month, I can assure them that it does not hurt us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, because you pay the damages out of the public treasury.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend might wait until these damages are paid before he makes this assertion. His assertion is of a like kind with that of my hon. friend who sits behind him (Mr. Monk) who declared to the House in good set terms that this company was to-day suing the government for the balance of payments due. The company is not suing the government for the balance of payments due. The government has paid every dollar that the company claimed for work done and holds receipts for these payments. The government has not paid any damages to the company, and we believe that the Department of Justice is sound in its advice that the government will not have to pay a cent of damages to the company.

My hon. friend who asks the question, said that we were not likely to be rid of the ghost of this North Atlantic Trading Company for an interminable period. Might I say I do not think it is a ghost that we are in danger of, it is merely the mania that possesses the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. If we have had dealings with the North Atlantic Trading Company, and if we have ceased business relations with the North Atlantic Trading Company, surely this House has something more important to concern itself with than questions surrounding the North Atlantic Trading Company, or the question of who composed the company or who did not compose the company. However, as I have no doubt the hon. members who have already addressed the House have done so with the view of instructing their followers who are more recently in the House than themselves, with regard to this question in order to be sure that they shall be aware of all the facts surrounding it, perhaps I may take the opportunity of giving some of the facts as well for the information of these gentlemen and of the country at large.

The contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was entered into on the part of the government for the purpose of directing emigration from Europe to Canada. I do not know whether my hon. friends will agree that that was a desirable object or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. From what part of Europe, may I ask?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) will keep his hat on and bide his time he will know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Perhaps I ought to feel belittled by the remark of the hon. gentleman, but I do not. I took my hat off in courtesy to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. The contract was entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company in connection with emigration to Canada, and I ask the House if that was or was not a proper and a desirable object to be achieved? We might just as well divide on that point here and now. On this side of the House we believe the object was desirable, that it was a proper object, and in so far as it has been achieved by means of the contract entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company and other

means, I believe the government is entitled to credit and not to blame, and I believe that the Dominion of Canada has reaped many, many millions of dollars of advantage from these efforts on behalf of emigration to Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was it embodied in the contract that the immigrants should be from Galicia?

Mr. OLIVER. It was not embodied in the contract that the immigrants should be from Galicia; it was embodied in the contract that they might be from Galicia.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the minister remember his speech in the House in which he reflected on the Galician immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. The minister remembers very well that he said in the House and out of the House on many occasions and is prepared to say on as many more occasions that there are immigrants who come to Canada who are more desirable, from many points of view, than the Galicians.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister surely does not take in as one of these occasions that he now refers to, the eve of an election when he was expecting 2,000 Galicians to vote for him?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the minister has never had any occasion to alter the views that he has expressed in this House in regard to the different value of different classes of immigrants coming to this country. If I might take the liberty of making a reflection, it is not my custom to vary my arguments to my audience as I have no doubt it is my hon. friend's. If it is of interest to the House, I will say that I have nothing to take back of anything I ever said in this House or out of this House in regard to immigration. I hope my hon. friends opposite understand my position. I said that the purpose of the government was to promote immigration from Europe to Canada, and that the contract was entered into with that purpose in view, and as a part of the general immigration scheme of the government. The country has benefited to the extent of many millions of dollars as the result of the government's general policy of which this was a part. I see my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his place, and I remember very vividly that yesterday he told the Minister of Finance that the financial management of the affairs of this country was disgraceful, but that what really saved the situation was the fact that production had increased so stupendously. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will admit that the reason of that increase of production is the increased number of people in the country. I have the hon. gentleman as a witness, and he is as good a witness as I want, in support of the assertion I have just made.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't quote me in favour of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. OLIVER. I have quoted the statement of my hon. friend made only yesterday that the prosperity of the country and the success of the Minister of Finance was due to the increased production of grain, and I think I may say of western grain. Now, that increase in the production of western grain was as surely and as definitely and as perfectly the result of the immigration policy of this government as any one thing can be the result of any other thing. Therefore, we have no apologies to offer for our efforts on behalf of immigration. Now then, as to the propriety of the special efforts that were made and the reasons for them. There are countries in Europe which are just as anxious to keep their people at home, to prevent them from leaving, as we are to get them. Amongst these are countries whose people it will be admitted by every one are as desirable settlers as the people of our own country in every particular, except that they are not the people of our own country, and I will admit that is an important particular. I speak for instance, of Germany and Switzerland and Scandinavia. These were the countries to which the government desired to direct its efforts, outside of Great Britain, France and Belgium, in which countries there was no restriction on our carrying on an aggressive emigration campaign. An agreement was entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company, whereby, in consideration of payments made to the company on immigrants brought to Canada, the company was to use its efforts through its agencies in Switzerland, Germany and Scandinavia, to secure immigrants for Canada. There is certainly one feature of the bargain that no fault can be found with and that is the feature of payment by results. The North Atlantic Trading Company was paid on the immigrants they landed in Canada, these immigrants having passed an inspection to the satisfaction of the government. If they did not land the immigrants they did not get any payment. Surely that is a fair businesslike arrangement. The work of the North Atlantic Trading Company was carried on for some years, but I suppose that even the friends of the company who are now arguing their case so eloquently and so ably from the benches on the other side will admit that even the North Atlantic Trading Company may not in all particulars have lived up to all its agreements

or fulfilled the expectations which the government had with regard to it. As a matter of fact, when I had the honour of taking charge of the immigration department and after the arrangement with the North Atlantic Trading Company had continued for some years, it appeared to me that the company was depending for its revenue rather upon the movement of people from countries where the emigration was occasioned from causes existing within these countries, than upon efforts made in the countries where such reasons did not exist. In other words, they were depending for their revenues upon the people who were the easiest to move and they were not making due exertions to move the people from countries whence emigration was desirable. but where it was not so easy to accomplish. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition read from the pleadings of the company which assert—and he gives all the publicity of 'Hansard' and all the weight of his position as a leader of a party in this House, and all the backing of his party behind him to strengthen the contention of the company against the government before the courts—that this was done without consideration on my part.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I merely pointed out, in answer to the Minister of Justice, that the issue upon the pleading was not as he stated, but was an entirely different issue. I said nothing in support of it and nothing against it. The matter is before the courts and must be determined there.

Mr. OLIVER. I said that my hon. friend placed before the country with all the weight and strength of his position as a leader of a party in this House, all the publicity that 'Hansard' can give his statement and all the backing that a political party can give that statement: the assertion that this contract was cancelled by me or on my advice without due consideration and contrary to the facts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I made no such statement at all. I simply read the pleadings in reply to an observation of the Minister of Justice, for the purpose of showing what the issue was. I made no assertion on my own part at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Retract.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say my hon. friend made an assertion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not intend to say he made an assertion, but I said he gave the statement publicity and I think he will have to admit that is so. Now, I want to say that this contract was not cancelled without due consideration, and so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned it is prepared to stand by and maintain the correctness of the reasons given for the cancellation of the contract, and I am giving them to the House fully and frankly. We believe that the company was depending upon what was easy and was not making due exertions in what was hard. It was from Germany, Switzerland and Scandinavia that we particularly desired immigrants, and we believed we were not getting that proportion of people from these countries that we were entitled to under the contract, and because we were not satisfied with the way in which the company were carrying out their contract we terminated it. If we were mistaken in that, and if the company shall be able to establish that it has suffered damages because of the improper cancellation of the contract, I am sure that a great deal of the credit will be due to the attitude of our friends on the other side, who from the very beginning have taken the ground, first, that the government dare not cancel the contract, and next, that it had not the right to cancel the contract. As to whether or not the government had a right to cancel the contract, that will be decided in due course in the courts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it correct that the contract was entered into six months before the company was incorporated?

Mr. OLIVER. I was not minister at that time, and cannot answer my hon. friend's question; but, as the matter has been under question in the House and has been before the Public Accounts Committee during several sessions, I am sure that my hon. friend is well acquainted with the facts, whatever they may be. If the company succeed in the case, they will be entitled to give a fair measure of credit to our friends on the other side, who have fought their battles so ably and so well. But I want to call the country's attention to this point, that the greater part of the argument of our friends on the other side was that the government dare not cancel the contract because they were tied up with the company. The slander has been suggested again here to-day, that officials of the government were improperly connected with this company.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, tell us the names of the company.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know the names of the company.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why don't you?

Mr. OLIVER. Because it is none of my business, nor of my hon. friend's either.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is mine.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friend must find out for himself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. OLIVER. I am giving all the information I have.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not much.

Mr. OLIVER. It is true, it is not much, but it is enough. The suggestion was made session after session that the government dare not cancel the contract, because members of the government were involved in it. It has been suggested to-day that officials of the government were improperly involved in the contract. But I ask our hon. friends to remember that the government did cancel the contract, and that the privilege of suing the government for damages, the government was not afraid to let them sue.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. To give them a chance to get some more money.

Mr. OLIVER. The North Atlantic Trading Company is entitled to every dollar the government owes it. If an illegal act was done by the government, if the company's rights were trespassed upon, it is entitled to justice the same as any other institution or individual.

Mr. BLAIN. If the government found that the company were not fulfilling their contract, why did not the government compel the company to fulfil it?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the government could not compel the company to fulfil it. I suppose my hon. friend has employed a labouring man to do some work. If he found the man inefficient, did he compel him to do the work? He cancelled his contract with him; that was the only thing he could do. He could not compel him to do the work. And we could not compel the North Atlantic Trading Company to do this work; but we could cancel the contract and could cease paying them money for work that in our estimation was not satisfactorily done; and that is what we did.

Mr. FOSTER. He might have retained the man's baggage in that case, but you did not know whose baggage to retain in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. We did not retain any baggage. I do not understand the allusion.

Mr. BARKER. If the company had not done their work satisfactorily, and claimed $31,000 to wind up, why did you give them $36,000?

Mr. OLIVER. The government did not pay them $36,000, when they demanded only $31,000. The government paid them the amount of their claim as agreed upon, after careful consideration on behalf of both parties.

Mr. BARKER. Although they had not done the work.

Mr. OLIVER. They had done the work, but they had not done it satisfactorily; and exercising our right in that connection, we cancelled the contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the hon. gentleman has a field of hay and he hires a man to cut it, and the man does not cut it, does he pay him?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is exactly the position of the government. They entered into a contract, and the other fellow did not carry out his part of it, and they paid him to get rid of him.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose my hon. friend has hired men to cut fields of hay. If a man cut the hay, he paid him; but if he did not cut it satisfactorily——

Mr. CAMPBELL. I fired him as high as Gilderoy's kite.

Mr. OLIVER. He would do exactly what the government did; he would pay the man for the hay he cut, but he would not hire him to cut any more. The government cancelled the contract, and asked for no other consideration at the hands of this company than it would require in any other business transaction. So far as we are concerned, we deal with this matter from start to finish as an ordinary business transaction, and we know nothing else in it or about it.

There is one other side to this question which I wish to put before the House. In the judgment of the government, the company was not living up to its contratct; we were warranted in cancelling it; we did cancel it; and, as a result, from that day to this the government has not been able to put forth any immigration effort in the countries of Germany, Switerland or the Scandinavian peninsula, and as a consequence we have not received from these countries the immigration that we very much desire and that would be very greatly to the benefit of this country if it were received.

Mr. U. WILSON. Did you ever try?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes we have tried; I need not go into details, I can give them at some other time. As a matter of fact that is the position that under the restrictive laws of Germany, Switzerland and the Scandinavian peninsula, it is not possible to carry on immigration work as it is carried on in some other countries, and as a consequence of the cancellation of the North Atlantic Trading Company contract, Canada has not been carrying on any immigration work in those countries since that time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister say that these unknown persons possess a monopoly in respect of immigration from those countries?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but I say that the government of Canada cannot send agents into Germany to promote immigration into Canada; they cannot do that in Switzerland and I am advised they cannot do it in either Norway or Sweden. That being the case, we are not carrying on the immigration effort in those countries, we would desire to carry on. The North Atlantic Trading Company was in a position to carry on immigration work in those countries and this government was not in a position to be held to account for what they did.

Mr. OSLER. Was there not a provision in the contract that the incorporators should not in any shape or way do anything unlawful in promoting immigration where there was a restriction? The only inference from the minister's words is that the government deliberately entered into a contract with responsible people on the face of it, to do what was absolutely illegal for the government to do in regard to a friendly nation.

Mr. OLIVER. If that is the inference to be drawn from my remarks I can only say I did not wish that inference to be drawn. If I may explain a little further I think my hon. friend will agree that that inference is not warranted. While I am not acquainted with the personnel of the North Atlantic Trading Company, my understanding of the matter is that it was an association of what are called booking agents, operating in the European countries which I have mentioned. A booking agent in Europe works under a license, he is licensed to sell transportation. He sells transportation for such lines as he can secure agencies for. He gives bonds to the government of the country in which he operates which ensure that that country shall have due supervision over his operations. Inasmuch as his business is to sell transportation and is authorized and licensed to do so, it is within his power, without contravening the law of the country in any degree, to say to the man who comes to buy a steamship ticket to take him across the ocean: You ought to go to Canada rather than to the Argentine or to Brazil or to some other country. I hope I have made my point clear that the agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company was not an agreement in contravention of the laws of the countries in which that company operated but it was an agreement with people who were licensed by the laws of those countries to carry on the business of selling transportation and by that agreement we enlisted their services on behalf of Canada as against other countries to which they were also authorized to sell transportation.

Mr. MACDONELL. Then how was it that Mr. Smart, in giving evidence said that if the names of the persons composing that company were known, a large number of suicides would be committed.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not responsible, of course, for what Mr. Smart said, and I am not responsible for my hon. friend's understanding of what he said. I am rather inclined to think there must have been some misunderstanding on his part. It must be clear, however, that in a country where the laws are absolutely restrictive against immigration, but where booking agencies are licensed, while it might not be against the law for booking agents to take a bonus from one country as against another country it might be against the administration or the policy and might put these booking agents at a disadvantage in their own country; and it was to protect them against that feature of the case that it was desirable that their names should not be divulged. That is my understanding of the case, a perfectly fair and legitimate understanding. It is, I firmly believe, according to the facts; and all the ideas which our hon. friends have built up around this question have no more foundation than the idea that the government dared not cancel the contract.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the minister aware that these booking agents have an organization and have an arrangement with the steamships sailing to the various parts of the world from these European ports by which a certain proportion of immigrants are allotted to each steamer and that the payment of the bonus by Canada would have no influence on the proportion of immigrants sent to Canada by these agents?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am not aware of that fact, and I would be rather inclined to doubt it. I know there is what is practically a steamship combine. I do not know what the arrangements are in regard to that, but I do know that since the cancellation of the North Atlantic Trading Company agreement, immigration from the especially desirable countries I have mentioned has unquestionably fallen off, but I cannot say more than that on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the minister said it had fallen off before and that that was the reason he cancelled it.

Mr. OLIVER. My reference in that particular was to Norway and Sweden in regard to the immigration from which countries we paid a special grant of $5,000. I am speaking now of Germany and Switzerland, two other countries with much larger population and nearer to immigration effort, and I say in regard to these countries, Germany and Switzerland, the immigration

has, if my information is correct, decreased since the cancellation of the North Atlantic Trading Company contract.

Mr. HUGHES. Has not emigration from Germany decreased to other countries, the Argentine, Brazil and the United States in a greater proportion than to Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that question, I am not famliar with the facts.

As the question of bonus payment has been up many times, and as I am satisfied the House has a misunderstanding in regard to it, I think it might as well be brought out in this connection that the bonus was paid to an association of licensed booking agents operating in European countries whose laws were such as to prevent direct emigration effort on the part of the government of Canada. The contract entered into was not in contravention of the laws of these countries, but it may have been such as to render the booking agents who were a party to that arrangement liable to the displeasure of the authorities as contravening, not the law, but the policy of their countries. This would be to them a very serious business disadvantage. It surely must be evident that if a man is making his living by selling transportation, he is interested in promoting transportation, and, if he gets $5 per head more on people who go to one country, he is going to use his efforts at publicity towards sending the emigrants to that country as against a country for emigration to which he receives no bonus. By the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, and by the arrangements that we have in Great Britain with the booking agents, we secured the active efforts of these men whose business it is to promote transportation towards immigration to this country. But, by the cancellation of the agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company, that arrangement was cut off, and we have not been able to carry on an effective propaganda in those countries since.

Mr. GLEN. CAMPBELL (Dauphin). The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and myself have one thing in common, we both come from the west; but I must say that his idea of the west and its interests and possibilities have been widened out in my mind by his speech. He certainly wandered from Dan to Beersheba and back again; he has talked of everything under the sun but has made no argument in the particular matter before us that ought to be considered by this House. He spoke of the matter of the North Atlantic Trading Company as being a dead issue, a matter that has been threshed out for years in this House, and, before the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. minister seems to hold that any matter which has been brought before the Public Accounts Committee and has reached the kind of settlement that it gets in that committee is satisfactorily settled so far as this House is concerned. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I was in the Public Accounts Committee last year when the chief solicitor—shall I call him?—or legal adviser, or defending lawyer, of the government, said that the committee was not there to hear the rights or the wrongs of the case, that the committee was there playing the political game and he was there for the government playing it. And yet because the case of this North Atlantic Trading Company was more or less bruited before the committee, the hon. gentleman is satisfied. I want to tell him that we on this side were never satisfied nor was the country. He may have been satisfied because the government was in a measure whitewashed in the eyes of the people who did not understand the methods that were being operated in that committee. If this be a dead issue why is this claim of $71,000 put forward? Dead men are supposed to tell no tales; they certainly do not bring claims. The hon. minister was asked two or three times to tell the names of the people who composed this company; he does not know; the government pretends to this House that it does not know; and a man who used to have a prominent position in one of the departments here went the length of saying, when he was on oath, that were the names of these men disclosed suicides would occur. I say it is a pity the names were not disclosed, because if the business of these people was so nefarious that on the disclosure of it they would commit suicide, it would have been for the good of the country and the world that that disclosure should be made. The hon. minister refers to the class of immigration that came in under this company. I asked with regard to the Ruthenian immigration. He seems satisfied that the Galicians came in vast numbers into Manitoba and what were then the Northwest territories. And he was well satisfied, in the late elections, that these people were in the country as electors. In the country from which they came they had no voice in public affairs, and, coming here, they understand nothing about the duty that goes with the franchise and are controlled by men, as far as my experience goes, vitiated men who lead them astray and they vote, as it were, in flocks. The minister himself knows that what I say is absolutely true. He need not wag his head as much as to say he does not agree with me, because I can give him an instance in which he recognized the fact that these people can be controlled by a vitiated influence. He recognized the fact to this extent, that the law was subverted so that a man who had been put by this government in charge of the Ruthenians

and Galicians coming into Edmonton district and had afterwards been found guilty of stealing from these people and condemned under the law to serve a sentence of years, was allowed out before that term expired and was utilized by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) as his forerunner, as it were, among the Galicians, to round them up and get them to vote for himself and his candidates. He knows that that is true. I refer to the case of Wagner——

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to interupt the hon. member (Mr. Campbell), but, as he says that I know this to be true, I must give an answer, and the only answer I can give is that I know that it is not true.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thought the hon. gentleman knew what was going on in his constituency when it came to election time. But I am quite satisfied to accept his statement that he did not know what was going on and what is well known to every man in the part of the country from which he comes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) as it were, clapped the Minister of Finance on the back because the immigration policy has been conducive to the settlement of the northwest. He knows, away down in his heart, that the only reason why the northwest has settled up in the way it has done is the fertility of its soil. The immigrants who drifted in for one reason or another were so successful in that country that they wrote to their friends in the south and elsewhere, and told them what could be accomplished in the northwest, and their friends came up and helped to fill the country. That is the only reason that the country is filling up at its present rapid rate. The hon. gentleman also said in his remarks—it was rather difficult to follow him because, as I say, he wandered from Dan to Beersheba—that the Conservative party pretended that the government did not dare to make any change in the contract or to abrogate it in its entirety. I think that statement was made before the present Minister of the Interior took charge of the department. The hon. gentleman also said that owing to the abrogation of the arrangement with the North Atlantic Trading Company, immigration from Northern Europe had nearly or entirely ceased, and that they were no longer able to get immigrants from Norway, Sweden and other countries in northern Europe. I think that is a very poor argument. Those people from northern Europe, he knows very well, and I know very well, are the best class of settlers we can get, outside of our own Canadians, and the Canadians who have gone into the United States. Surely, Sir, the Minister of the Interior is making a very lame excuse when he tells us that because a company formed, according to Mr. Smart, of men who would commit suicide if their names were known, had their agreement cancelled and went out of business, therefore his department could not carry on successfully an immigration policy in northern Europe. He must think that this country offers no attraction to immigrants except the inducements put before them by the North Atlantic Trading Company; he must think that western Canada is played out. That country offers the same advantages to-day that it ever did, and is not dependent and never was dependent upon the advertisement of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Now, with regard to the Ruthenians who are largely responsible for the presence of the Minister of the Interior in this House, and who are found in large numbers in my constituency, I would like, if I had time, to read to this House the opinions expressed of them by the present Minister of the Interior before he took charge of that office. When they first began to come into this country he looked upon them from a very different standpoint to the one he holds to-day. He said that when the Ruthenians came into a country to settle, they were a detriment to the country from all points of view, that their presence depreciated the value of the lands, that other people did not like to procure homesteads in their neighbourhood. Now, Sir, I want to tell the minister that I have many of these Ruthenians as my neighbours. I am only a western farmer myself, and my nearest neighbours are Galician farmers, and they are as good settlers as any other settlers that come into our country. They mostly belonged to the peasant class in Galicia, and excellent farmers they make too. The trouble with regard to the immigration policy of the department, as administered by the Minister of the Interior and his officials, is that they have not paid sufficient attention to the kind of Galicians they have brought out. They have brought out men who, in their own towns at home, were mere loafers, and were already a detriment to the towns where they lived in Galicia. For that reason perhaps some of the undesirable ones have given a bad name to the Galicians who have settled in the neighbourhood of towns like Winnipeg. But I am able to bear testimony to the fact that in my neighbourhood the Galician farmers have proved to be a splendid class of settlers. Although they were put upon lands that were practically unfit for any man to live on, bush lands, lands that were stony and undrained, yet they have, by their industry, developed those lands and have shown that even under disadvantageous conditions, they are a hardy and industrious class of people, and are prospering as well as any other class of people in that country. They are inter-marrying with the Canadian people, and in a couple of genera-

tions from now, I have no doubt that their children will become thorough Canadians, and no man will be able to tell, on meeting them, that they were not of British or Canadian ancestry. I have only to say in conclusion that since the Minister of the Interior has spoken in favour of this North Atlantic Trading Company, it is up to him surely to tell this House who were the members of that company.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, three conclusions of some importance are the unavoidable outcome of this discussion. In the first place, I think that if the hon. Minister of the Interior had played the part of a busines man he would certainly have settled that claim and secured a receipt in full when paying over to the company that amount of $36,950. A mere country dealer under similar circumstances would have thought of protecting himself against any future action of the company in that connection and secured a receipt in full, instead of the ordinary receipt.

The company claimed approximately an amount of $31,000 only, and after some discussion a sum of $36,950 was agreed upon. That was an opportune time for securing a receipt in full. Then the hon. Minister of Justice stated a moment ago that conscientiously he was satisfied that the company had no fair claim to make on the government, notwithstanding which he grants a fiat. On occasions such as this the minister is acting in a judicial capacity, and if he is satisfied that the party applying for a petition of right is not entitled to such a privilege, he should not grant the fiat. Lastly, the outcome of it all is that the government is now being sued for an amount of over $71,000 by a company unknown to him for the time being and possibly for-all time.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am greatly surprised that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is defending the rascalities that have been going on in the Department of the Interior. We older members of the House will remember a time when the present Minister of the Interior occupied a seat at the back of the ministry, and when he was held up as the angel of the Liberal party He was for ever finding fault with what the government were doing and we all believed that there was no man in the Liberal party who was more anxious to remedy the rascalities that were going on in the government. At that time, as my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) says, he claimed he was an independent, but, strange to say, the minute he appeared on the ministerial benches he changed his tune. There is not a man in this House, on either side, if he will stand up and tell us what he conscientiously believes, but will admit that this was one of the greatest rascalities that was ever committed by any government. The Minister of the Interior tells this House now that he does not yet know who the gentlemen—

An hon. MEMBER. Men.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, the men were who composed this company. Yet he is doing business and going into this suit with these men although he does not know who he is dealing with. Can any person believe that the Deputy Minister of the Interior (Mr. Smart), who was occupying a good position, and who went over and made these arrangements on the other side, and then resigned and took the management of that concern, was not one of the company, and was not interested in it? Can any man in this country believe that there were not others in Canada also connected with this corporation? I do not believe there is a man in Canada who does not believe that in some way directly, or indirectly, men connected with the civil service or the government were interested and received benefits from this great piece of rascality which the Minister of the Interior did not hesitate to stand up and defend. Every man believed that a good, righteous, honourable gentleman like the Minister of the Interior, when he saw any rascality, would immediately try to remedy it. But right in his own department a man named Philip Wagner is convicted and sent to jail for robbing immigrants in the Northwest, and immediately when he gets out the min ister gives him a higher salary and a better position. Is there any justification for the minister doing a thing like that? He was one of the members who complained about giving away lands in the Northwest, yet, immediately he comes into the department he is willing to give away 250,000 acres for a dollar an acre when it was proved that these lands were worth $3 an acre and up. It is strange how the gentleman that we believed was the angel of the Liberal party could be converted so soon immediately upon occupying a seat on the ministerial benches. When I saw that contract and when I found out the way the government allowed the payments to be made it appeared to me that there was something wrong in the deal at this end. Instead of counting the immigrants they simply took the ship's register, and perhaps counted the crew, for all we know. They counted the number of people on board and paid $5 per head for all that came in that way. First-class passengers, second-class passengers and all were counted as immigrants and $5 per head was paid. I am awfully sorry to see good men like the Minister of the Interior getting into a mix-up like this. I would like to have seen the

minister continue to be the angel of the Liberal party, but I am afraid he will get down to the foot of the list, and he will find it hard work to get up to the top again unless he changes his ways. I think he will probably find before the session goes by, while he is administering the department, that some little things will appear, and I would suggest for his own good and for the good of the country that he would try and turn over a new leaf and get back to the same good upright ways that he followed while he was sitting in the back seat and when he was recognized as the angel of the Liberal party.

Mr. MONK. Just one word before the motion is adopted. I am beginning to think there is some foundation in the accusation of my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Reid) that the Minister of the Interior is backsliding. It would have been better for my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, instead of talking about immigration in general, to have gone to the very heart of this question and to have told us under what circumstances this final payment of $36,950 was made. I agree with what my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) has said as to the secret of the trouble which has come upon us to-day. The contract ceased its operation exactly on the 30th November, 1907. Why, after the Minister of the Interior had stated positively in this House that the only balance to readjust was one of $31,804.18 claimed by this company, did he, in the month of December of the year following, pay that $36,950, nearly $5,000 more than, according to the records of this House, they actually claimed? Why was this payment made? Who was it made to? Was it to Mr. Preston or was it to Mr. Smart? Was that amount, exceeding by nearly $5,000 the amount claimed, paid in London or in Montreal? Why, as my hon. friend from Terrebonne has said, should the minister make that final payment after the close of a contract which he had declared bad and which had given rise to endless discussion in this House and before the country without guarding against what has come to us since? Not one word upon any of these points has the Minister of the Interior said to-day when he should actually have brought down and put upon the table of the House the receipt which closed our relations with the company and explained to us why he was deceived at that time? I think that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior are wrong when they say that this is a trifling matter. It is not a trifling matter to have paid nearly $400,000 to these unknown people; nor, is it a trifling matter that we should be sued for a sum far exceeding any of the individual payments we made to that company. I will add this: That it is a matter upon which you cannot refresh the memory of the people too much, that at a given moment when members of this House desired to know the names of the contractors to whom we were paying this money, the government and the Liberal party were opposed to what I consider to be one of the fundamental principles which should govern the representatives of the people in this House.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a return showing: 1. The present indebtedness to the Dominion government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust (a) on capital account, (b) for arrears of interest.

2. The amount collected at each toll gate belonging to the said Turnpike Trust during the year ending December 31, 1908, and for the first six months of the year 1909.

3. The names of all parties who have commuted their tolls during each of the two above-mentioned periods and the amount of the commutation money paid to the Trust in each case.

4. The amount expended on each section or road division under the control of said Trust, during the year ending December 31, 1908, and the contracts given out during the said year, with the name of the contractor and the date and amount of money involved in each case; and a statement in each case also as to whether the contract was awarded after tender called through newspapers.

5. The amount paid out during the said two first above-mentioned periods at each toll gate for salaries of day and night guardians and any other expenditures at each of the toll-gates maintained.

6. The names of all parties holding passes for free use of the roads under control of said Trust during the period above-mentioned, with a statement, in each case, of the reason why the pass was so granted.

7. The expenses of the said Trust during each of the two periods above-mentioned for rent, salaries of the office, inside or outside service, giving name and remuneration of each official and amounts paid to any civil engineer employed by the Trust.

8. The actual present indebtedness in detail of said Trust outside of its bonds due to the government of Canada.

9. The amounts collected by said Trust during the above-mentioned periods from municipalities under special agreements made as to their share pro rata of the bonded indebtedness of the Turnpike Trust.

10. The names of all members of the Trust elected to represent the bondholders with date of election in each case, during said two periods.

11. The amounts paid by the Trust to any of its members or officials during said two periods, whether as travelling or personal expenses, or indemnity for attendance or for any other reason whatever.

12. The name of any auditor who has acted during said two periods, and the amount paid such auditor.

13. And exact statement of any amounts paid by the Trust for purchase or lease of any property outside of the city of Montreal and in defraying the travelling or displacement or maintenance expenses of the trustees or their officials generally.

He said: This is a motion which has been made very often since this government has been in power and no objection has been taken to its adoption. It is the only means which the people of the city of Montreal and of the Island of Montreal have to obtain a statement of the affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust. That body is governed by an old statute which puts upon it no obligations to give the people the result of its operations. It handles thousands of dollars yearly and the public have no other means than by such a motion as this to obtain information as to what becomes of that money. The statements which this House has obtained from time to time clearly demonstrated that the affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust were not being administered in the interest of the taxpayers and the road users of the Island of Montreal, and in February, 1908, I moved in this House for an inquiry under chapter 104, revised statutes of Canada, to ascertain the position of our claim as sole bond-holders of the debentures of the Montreal Turnpike Trust. Upon that motion the Prime Minister said:

My hon. friend by long experience knows that where he is right he can always expect the government to accede to anything he wants, and on this occasion we think he is right and therefore we accept his motion.

The motion for inquiry was adopted, but I regret to say that in the intervening almost two years, the government has not put the resolution of the House into execution and we have had no inquiry, that is a matter for very much regret. However, the Quebec government, aroused by the public opinion in the municipalities concerned and by the statements which were from year to year obtained as a result of this motion regarding the financial position of the trust, instituted a royal commission to inquire into the affairs of that body. The federal government not having instituted an inquiry on its own account I trust they will see that our interests as bond-holders to the extent of nearly $270,000 will be protected by our having a representative at the inquiry in Montreal, if it is ever held.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICES IN MONTREAL AND VICINITY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a copy of the report, plans and correspondence in the hands of the government regarding the construction of branch post offices and postal substations in and around the city of Montreal, and of all proposals and suggestions made to the government by the post office authorities at Montreal for the establishment, in a systematic way, of postal branches and substations in said city and suburbs?

He said: The object of this motion is to place in the possession of the House a report which was made some years ago by the postal authorities, showing where within the limits of the city of Montreal and the adjoining municipalities it was intended to erect postal substations and branch post offices. That report together with a plan accompanying it was laid upon the table, and it seemed to commend itself to those interested as being the result of a careful examination of the postal needs of the locality. The question of having branch post offices in the city of Montreal and the suburban municipalities is very often raised, and I think it would be very advantageous for the members interested to have that report and plan before them so as to enable them to answer the inquiries that are made.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN ATTACHE AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that a petition be sent to His Majesty's government, praying that a Canadian Attaché be appointed to the British Embassy at Washington, with a view to providing a direct medium whereby the government of Canada may advise with the British Ambassador at Washington in respect to matters pertaining to international relations affecting solely the Dominion of Canada and the United States.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since I gave notice of this resolution it has been said to me that if I kept on much longer I would be a separatist. In justice to myself I may say that I am the grandson of one of those men who followed the flag in 1776 to Canada, and I take second place to no man in this House or out of it in loyalty to that flag. I am a great believer in the couplet of that English poet who wrote in reference to Canada:

Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.

And, Sir, the question I raise now is not a matter of loyalty; it is a matter purely of business relations with our nearest great trade competitor. I submit, Sir, that the manner in which our business arrangements are now carried on are altogether too round-about and that we should have some one at Washington, not to conduct our business relations altogether but to advise the British Ambassador with regard to them. I have in support of this proposal the President of the United States who has said that it

would be a good thing. I believe it is an absolute fact that seven-tenths of the business of the British embassy at Washington concerns Canada. Now, the British Ambassador, as a rule, has never been in Canada and he knows nothing of Canada. The conditions in Canada are different from those in England; our business interests are different, and I submit that we would be better able to conduct purely business relations with this nearest great competitor of ours, in a friedly manner, if we had a representative of our own at Washington. I trust as time goes on we will be more and more friendly with that great nation to the south because we have all sprung from the same race; the great American republic was founded by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton. I may remark that for the first time in the history of Canada there is now in the press gallery of this House a representative of that great newspaper the New York 'Herald'. Some remarks on this question appeared in the New York 'Herald' on December 10. The Chicago 'Tribune' has also intimated its intention of sending a representative here and had some remarks on the subject in its issue of December 10. We have direct relations with the United States on almost every question. We deal with that great nation with regard to our waterways; why should we not do so in other matters? I could quote various hon. gentlemen who have expressed their opinion publicly in favour of this motion—the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Thoburn), the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm), the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Stewart)—two from each side of the House. Though at one time I was not in favour of this, I have seen the importance of it, and the cost of it will be small in comparison with the benefit to be gained. I consider that under all the circumstances we should have a representative of Canada to advise the British Ambassador at Washington.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, everybody, I am sure, will agree with the sentiments which have been uttered by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) as to the character of the relations which should prevail between these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. The relations between the United States and the parent state ought naturally to be extremely cordial. I am glad to be able to say that at no time in the history of the two nations since the war of the revolution have the relations between Great Britain and the United States been so friendly as they have been for the last six or seven years. We do not hear any more, as we used to hear at one time, in the United States of British arrogance or in Great Britain of Yankee aggressiveness. The language uttered now in the two countries is one of mutual respect and cordiality. The war between the United States and Spain, if it did no other good—and I expect that good can very seldom come from war—has had the effect of showing that blood is thicker than water. From the time of that war the relations between Great Britain and the United States, which up to that time had been more or less strained, have become very cordial. Indeed, it was obvious that in that war, without going to the causes of it, the English speaking countries generally were friendly to the American side. This improved feeling on the part of the two nations towards each other has had its good effect in Canada's relations with the United States. Those relations have been on the whole very friendly. They have not always been as satisfactory as for my part I think they should have been. For instance, the Alaskan Boundary Treaty was not just what we thought it should have been; still, the arbitration had the good effect of removing a possible cause of contention and settling for ever a difficult question which might otherwise have become dangerous at a very inopportune moment. I am glad to acknowledge also that the British Ambassador at Washington at the present time is giving more attention to the affairs of Canada than was ever done before. There was a time, perhaps 20 years ago, when, if my hon. friend had made the motion he has now made, I would have been strongly inclined to vote for it; but I must say, in the present condition of things, that my ideas on this subject have been very much modified. If we had an attaché at Washington, I do not know that it would be possible to have more attention paid to the business of Canada than is paid to it by the present occupant of the office. Mr. Bryce has taken special pains to give to Canadian affairs as much attention as could be given to them by a native Canadian. First of all, he did one thing that was not done by any of his predecessors. As soon as he became ambassador, he visited Canada, coming to Ottawa and some of the other large cities of the country, to familiarize himself with all the issues between Canada and the United States. The result has been that, in all our relations to that country, if anything has not turned out well, no blame can be attached to Mr. Bryce, because he has taken no action with regard to Canada except after ample conference and with the full sanction of the Canadian authorities. I do not believe that if we had an attaché at Washington we could improve very much the conditions which exist at this moment. I do not know that it will always be so.

Perhaps the time will come when we shall think it advantageous to have somebody to take charge of our diplomatic business at Washington; but so long as the conditions continue to be what they are at this moment, I do not think this want will be seriously felt. It is also somewhat difficult to conceive what would be the status of a Canadian attaché at Washington. He would have to be under the British ambassador and at the same time be under instructions from the government of Canada. So that the position, while it would have good in it, would also have some very serious difficulties. If we had any cause of complaint in our present relations, or if our interests were not receiving justice, we might have to take a new step and try to improve those relations; but so long as they are what they are at present, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is best to leave well alone, and not try to improve when there is no cause of grievance. If my hon. friend agrees with these observations of mine, I hope he will not press his motion, but will withdraw it.

Mr. LEWIS. The right hon. the first minister may have slightly misinterpreted the meaning of the resolution. It is not to have a representative of Canada entirely separate, but one who is acquainted with the wants, manners and customs of Canada to advise with the British Ambassador. There is no intention on my part of expressing any want of confidence in the present conduct of affairs; but it can be readily understood that the business of Canada cannot be very well conducted by an almost absolute stranger. Mr. Bryce has endeavoured to remedy that by coming to Canada, and he is a very clever and able gentleman. He would be glad to have a representative of Canada there to confer with in regard to these matters. There are other ways in which it would be of value to Canada to have a representative in Washington. This representative of ours would be able to devote his time to some matters to which Mr. Bryce has not time to attend, and then Mr. Bryce is not accustomed to many things on this continent. Our representative would be advising this government in reference to matters on which an amicable arrangement now exists between the two countries, an agreement which I think will grow stronger and stronger and can be helped on by such advice, for I, for my part, look forward to the union of the English-speaking nations of the world and the Celts for the promotion of peace and harmony. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the first minister and to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 16, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITION OUT OF ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The petition of Robert Glover and others cannot be entertained as the granting of the prayer would involve the expenditure of public money.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING presented the first report of the special committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 21) an Act respecting hours of labour on public works as follows:

Your committee beg leave to present the following as their first report:

Your committee recommend that leave be granted to have their proceedings and the eviaence taken by them printed from day to day and that rule 72 be suspended in relaaion thereto.

Mr. KING moved:

That the first report of the Special Committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 21), an Act respecting hours of labour on public works presented this day be concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the report purely formal?

Mr. KING. It recommends permission of the House to have the proceedings and evidence printed and that rule 72 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the address which you have adopted in reply to my speech at the opening of the session of parliament, and thank you for it sincerely.

GREY.

Government House, Ottawa, 14th Dec., 1909.

QUESTION OF ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), yesterday raised a question of order with reference to the answer by the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to question No. 10 on the Order Paper.

The answer given to the said question, in my opinion, did in some measure contravene the rules and practice of the House in that regard but, as the hon. minister stated, the answers were drawn from

him in that form in consequence of irregularities in the form of the question.

In my opinion the question as put by the hon. member for Sherbrooke was in several particulars irregular inasmuch as it contravened the provisions of rule 36, a portion of which rule reads as follows:

In putting any such question or in replying to the same no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same. And in answering any such question the matter to which the same refers shall not be debated.

Comments upon this rule will be found in Bourinot's Parliamentary Practice, pp. 433 to 435. Among the comments made in that work as to the form in which questions may be put, I would quote the following: (a). 'A question has been refused a reply because it referred to a matter of opinion'. (b). 'A question should be simply and severely accurate in its allegations. If it is hypothetical it is objectionable and should not be answered'. (c). 'It should not be ironical or convey any imputation'. Members are reminded that it is the duty of certain officers of the House to point out to a member when any question is put in improper form and to communicate with the member in order that the notice may be properly amended. Occasionally irregularity in questions is not noted by the officers of the House but in this respect instructions will be given to be more particular in the future in this regard.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company. —Mr. Ralph Smith.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) to amend an Act to establish a commission for the conservation of our natural resources.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As the Act at present stands the chairman of the commission can send a man out to investigate mines, and timber lands, and fisheries, and water-powers and practically any of the resources of the country; he can spend the money of the public in doing so and then there would be nothing to prevent him purchasing land or rights in water-powers and fisheries and making them his own. The members of the commission are practically in the same position in that regard. The Bill which I now introduce will provide as follows:

14. No member of the commission or person appointed as secretary or as officers or clerks under him, or person employed as an assistant for the purpose of any special work or investigation, shall, while a member of the commission or appointed or employed as aforesaid:

(a) purchase, lease, acquire or obtain, on royalty or otherwise, any Dominion or provincial franchise, fishery rights, water-powers, water privileges, lands, mines, mineral lands, or timber limits, or in any way contract therfor or acquire any interest therein, either for himself or as agent for any other person or corporation;

(b) locate military or bounty land warrants or land scrip or act as agent of any other person in such behalf;

(c) disclose to any person, except to members of the commission, any discovery made by him or by any of them, or any other matters in his possession relating to matters under the control of the commission, or in relation to their investigations, until such discovery or information has been reported to parliament.

15. Every person guilty of any violation of any of the provisions contained in section 14 of this Act shall forfeit to His Majesty all property or interest so acquired or obtained and shall also incur a penalty of one thousand dollars for each such violation.

(2.) The acquisition of each item of property or interest therein or contract therefor as aforesaid shall be deemed a separate violation of the said section.

(3.) Such penalties shall be recoverable on information filed in the name of the Attorney General of Canada, and a moiety thereof shall belong to His Majesty, and the other moiety thereof shall belong to the informer.

I may say that the first clause is similar to clause 14 of the Geological Survey Act and the last clause is similar to the penalty clause 376 of the Railway Act. I believe this amendment should be adopted at as early a date as possible and I ask the government to facilitate its passage during this session. In presenting this Bill I in no way reflect upon the chairman or upon the members of the commission. Many members of the commission are personal friends of mine and I am satisfied that they believe this Bill is in their interest as well as in the public interest.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—THEFT OF SILVER ORE.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON (Nipissing) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GORDON. This Bill is an exact duplicate of one passed by this House and buried in the Senate last session, owing, I believe, to that honourable body not being aware of the extensive illegal traffic which is being carried on at the silver regions of Nipissing and which the law as it now stands, fails to cope with. Valuable ore, in many cases, nearly pure silver is being carried away in the pockets of persons who dispose of it in one of two ways: (1) It readily passes 'current' at the 'Blind Pigs' in exchange for cash for drinks, principally as I believe the latter, or, (2) It can be sold to persons who are making a business of dealing in it. When the receiver has accummulated a quantity he takes it to Toronto or elsewhere and sells it. The monthly losses to the mines are very large, the trade being a considerable one. It seems to be impossible to stop the business with the law as it at present is because it is practically impossible by examination of a piece of ore to tell from what mine it came, and on any prosecution for recovering stolen ore the prosecutor is not able to technically prove the theft. What is desired is to put the receivers out of business; if that is done these thefts will cease. What is aimed at is to throw upon any person found in the possession of ore the onus of proving where he got it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS' SALARIES.

Mr. GAUVREAU—(Translation)—asked:

1. Does the minister of Marine intend to raise the salary of lighthouse keepers considering the increase of $30,000 mentioned in the estimates of 1910-1911? If so, how does he intend to distribute that sum?

2. Does the Department intend to re-establish the retreat fund of those lighthouse keepers?

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

1. The classification of the lighthouse-keepers of the Dominion, approved by order in council on September 24, 1908, says that all the keepers will receive a regular increase until a certain amount mentioned for each class is attained. Every keeper who has not yet received the maximum of his class will receive an increase during the next year, provided that his conduct be good and satisfactory.

2. Not now.

THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT.

Mr. KNOWLES:

Does the government intend at the present session of parliament introducing legislation to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act with a view to meeting the wishes of the railway brotherhood, to avoid expense and delay in the steps required prior to the declaration of a strike?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING. It is the government's intention to introduce legislation to amend the Industrial Disputes Act during the present session.

THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Has the commission of conservation met? If so, on what date, and how many members were present?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the commission has met and organized, and that it will meet in January according to the terms of the statute.

SOUTH AFRICAN SCRIP.

Mr. BARNARD:

Is it the intention of the government to allow holders of South African scrip to locate in respect thereof on lands in British Columbia within the railway belt?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Volunteer Bounty Act does not make provision for the location of military scrip in the railway belt, British Columbia.

NORTHWEST POST OFFICES.

Mr. McCARTHY:

1. What was the postal revenue per month from the 1st day of December, 1908, to the 1st day of November, 1909, at the following post offices, namely: Edmonton, Alberta; Calgary, Alberta; Regina, Saskatchewan; Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Prince Albert, Saskatchewan?

2. How many people were employed in each of said offices during said months?

3. What was the amount paid for salaries in each of the said offices during said months?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will lay on the table a detailed statement which contains all the information sought for in that question:

	December, 1908.	January, 1909	February, 1909.	March, 1909.	April, 1909.	May, 1909.	June, 1909.	July, 1909.	August, 1909.	September, 1909.	October, 1909.
1.—	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Edmonton	7,056 35	5,480 19	5,956 84	7,731 70	6,079 28	5,216 91	5,616 12	6,146 36	5,586 47	5,620 58	6,287 54
Calgary	10,241 85	7,865 84	7,078 96	9,046 93	10,680 67	8,514 55	8,750 70	10,195 63	8,994 09	9,472 48	10,810 62
Regina	7,656 93	7,310 99	5,029 92	5,727 93	5,780 81	5,597 75	5,861 27	5,891 77	5,655 10	5,975 29	7,569 81
Saskatoon,	2,928 59	1,971 63	1,778 19	2,499 99	2,501 52	2,549 14	2,648 52	2,549 24	2,418 75	3,006 58	3,264 17
Prince Albert	1,552 25	1,679 90	1,075 82	1,225 20	1,171 32	951 01	1,066 45	1,267 62	1,010 87	1,138 35	1,294 16
2.—	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Edmonton	39	40	37	38	37	38	39	40	40	40	40
Calgary	61	52	52	53	55	56	55	57	58	56	55
Regina	15	17	16	15	17	18	24	26	26	26	28
*Saskatoon and Prince Albert											
3.—	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Edmonton	2,150 81	2,457 48	2,193 98	2,642 95	2,403 02	2,472 09	3,108 73	2,732 61	2,842 61	3,217 37	2,850 26
Calgary	3,494 37	3,426 18	3,093 28	3,444 11	3,506 96	3,589 64	4,551 04	3,972 76	3,899 57	3,836 55	4,062 85
Regina	914 53	1,003 72	997 90	956 14	1,026 45	1,005 04	1,474 80	1,573 94	1,544 57	1,569 41	1,642 04
Saskatoon	653 93	580 32	1,043 22	661 35	577 99	577 99	577 99	577 99	577 99	578 05	577 99
Prince Albert	360 83	360 83	360 83	360 85	360 33	360 83	363 85	444 83	380 33	380 35	380 33

* On revenue basis—Staff employed by postmaster.

BAIT FREEZERS.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. In what year was assistance first granted by the government in aid of the erection of bait freezers?
2. How many bait freezers have been erected with government assistance in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, respectively?
3. What sum has been expended in each of said provinces for such purpose?
4. How many government aided bait freezers were reported in operation in each of the said provinces during the year 1908?
5. From whom were the reports received?
6. Has any change been made in the regulations respecting the conditions upon which aid is granted towards the construction of bait freezers? If so, what is the nature of the change and why was it made?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR:

1. 1899.
2. Nova Scotia, 49; New Brunswick, 5; Prince Edward Island, 5; Quebec, 16.
3. Nova Scotia, $46,816.28; New Brunswick, $4,277.19; Prince Edward Island, $3,536.21; Quebec, $14,141.10.
4. Nova Scotia, 20; New Brunswick, 1; Prince Edward Island, 1; Quebec, 12.
5. Peter Macfarlane, officer in charge of fishermen's bait freezers.
6. Yes. Instead of further assisting Fishermen's Bait Associations in the building of purely bait freezing establishments, at locations and under conditions approved by the minister, firms or persons building fish freezers, who will guarantee to keep on hand a supply of bait, which will be sold to fishermen at current market prices, will be aided in the building of such freezers to the extent of half the cost up to $2,000, and an annual bonus of $5 per ton on bait frozen for the first five years of operations.

MILITARY QUESTIONS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

Is it intended to supply the different regiments of garrison artillery with 12-pounder B. L. guns? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will read the answer that has been sent to me from the department: No, but the actual meaning of the question is not quite clear. Perhaps the hon. member will put a further question.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What part does the minister not understand?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say I did not understand, but the officer who prepared the answer—which I did not see until this moment—said he did not understand. I presume he wanted to know what service or use these guns were to be put to. It would not be to arm the garrison artillery generally, because they are armed with a different arm.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. My object in asking was to ascertain if it was the general policy of the Militia Department to arm garrison artillery with twelve-pound guns; for this had been done a few weeks ago at Esquimalt.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not the policy of the government.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What is the general policy of the government in the matter of furnishing the active militia with armouries or drill halls?
2. Are there any fixed regulations as to land being provided by municipalities and deeded to the Crown, upon which to erect such building? If so, where are such regulations to be found?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. The policy of the government with regard to furnishing the active militia with armouries has been stated in parliament many times.

(a) City militia—As the regiments do not perform their drill in camps of instruction, it is absolutely necessary that drill halls sufficiently large for drill purposes should be supplied, and this has been largely done in all cities and towns where such regiments exist.

(b) Rural militia—So far as the militia units recruited from villages and small towns, which perform their annual drill in camps of instruction, are concerned, there is not the same necessity for drill halls, and such units of the active militia receive allowances in money to pay for care of arms, &c. It is, however, thought desirable that these units should be provided as rapidly as possible with small regimental or company armouries as a place for storing their arms and ammunition, also as furnishing lecture rooms for instructional purposes and affording sufficient accommodation for officers; with a view to promoting esprit de corps, and affording what might be called a 'home' for each unit.

2. None.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are facilities for rifle practice available at the Royal School of Instruction, St. John, P.Q.? If so, to what extent?
2. What was the total cost of the Brandon drill hall, including site?
3. Have the buildings for guard-room and married quarters at the Winnipeg barracks been yet completed? If so, when?
4. What was the total cost for each of these buildings, and when were they occupied?
5. Are there any members of the permanent force at Winnipeg still drawing allowances in lieu of quarters? If so, how many, and at what rates?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes; a thirty-yard range consisting of four targets was constructed in October, 1908.

2. Total cost of Brandon drill hall was $52,954. A free site was deeded to the government by the city.

3. Yes. Guard-room and office building was inspected by a board of officers on December 15, 1908, and taken over for occupation on March 1, 1909. The married quarters were reported upon by a board of officers on June 21, 1909, and were taken over for occupation on October 1, 1909.

4. Cost of guard-room and married quarters is being answered by the Department of Public Works. For date of occupation, see answer to No. 3.

5. The following officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent force at Winnipeg are still drawing lodging allowance at rates hereunder: 2 captains at $50 per month; 1 sergeant at 30 cents per diem; 1 private at 25 cents per diem. Leases of houses have been taken by the department and rent paid for the following: 2 warrant officers at $30 per month; 6 non-commissioned officers at $30 per month; 2 rank and file at $22 per month. Total: 2 officers, 2 warrant officers, 7 non-commissioned officers, 3 rank and file. Total cost per annum, $4,808.75.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are officers of all ranks on the married establishment of the permanent force entitled, with their families, to free medical attendance?

2. Are money allowances paid to such officers in lieu of medical attendance at places where permanent medical officers are not available?

3. If such is the case, are these allowances based on rank, and without reference to whether the recipients are married or single?

4. Is there any reason why one officer, because he is superior to another officer in rank, should receive a higher rate of allowance for a service to which both are equally entitled to the same extent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. Yes, except to officers on the headquarters staff.

3. Yes.

4. Only on the general principle that, as an officer advances in age and rank, he has more expenses to meet than a junior officer, and the practice in all military and naval services is to base allowance on rank.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the issue of efficiency pay in the active militia dependent upon the acquiring of a fixed standard of proficiency in rifle shooting, as well as other efficiency and good conduct?

2. Is any increased rate of pay in the permanent force dependent upon the acquiring of any standard of efficiency in rifle shooting, or upon the possession of any instructional qualifications?

3. Is the chief business of the permanent force to instruct the officers and men of the active militia?

4. Do officer instructors and sergeant instructors of the permanent force, who are in receipt of regular pay as such, draw extra duty pay when employed instructing the active militia in camps of training? If so, why so?

5. Do the members of the permanent force receive increased rates of ordinary pay after fixed periods of service without regard to either their instructional abilities or their shooting efficiency?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes, in the case of cavalry and infantry, with a few exceptions in cases of certain ranks and employed men.

2. No increase of pay for rifle shooting. Instructional qualifications enable a man to earn increased rates of pay or extra pay.

3. The duties of the permanent force are as set forth in paragraph 25 of the Militia Act, viz:

The permanent force shall furnish schools of instruction for the militia and provide instructors thereof; and it shall, also, be available at all times for general service.

4. Officers—No. Sergeant instructors—Yes, to place them on the same footing as other non-commissioned officers employed on the camp staff, and as a reward for their excellent work when instructing the militia.

5. Yes; a gunner or a private on enlistment receives fifty cents a day, and after three years' service, if satisfactory and he is re-engaged, he receives sixty cents a day, and after six years, seventy-five cents a day.

Other ranks are also graded for pay on completion of two periods of three years' service in rank.

ARCTIC EXPEDITION COMMEMORATIVE TABLET.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. By what authority was the tablet commemorative of the Arctic expedition placed in the vestibule of the library of parliament.

2. Was a sketch of the tablet proposed to be erected submitted? If so, what officer of the government was charged with the duty of examining and reporting on said sketch?

3. What has been the cost of the tablet, and to whom was the money paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. The Hon. the Speaker of this House.

2. This tablet is an exact copy of the tablet left on Parry's Rock, Winter Harhour, Melville Island, longitude 60 min. west to 141 min. west, by the crew of the 'Arctic,' 1st of July, 1909.

3. The tablet was made by the government employees on board the 'Arctic' and there was, therefore, no charge made for this work.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That, as the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills, and the time for presenting Private Bills without additional charges, will be curtailed through the Christmas adjournment of the House, the said times as fixed by rule 87 and rule 88, subsections 3 (b) and 3 (c) be extended to Wednesday, the 19th of January, Wednesday, the 2nd of February, and Wednesday, the 2nd of March, respectively.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF ORDER—MR. WORTHINGTON.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer to a statement made yesterday during the asking and answering of questions by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). As reported on page 1583 of the unrevised 'Hansard,' the hon. minister made the following statement:

These allegations are possibly improper in a question, but I answered according to the law of Scripture that we are bound to answer a fool according to his folly.

I think that answer was not only undignified on the part of the minister, but absolutely out of order, and I would ask that the same be withdrawn.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps I might substitute other words—I do not know that they are a quotation—answer a wise man according to his wisdom. However, I am quite willing to withdraw the quotation if it is offensive to my hon. friend (Mr. Worthington).

ADJOURNMENT—LOSS OF LIFE ON LAKE ERIE.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I desire to discuss for a moment a matter of great public importance which, I take it would be in charge of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I would have put what I have to say in the form of an interrogation addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) had that hon. gentleman been in his place. But, as he is not present at the moment, I shall make a motion for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of the discussion. The subject I wish to refer to is the loss of life by the foundering of the car ferry steamer 'Bessemer No. 2' on Lake Erie, off Port Stanley harbour. Despatches received from Toronto state that the Canadian Pacific Railway car ferry has been wrecked opposite Port Burwell. Forty members of the crew were on the boat, but from last accounts, it is hoped that these have been taken off. But the boat is a complete wreck and these forty lives were at least endangered. The matter is of very serious and urgent public importance and I bring it to the attention of the House because I think the government has been remiss in not having proper marine signals either at Port Stanley, Port Burwell or Rondeau Harbour.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is going to discuss the matter, he must submit a motion.

Mr. MACDONELL. I have a motion drawn for the purpose. I move:

That leave be granted to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz.: The recent loss of the railway ferry 'Bessemer No. 2,' on Lake Erie, off Port Stanley, in which at least thirty-eight lives are known to have been lost.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACDONELL moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose stated. He said: I desire to bring to the attention of the government, and especially of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the great loss of life that occurred because of the foundering of the car ferry 'Bessemer No. 2.' At least thirty-eight of a crew were on the boat. As there is no passenger ferry across this part of the lake—or any part of the lake at this season—there is every reason to fear that a number of additional persons were on board that ferry as passengers. I am informed that, although there are these three harbours on the north shore of Lake Erie, harbours on which large sums of public money have recently been spent—I believe quite $250,000 at Port Stanley, $200,000 at Port Burwell, and large works going on at Rondeau—yet in all these cases there is no marine warning for incoming vessels. These are not ordinary harbours that are closed at the close of navigation; they are open all the year round, and these railway car ferries run to these three harbours from the south shore of the lake throughout the year. Therefore, additional precautions should be taken there by the government to protect navigation. I am informed that there are some lights at Port Stanley and Port Burwell, but at neither is there a fog horn or other means of giving a signal or answering a signal of distress from the water. On the night on which the 'Bessemer No. 2' went down, involving this shocking loss of life, a number of the residents of Port Stanley Harbour state the whistle of the steamer was heard blowing signals of distress again and again out in the lake. There were no means of answering that vessel. I am informed that during the progress of the work on the pier in the last year or two on many occasions signals of distress were sounded by this very boat and there being no means of answering these signals the contractors who were

doing the work would send out one of their tugs to the entrance of the harbour to answer these signals of distress, in that way enabling the captain and pilot of the boat to locate the harbour entrance. What happened on this occasion, apparently, was that during a blinding snow storm, when marine men could not see more than a boat's length or two ahead, the ferry had no means of knowing when it was near the harbour. Lights were of no avail, what was needed was a fog horn or proper marine signal which would warn them where the entrance to the harbour was and would answer their signals of distress. There were no means provided at the harbour of Port Stanley and as a direct consequence of that this boat foundered because she could not make the harbour and in turning to make shelter, either up or down the lake, in the opinion of marine men, the cars broke loose and she turned over and sank to the bottom.

In the opinion of marine men that loss of life and property could have been avoided had there been proper signals there to warn the vessel of its approach to the harbour. Practically the same thing happens thirty miles away further down the lake at Port Burwell, where we find the wrecked Canadian Pacific railway ferry steamer with forty men in danger from Sunday last until at least yesterday afternoon. It is incumbent upon the government to protect shipping at these points and I wish to point out to the Minister of Marine that this is not a case where navigation closes and signals are not needed. It is just after the ordinary navigation closes that these signals are required, during the snowstorm season and the storm season when lights cannot be made out that a fog horn or other means of signalling is absolutely indispensable. I wish to point out that there was no such means of warning at any of these harbours. It would have cost very little money to install these warnings, the lighthouse keepers at these different harbours could turn on steam and start the fog horn or steam whistle without the extra expense of one man. Thus the signals could have been given had the government taken the precaution to have installed a proper machine to give the usual warnings to mariners. I hope the government will take this matter seriously into consideration and that not only at the ports mentioned but at all other ports where ferries cross in the winter they will take the proper means to see that warnings for navigation are installed. Otherwise what is the use of spending millions on harbours and places of refuge if their approach is made impossible for want of proper aids to navigation?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that my hon. friend has not thought fit to notify me that he was going to bring this question up to-day because then I would have taken the means of giving to the House whatever information the department may have on the question he has raised. I may say to my hon. friend that instructions have been given to make a formal inquiry into the matter to find out the reason of the accident and whether the complaint which has been made by my hon. friend might be remedied as he has suggested.

Mr. MARSHALL. Has not a petition already been presented to have these signals installed in different places?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not answer off hand. I am extremely sorry the matter has been brought before the House without notice being given. I think it only fair when a question of this kind is being brought before the House the minister should be notified. I am not supposed to know all the details of aids to navigation, and I think it would be only fair that the minister should be notified in advance in order to be able to discuss such a question intelligently and to the satisfaction of the House.

THE NAVAL BILL.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the Bill embodying the naval proposals of the government? I presume we shall have it at the latest immediately after the reassembling of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A notice will be placed on the Order Paper to-day to be taken up on the first reading on the 12th of January.

REPRESENTATION OF OTTAWA.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Prime Minister made a decision as to which of these two loves he will ultimately adhere to, politically speaking?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The moment the question is placed in this way I have no hesitation in answering. I have made up my mind and if my hon. friend will allow me until perhaps to-morrow, I will tell him which it is.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to mention to the Prime Minister motions numbers 28, 29, 31, 32, 34 and 35. Some hon. members on this side suggested that these might be called as they are probably unopposed motions. I did not think it worth while that the debate on the budget should be interrupted for this purpose and I would therefore ask that if there is no

objection to these motions the various departments concerned might get ready to bring the returns down immediately after recess so that upon the motions being made the returns will be ready.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can see no objection to that but I would suggest to my hon. friend that to-morrow, before adjournment, we can pass them. I may have to consult some of my colleagues in regard to the matter but I see no objection to their being passed to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET DEBATE.

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

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate on the budget deliverance of the hon. the Minister of Finance, I do not purpose making any lengthy remarks or discussing a large number of subjects. I have no doubt that I voice the sentiment of the country in expressing the satisfaction that it gave the people of Canada to hear the financial statement of the hon. the Finance Minister and to know that the country was in such a happy financial condition. I doubt not but it will be accepted with pleasure and satisfaction generally. It proclaimed a buoyant and expanding revenue, which is always desirable where extensive work is to be done; increasing commerce, and that I am sure will please every citizen of Canada; busy industrial life and heavy expenditure, that will please some, and it will displease others; a rapidly growing debt with our credit not improving but rather the reverse. With regard to the last two features, there may be some exception taken, some would desire that we had not have reached the record which we have reached to-day. Last year has been, according to the budget deliverance, a record year in the history of Canada in many respects. It has been a record year with regard to collections from the people. We collected $85,000,000, the largest sum perhaps, with one exception, that was ever collected from the people of Canada. Therefore it was a record year in that regard. We spent $126,000,000, the largest amount that has ever been spent in one year in the history of Canada. Therefore our expenditure was a record breaker as well. We increased the debt by $45,969,-414, in one year. I believe there is only one other year in the history of Canada where the increase of debt was larger than it was last year, and only one. We spent $31,317,132 on the Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge. With regard to that, I made an observation at the time the hon. Minister of Finance said that we had spent for the current year $31,000,-000; I asked the question if that was the railway which was to be built by the surplus of one year, and the Finance Minister's reply was 'I am afraid that was a pipe dream of my hon. friend'. Something imaginative rather than the reality. That statement was credited to this side of the House rather than to the source to which it properly belonged. Not desiring to infringe upon the right of others, I simply wish to refer to that statement in the 'Hansard' at the time it was made, so that the people of Canada may know that it was no pipe dream in the mind of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), or of any other member of this side of the House; but if pipe dream it was, it should be credited to the Prime Minister, and not to the member for East Grey. This is what the 'Hansard' says as the words of the Prime Minister when he was explaining the Transcontinental Railway Bill:

> The sum total of money to be spent by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more. . . . Now, Sir, what is $13,000,000 in 1903? It is about the surplus of revenue over expenditure; the surplus for this year will pay for the construction of this road.

Therefore the pipe dream, if pipe dream there was, ought to be credited to the hon. the First Minister instead of to the member for East Grey. I wish the country also to think over the fact that we have spent over $59,000,000 on a road that was going to cost less than the surplus of one year, less than $16,000,000 and the road is not half built yet. I want the country to think over the fact that we have recently voted over $20,000,000 this year, and we spent $31,000,000 last year, and a large amount the year before. So the people of Canada may understand whether they were misled by the pipe dreams of the government when they undertook this gigantic enterprise.

This is going to be a record session also, we are told. Well, I looked over the speech from the Throne to ascertain what there was in it that would indicate that it was going to be a record session, and I noticed that that speech deals with only one question that might be regarded as new matter, and that is Naval Defence. On that question, as the Bill is not before the House, I do not desire or intend to make any lengthy observations. But I may say in passing that the speech from the Throne rather indicated that the Bill would have been brought before parliament long ago, and I cannot understand why the delay at the present time. The Governor General said:

Two members of my government attended the Imperial Conference, called by His Majesty's government on the question of defence. A plan was adopted after consultation with the admiralty, for the organization of a Canadian naval service, on the lines of the resolution of the House of Commons of the 29th of March last. The papers will be immediately brought down, and a Bill introduced accordingly.

Well, I would take the language to mean forthwith after the papers had been brought down. But we have now passed five weeks of the session, and although the papers were brought down long ago there is no Bill yet. Now I have only to say with regard to that measure that in my judgment what Canada expects is that something should be done immediately and effectively. I am not going to pretend to say what it will be, but it did occur to me at the time that the speech was made that the observations of my hon. friend from North Toronto pointed directly to what was perhaps the sentiment of the country on the question then. Therefore, in order that it may be a reminder to the House and the country, may I be permitted to refer to those observations, and that is the only remark I intend to make on the subject. The hon. member for North Toronto said:

To-day parliament stands at the gateway. It is not for me to say how grave it is, but I cannot brush it aside. To-day it impresses itself upon the gravest statesmen of the old country; to-day it appeals to Australia until public subscriptions are taken and the government is being importuned to do even more than its settled policy to meet the emergency; to-day little New Zealand gives one Dreadnought and offers a second, and to-day Canada faces that position of peril, that imperial emergency. Let me say to my right hon. friend that if, after careful consideration, he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money, this side of the House will stand beside him in thus vindicating Canada's honour and strengthening the empire's defence.

I have only to say that I believe the sentiment of the country remains to-day the same as when these observations were made, and that what Canada desires is immediate and effective action, whatever that action may be. I might for a moment ask what accounts for the good times that we have, the buoyant revenue and the general prosperity of the country as indicated by the budget deliverance? It is quite natural that the Finance Minister and his supporters would desire to have the country believe that in some way or other their conduct was responsible for these good times. What accounts for the favourable condition of affairs to-day? It is to be chiefly accounted for by the bountiful crop that we have had which brought a very large return to the labours of the field, to the agriculturists, who represent about 45 per cent of the population, and if you can give a good return to 45 per cent of the people and they are well employed, thus doing good to them, you necessarily do good to the whole population. The large return for their labours obtained by a great number of the people, and the very heavy expenditure carried on by the government in public works and in other lines, involving the distribution of 126 millions amongst the people of Canada, would help to make good times whether that expenditure was wise or unwise, extravagant, profligate or economical. The exceptionally heavy expenditure on railways, canals, telegraph and other lines would naturally help to make good times. Then, there is the expenditure which took place in connection with corporations outside of the government. Railway building is carried on extensively in the country to-day. The three great transcontinental railway companies are extending their branch lines in every direction at a very rapid rate and this as well means a heavy expenditure in the country. It means employment for labour at remunerative wages, and, therefore, it is one of the elements that assist in bringing about these good times. Then, there is the heavy influx of immigrants who bring with them all the money they possess, as well as their settlers' effects, which money must be spent immediately on arrival to support themselves and those dependent on them with the necessaries of life and to provide an outfit for commencing operations in the new country and in the new home. This money must be spent immediately, and it means a very large additional expenditure in the country. This means as well a valuable additional market for the products of the country that we have to sell because it is usually a market in which the highest prices are paid. A heavy expenditure is required to provide implements and other things necessary to the outfitting of the new-comers. This means not only an increased market, but it means a home market which is always the best market to be had. It means an enhanced value for everything that is produced in the country and that has to be sold. Compare that with a few years ago. It is undoubtedly due to the law of supply and demand, to increased consumption in the country, to the increased numbers to help to create the demand. But, what have the government to do with benefits derived by the people from the large harvest? Nothing whatever. To what extent were they responsible for the increased prices that were obtained by the people of the country for what they sold? They were in no way responsible for it. These increased prices were due entirely to the law of supply and

demand, with which the government had no connection. These things help materially to make good times and in consequence we have the good times that we now enjoy. Our trade and commerce affords a number of examples, but I will only mention one item and that is the enhanced value of everything that the country had to sell last year as compared with previous years. To show what this means to the people of Canada I will mention three articles of export and give a comparison of the prices that were obtained for them last year with the prices that were obtained for the same commodities a few years previously. First, take the exports of wheat. In 1896 we exported 9,919,000 bushels and the farmers got in return, $5,771,000 in round figures. What was that per bushel? It was 58¼ cents per bushel. That was a very low figure. That could not possibly mean good times for the farmers. But, we take 1906 and we find that the farmers of Canada exported 49,137,000 bushels, in return for which they received $48,000,000. In other words, they got 98 cents per bushel for their grain, whereas, in 1896, they only got 58¼ cents per bushel. What had the government to do with that? Nothing in the world. It means to the agriculturists of Canada a greatly increased return over what they received a few years previously and, therefore, they were benefited to that extent. Take cured meats. In 1897 we exported 1,861,000 pounds, for which we got $84,000. In 1909 we exported 1,610,000 pounds; that is over 250,000 pounds less. But instead of getting only $84,000 the farmers got $123,911 for it, or $34,493 more for 250,000 pounds less than they got in 1897. What had the government to do with that? Nothing at all. It was due to the markets of the world. Then, I take cheese. In 1897 the farmers of Canada exported 164,220,000 pounds of cheese, for which they got $14,676,000. In 1909 they exported exactly the same number of millions, or 164,907,000 pounds of cheese, for which they received $20,384,000. What had the government to do with that? Nothing whatever. But, it helped to make good times. It helped to make the farmer's return more profitable, but it is not attributable to anything that has been done by the government. It is attributable to the law of supply and demand.

I do not propose to travel over very extensive ground or to engage in anything like an analytical criticism of the budget utterances of the Finance Minister, but I wish, very briefly, to direct attention to one particular line where I think the government have been very remiss in their duty, and in connection with that I was rather surprised at the observations of the minister in closing his budget speech. The Finance Minister announced that there will be no changes in the tariff this year, and he used the following language:

> We have no tariff changes to propose on this occasion. It is not because we have entered a claim that the tariff is perfect. We have no doubt that wherever you have a custom tariff necessarily as full and intricate as ours has to be there will be room for criticism and certainly always room for demands for changes. But, we are of the opinion that it is not in the best interests of the country that there should be frequent changes. We believe that frequent tariff changes must have a disturbing influence on the interests of the country and we wish to have it generally understood that where there has been a general revision of the tariff as we had two years ago the government would not be disposed to make changes unless the need for them was very urgent indeed.

Language of somewhat the same kind was used by the Minister of Finance last year and the year before. Let me point out to him that one of the changes made in the tariff when it was revised some years ago, was a change which I have always regarded as unwise and injurious to the interests of the agricultural community who represent 45 per cent of our population, and also the woollen textile industries which were being rapidly developed in Canada; which gave employment to thousands of hands, which produced cheaper clothing than we can now obtain, and which gave a better market to the farmers of Canada for their wool. When we gave the British preference we struck a vital blow at the woollen industry. When the reduction was made in the tariff rate on woollen fabrics there were in Canada 207 woollen mills operating at full time, employing a large number of people and paying them good wages. These mills had 624 sets of cards, 2,645 looms, and 194,086 spindles moving all the time. But, a few years after the British preference was introduced instead of having 270 mills in operation in Canada there were only 197, instead of having 624 sets of cards there were only 521, and instead of having 2,654 looms there were only 1,706. That is the result of the tariff changes which the Minister of Finance told us were so valuable for the people of Canada, and which, as he said, the government gave out of the generosity of their heart. I am told that twenty more woollen mills have gone out of operation within the last year and that in all there are 73 fewer mills now operating in Canada than there were when the British preference came into force. The operatives in these mills have been thrown out of employment and the bread winners have had to find employment elsewhere. We admit into this country free of duty, or at a nominal duty, from 5,000,000 pounds to 12,000,000 pounds of wool and over 2,000,000 pounds of yarn every year which would have been produced in Canada had we kept

our tariff as we should have kept it against wool, and extended adequate protection to this woollen industry which at one period was developing so rapidly. In addition to that we have 7,000,000 pounds of tops, waste, and rags imported. We threw out of employment over 3,000 operatives on whom probably 15,000 people would be dependent, by virtue of that change in the tariff which was said to be in the interests of Canada. Why was this unwise policy introduced? For what purpose did the government give that British preference? The Minister of Finance told us it was in the first place to show our generosity and our liberality to the mother country. It is very well to be generous and liberal with what belongs to yourself, but it is not always wise to be liberal with what belongs to other people, and that is what the government did. We were told in the next place by the Minister of Finance that the consumer of clothing in Canada, especially those who purchased the cheaper wearing apparel, would be benefited by this change. Well, I do not dispute that we showed our generosity and liberality, but I do dispute that it has cheapened the cost of clothing to the people of this country. I think I shall be able to prove from the prices quoted by two large establishments in Toronto, that notwithstanding that we brought in over $22,000,000 worth of woollen textile fabrics last year, and notwithstanding that we closed down 73 Canadian mills and at the same time wiped out a valuable market for the wool produced by the farmers of the country, we did not reduce the price of clothing to the poorer people.

Why? Because the advertisements of these firms tell us plainly that this could not be done. I give the prices of clothing from the files of the Toronto daily papers in 1896, 1905 and 1907. In 1896, throughout November and December, the T. Eaton Company continuously offered ready-made four-button, all wool tweeds, with best Italian cloth lining, sizes 34 to 44, at $6 to $7.50 a suit. At the same time the R. Simpson Company advertised ready-made, all-wool, four-button sack suits of English and Canadian suits, at $5.99, $6.40 and $6.99. In 1905, nine years later, when, according to the Minister of Finance, if his policy had worked out as he seemed to desire and intend, they should have been a great deal cheaper, throughout November and December the T. Eaton Company continuously advertised the same classes of ready-made suits at $10.50, $15 and $18. These figures show that the Minister of Finance's judgment was bad, that instead of cheapening the cost of these articles to the consumer, that change in the tariff made them very much dearer. In 1905, throughout November and December, the R. Simpson Company advertised the same class of suits at $9, $11.75, $14 and $16 a suit. In 1907, the Eaton and Simpson companies advertised early in November all wool and worsted winter suits, sizes 36 to 44, at $12 and $14. The same class of suits that were offered previously at $5 and $6; and towards Christmas the R. Simpson Company advertised manufacturer's stocks at slaughter prices of $7.95 and $8.59. I give these prices to show that if it ever was intended or believed that the reduction of duty on British goods would reduce the cost of these goods to the poor consumer in Canada, the people know better to-day.

I have given evidence of what this policy has done for the poor people of the country by increasing the cost of the clothing they must wear. What has it done for the farmers of the country? It has destroyed the sheep raising and wool growing industry. I can give first the quantity of wool that was sent out of the country at the time when we commenced to build up the textile industry, as indicating the number of sheep that we owned in Canada. The trade and commerce returns show that in 1897 we exported 7,740,000 pounds of wool. Shortly after that we had the British preference, and what effect had it on the sheep raising and the wool industry of the country? In 1898 it fell off; in 1900 it amounted to 2,000,000 pounds; in 1901, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1902, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1903, 2,000,000 pounds; in 1904, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1905, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1906, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1907, 1,000,000 pounds; in 1908, 1,848,000 pounds, and in 1909, 1,224,000 pounds. These figures show conclusively that the farmers of Canada have found sheep raising unprofitable, and therefore have disposed of their sheep and gone out of the business. What was the cause of that? Undoubtedly one of the main causes was the destruction of the home market which they previously had for their wool, by the blow that was given to the woollen textile industry by that reduction on English goods. The provincial governments are doing all they can to induce our farmers to go more extensively into sheep raising, but the farmer does not do so, because he finds it unprofitable owing to there being no market for his wool. As our sheep cannot be transported very well by water, they are not being sent to the European market, but to the United States. The result is that the number of sheep in Canada to-day is only 2,510,000 as compared with 20,108,000 in New Zealand, a much smaller country; 30,011,000 in the United Kingdom, although our country is ten times as large; 53,240,000 in the United States of America, 74,000,000 in the Argentine Republic, and 87,000,000 in the Australian Commonwealth. There is not one of these countries that is not smaller than Canada, and the requisites for sheep raising are as good in Can-

ada as they are in any of these countries Why is it that we have not more sheep? Because of the very unwise policy of the government, first, in destroying the textile industry of the country, and secondly, in not providing a better market for mutton, of which we might send millions of pounds to other countries.

Let us compare our own country with some of the states of the Union. Take, for instance, Montana. That state produced last year, 45,000,000 pounds of wool. Why was she able to make so large an output? Because the textile industries of that country use up every pound of that wool, and the farmers who raised it could get a good price for every pound of their product. But when we cross into Alberta, a province which is larger than Montana and is capable of producing more sheep and raising more wool, we find that, instead of 45,000,000 pounds they raised only 400,000 pounds. In Alberta last year, they had 154,266 sheep, as against over twelve times that number in Montana. The whole clip of wool in Canada last year was only 4,500,000 pounds. How was it that we raised so little wool? Because the crop is not a profitable one and the farmer will not spend his time in raising it. Our country is as well adapted for raising wool as any of these other countries, our population is as large as that of most of them and our area certainly greater. This might be a very profitable industry if wise attention were given to it by the government. Instead of having only 154,266 sheep in Alberta, there should be two or three million sheep there, yielding a good return to the farmers. Why is it that these countries can raise sheep profitably and we cannot? Except the Australian colonies and Argentine Republic, the wool of which is finer than ours and therefore more valuable, these countries have no advantage over us except that they have a home market for their wool, and, a good market for mutton as well, whereas the Canadian farmer has not a home market for either. The mutton cannot be properly taken to the market because of our transportation arrangements, and, owing to the indifference of the government, we do not secure the better transportation system that we might have and that would enable the producers to send this material to market at prices that would yield much larger returns than at present. The United States produce 330,000,000 pounds of wool against 4,500,000 pounds in Canada. Why? Because their statesmen, years ago, saw the wisdom of fostering the woollen textile industry. It was first established on the wool of Canada. But it was fostered year after year through adequate protection, not at one stage only but at every stage of that production. This policy was continued steadily until now the woollen industry may be said to be the most important in that country. There are five million of people dependent upon it, and the spindles of the woollen factories turn out a greater product than any other line of industry except possibly that of iron and steel. The woollen industry gives employment to a larger number of people who receive more in return, and more people are supported by these lines than are supported by any other lines in the United States at the present time.

I have stated that England has 30,000,000 sheep, and England is a country not one-tenth the size of Canada. She grows 100,000,000 pounds of wool every pound of which is used in the factories in that country, besides which 557,000,000 pounds of raw wool are imported. England affords the farmers a good market for wool and for mutton also. Compare that with Canada. The Canadian wool consumed in Canadian factories in 1871 was 8,000,000 pounds; in 1881, 8,000,000 pounds; in 1908 a little less than 7,000,000 pounds. Last year, only 4,500,000 pounds. The Canadian farmer has gone out of sheep-raising because that industry is unprofitable. Let me give the figures showing the exports of sheep for some years in order that we may have some idea of what this industry has meant to the Canadian farmer. I begin with the year 1899, when the policy of the present government was coming into full effect. The following are the figures:

EXPORTS OF SHEEP FROM CANADA.

1899	405,322
1900	459,944
1901	394,681
1902	384,442
1903	401,443
1904	304,053
1905	288,319
1906	214,262
1907	354,665
1908	227,000
1909	118,000

This drop from 459,944 to 118,000 in a period of ten years was directly due to the destruction of the value of the market for the farmer's wool, causing the farmer to go out of the sheep-raising industry. And to-day there are only 2,478,688 sheep in Canada. We had more than that in 1861. We had more sheep in Canada fifteen years ago because sheep-raising was then more profitable than it is to-day. How is it that the farmers of Australia and the Argentine find sheep-raising profitable, although they have no local market whatever for their wool? Their wool is of fine quality, it is wanted abroad, it always commands a high figure and therefore they get a good return for it. At the same time the mutton is sent to the markets of the world in cold storage provided by their government and produces a good return. To give an idea of what

that means to the people of New Zealand I need only say that Great Britain takes annually from New Zealand of frozen mutton about 200,500,000 pounds and from the Argentine Republic 144,230,000 pounds. Canada, with a country as good for raising sheep and with mutton equally as good as the best they raise either in Argentine or in New Zealand, is not sending a pound of frozen mutton to the markets of the world. Why? Because our government have not thought it worth while to provide cold storage facilities so that the products of the farmers may be taken to the markets of the world where they realize a profitable return. The result is that all of our sheep, which we export have to be sent to the United States, while our home market is very limited. New South Wales exported of frozen meats last year 540,514,000 pounds, but, Canada, which could raise meat just as well and of just as good quality, is not able to send a pound to the markets of the world where the Australian and Argentine farmer is getting a good price. The industry of the farmers of Canada is destroyed by the carelessness of the Minister of Agriculture, who proclaims himself to be a farmer and is supposed to be looking after the interests of his fellow farmers. He has failed to do that. The Minister of Finance has struck them heavily on one side and the Minister of Agriculture has struck them on the other. What has this policy of the Finance Minister accomplished for the people of Canada? It has deprived 15,000 or 20,000 Canadians of the means of earning a living and left them in a state of starvation until they were obliged to turn to some other line to earn a living. It has swept away the capital invested in those industries that were running full time when the change was made in the tariff of our country. It has destroyed the machinery which is rusting or has been sold for scrap iron, and every year more and more of these industries are going down until in a few years there will not be one of them left, whereas there were 270 only a few years ago. That policy has destroyed the market furnished by these mills for the wool produced by these farmers. Sheep-raising, one of their best lines of industry, is made unprofitable and therefore they are going out of it at a rapid rate which is indicated by the increased cost of clothing to-day. Instead of getting an increased market and a better price for what he wishes to sell, the market the farmer had is being destroyed and no new market provided in its place. The government killed the Canadian farmers' market in Germany and destroyed the market for consumption at home by those who were engaged in the textile industry, in addition to sacrificing the home market for the wool the farmer raised. One of these things was done by the Minister of Finance and the other by the Minister of Agriculture.

This was all accomplished by the British preference, Then too, instead of cheapening the goods purchased by the poor people of the country it has increased these over 45 per cent in price. Do the government feel happy over it? Are they satisfied with their policy? Are the people of this country satisfied that that policy was a wise one for the country? I do not think they are. Are they grateful to the government for introducing that policy? I do not think they are. What do the farmers of Canada think of that policy? In my judgment they think that the government acted very unwisely, and they would be glad to have some one take up the question in their behalf and introduce a change that will be beneficial. This was accomplished by two members of the cabinet who above all others declared that they were most anxious to do good to two important classes, the poor people of the country who are consumers and the agriculturists who represent so many. The Minister of Finance was going to cheapen their clothing, but he has nearly doubled the price. The Minister of Agriculture was going to do so much for the farmers, being a farmer himself, and he jollies along in the same old slipshod way, he does not get new markets, he only destroys the markets they had, the German market and the home market here in Canada, providing nothing in their place. He did not even provide proper means to lay the products of the farm in the markets of the world and therefore the farmers are obliged to do without beneficial markets where their products might profitably have been sent. In considering these two lines only we have no reason to congratulate either the Finance Minister or the Minister of Agriculture for what they have done for the farmers of Canada or the poor people who are always needy and require to get the cheapest clothing the country can possibly afford. The very men who above all others should be most desirous to help the poor people are the men who have done them the greatest injury and injustice. The man above all others charged with the responsible task of dealing with that question has done nothing, he has destroyed the markets they had and provided no others in return.

I merely make these observations in order to draw the attention of the farmers of the country to what has been done, what accounts for the destruction of their valuable market, what accounts for the fact that sheep-raising is not profitable to-day. I want to draw the attention as well of the poor people of Canada and to let them know why it is they pay so much more for their clothing, about 45 per cent more than in 1897, when this new policy was introduced and put in operation.

Mr. F. L. FOWKE (South Ontario). Mr. Speaker, in the mother of parliaments as in the parliaments of the five nations, the financial statement or annual budget by the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Finance Minister as the case may be, is always a theme of interesting discussion both in the House of parliament and out of parliament. In this country where history is being made very rapidly, where the events of to-day will be counted as ancient history to-morrow, it is not at all surprising that in a peculiar sense the budget of the Finance Minister is looked forward to with interest. I am very glad to-day to be able to say that during the last twelve or thirteen years in this Dominion the budget speech has been looked forward to with feelings of joy, not with feelings of apprehension. The budget to which we listened the other day is perhaps the most magnificent of all the splendid presentations which the able Finance Minister has presented to the Dominion House of Commons. I am delighted to find that the gentleman who preceded me in this discussion pays this compliment to the Finance Minister when he says that the budget is in most respects one to be rejoiced over rather than to be complained of; and yet, like the good cow that gives a fine bucket of milk and then proceeds to kick it over, the hon. gentleman spoiled the good effect of his speech by an adverse criticism which practically put him out of court. To the present Finance Minister is due the existing fiscal policy of this country, under which Canada enjoys, and has so long enjoyed, such great prosperity, and which has enabled him to make the magnificent showing he was able to make on Tuesday last. Now, Sir, I am in a way glad that the two gentlemen who have spoken for the opposition have, at least in their speeches, found more or less fault with the hon. the Finance Minister, and I will tell you why. The speech and the presentation by the Finance Minister are approved by almost every body, and I hold in my hand a Conservative newspaper, the 'Citizen' of Ottawa, which contains a despatch from Great Britain to the effect that the address there is received with marked favour by capitalists, who predict that the great prosperity of the Dominion is reflected by it, and that this prosperity is likely to increase. I say I am rather pleased to have heard the two gentlemen of the opposition speak on this question, one of them an ex-minister of Finance and who would like to be again Minister of Finance and the hon. gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Sproule) whose heart has been made sick in waiting for an opportunity to be a member of a new government. They have found fault with the presentation of the Finance Minister, and so saved him from coming under the measure under this menace of the scripture: 'Woe unto that man of whom all men speak well.' Now the budget's presentation not only gives a splendid view of the condition of the business of the nation, but it gives a fair presentation of the social life of the people, and brings to our attention the growth and development of our trade and commerce. Yet it is too bad that even the opposition in this House should feel inclined to criticise the budget speech, and to pour out the vials of their wrath upon the administration as we have heard them do. Now let me suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, though not wishing to be disrespectful to the hon. gentlemen who preceded me, and to the hon. profession to which he belongs in life, I am bound to say that I can account for it on no other ground than that he is suffering from something like mental measles, and is unable fittingly to appreciate the real state of affairs in the Dominion of Canada. I do know that his desire for the treasury benches makes him feel to-day as melancholy as a pelican in the wilderness, as his colleague the other day showed himself to be as ferocious as a bear robbed of her cubs, when he came to think of the position which he now occupies and the position which he would like to occupy in the government of this country.

Now, Sir, the presentation made by the Finance Minister is remarkable in several particulars. First, it noted the fact of the splendid position this Dominion occupied during the panic that occurred in 1907 and 1908, and if we had time this afternoon to institute a comparison as to the effects of that panic on various countries, a panic which was world wide in its operation, you would find that this country resisted the effect of that panic as no other country was able to do. Why, Sir, in the great republic to the south of us, that wealthy and populous nation, what was the state of affairs? Not only was industry paralysed, but money could not be had to carry on the legitimate business of the country. Owing to the wise fiscal policy now prevailing in this country our business community was happily preserved from the disastrous effects which visited the republic. There was ample money for all legitimate business enterprises and business went on with slight interruption. Albeit the revenue of the country was somewhat diminished, and it was not at all surprising that such should be the case. Now, the Finance Minister's splendid speech also noted the fact that the trade and commerce of the country are growing by leaps and bounds. He was able to tell us of an overflowing treasury, of a great recovery in the revenue of the country which would enable the necessary expenditures to be met without

difficulty. He showed us that notwithstanding all the great expenditures that will have to be made upon the National Transcontinental railway, the increase of the public debt would be $2,250,000 less than the expenditure on that enterprise alone, and the naval expenditures ordinarily applied to capital account would this as would other years be paid out of revenue expenditures and be chargable to capital account?

Now, this is a remarkable condition of affairs in Canada, a very prosperous condition indeed. It is one that might well cause the hon. gentleman who preceded me to ask the question as to how this condition of affairs is to be accounted for. Well, Sir, it is to be accounted for in various ways. I cannot now follow him in all the paths in which he journeyed in trying to ascertain the cause of the country's prosperity. The way in which he tried to explain it, however, was a twice told tale. He laid emphasis upon the fact that much of the prosperity of the nation is due to the enterprise of the people, is due to the fact that agriculture is flourishing, is due to the fact that work and wages were never better, is due to the fact that we have a splendid industrialism in Canada. I would like to draw the attention of that hon. gentleman and of the House to the fact that all these vast interests in Canada are growing today, they are developing day by day, month by month and year by year. And how is it all to be accounted for? Sir, I think it is largely owing to the fact that we have a sane and sensible fiscal policy, one which not only ministers to the growth in trade and commerce abroad, but which has helped to build up an interprovincial trade which is vastly superior to that which we enjoy from imports and exports. I was glad to-day, in taking up the Ottawa 'Free Press,' to note the splendid influence that the fiscal arrangements of this country are now having upon foreign capital. The Ottawa 'Free Press' of December 15, has a statement from the State Department at Washintgon, noting that $226 500,000 of American capital has been invested in industrial enterprises in Canada. employing Canadian labour, on Canadian soil, and ministering to the comfort and convenience of the Canadian people. This is a point that is worthy of note. When these gentlemen come to discuss the ifs and ands of the prosperity of the day—and I shall go into detail in a moment more fully as to some of the things said by the hon. gentleman who preceded me—I listen in vain for a declaration from them as to what they themselves would do to improve the situation. I had hoped that they would have presented an alternative policy upon which they might have appealed to the Dominion of Canada. But, Sir, had we anything of the kind presented to us? No, Sir, we had not. They proceed upon the assumption that the government of the day are perfect men, that they are infallible, that they ought not to be expected to err in any single particular. Sir, high as my regard is for the hon. the Premier and the members of his cabinet, I do not claim for them absolute perfection. I do not pretend to say that there is no possibility of errors having been made, but if there have been errors made in the administration, these gentlemen have failed to point them out, and they have failed to show, if there have been errors, what they would do to meet the situation.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is this policy which this government has been administering during the last twelve years the policy that the right hon. the Prime Minister enunciated in Winnipeg in 1894, when he promised the people that if he were elected to power he would give them free trade as they have it in England?

Mr. FOWKE. I am very pleased to say that when the right hon the premier accepted office and opened that new era for Canada in which we are living now, an era of magnificent growth, development and prosperity, he established for this country the fiscal policy under which we have lived until this hour and which admirably meets the requirements of the situation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. May I ask the hon. gentleman what that fiscal policy was?

Mr. FOWKE. Is it that hon. gentlemen opposite are without a policy? I know that they were struggling to manufacture a policy. If I remember correctly there was such a thing spoken of as the Halifax platform and we were to have adequate protection, but since the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) refused to be godfather to that policy and since a wet nurse could not be had for it among hon. gentlemen opposite it has faded into the distant past and we no longer hear of the Halifax policy I had expected, therefore, that by this time, on the eve of the convention which is called ostensibly, I suppose, to unite the party and to give them possibly a leader under whom they can serve, they would have outlined a policy of some kind. But we are quite in the dark as to what these hon. gentlemen wish us to do in that respect. There is nothing positive from that side of the House, nothing statesmanlike, only fault-finding and unsubstantial statements, and if the hon. gentleman will receive it from me his address to-day seemed very much like putting empty buckets down and drawing nothing up. I have simply to say a word in answer to a few of his criticisms

and to point out a few of the mistaken statements and wrong conclusions which he has arrived at from what he would call his argument this afternoon. There are some facts that we ought to know in connection with the history of this Dominion. I want to state openly, unreservedly and boldly that with the coming into power of the hon. the premier there was opened a new era in the Dominion of Canada, the era in which we are living now and one which is likely to continue for a very considerable time, we trust. I want these gentlemen opposite to have it impressed upon their minds that we are living in an era, which is one rejoiced in by all classes and sections of the Dominion of Canada, by three or four dates which I will venture to mention. Has not the year 1896 itself a meaning for them? Have not the years 1900, 1904 and 1908 a meaning for them? These are very impressive mile stones along the line of the history of this country which ought to convince hon. gentlemen opposite that in all of the appeals that have been had to the electorate since the advent to power of the present government until this day the masses of the Canadian people have been shown to be absolutely, with an almost united front, behind the premier and the government which he leads so successfully. There is nothing wonderful in relation to that.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me undertook to speak on behalf of agriculture and in doing so he made a slight comparison as to the prices of agricultural products last year and this. It would almost seem to me, although I had not intended to do so, that the hon. gentleman needs to have told him some very necessary truths, but in order to do that I should have to move the hands on the dial back not a year but probably thirteen years to direct his attention to the prices of agricultural produce, say, in 1896, and in 1909. If he wants a comparison of that kind he may have it. Let me tell him that the price of wheat, for instance, when the Tories were in power was 58 cents a bushel; to-day we are glad to know that it is a dollar a bushel. At that time the farmers eggs were 10 cents a dozen; to-day they are 25 cents a dozen. Then butter was 12 cents a pound; to-day it is worth a shilling a pound. And if he wants to tell me that the exports of dairy products have fallen off I will tell him that so greatly has the population grown, so numerous have the consumers become, so much better has the home market demand been made than the export market demand that we are glad to avail ourselves of it and the farming industry is flourishing accordingly. The farmer will have little regard for the argument of the hon. gentleman if he will ask him to turn out the present government and place himself and his asociates in power. Now, Sir, there is another change that I would like to speak of in relation to Dominion affairs. Let me contrast the condition then and now. I will not harrow the feelings of hon. gentlemen by speaking of the state of political corruption that was known to exist in Canada then and of the changed conditions now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWKE. The people know it and the people rejoice in it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWKE. Hon. gentlemen say: 'hear, hear'. In those days it was necessary for the leader of the government to expel from the House of Commons of his own party because of their corrupt acts. To-day we stand behind the ministry which is unimpeachable in its character--

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWKE. And because of the wise economy and absolute honesty characterizing every department a majority of the people of Canada stand united behind this government and overwhelmingly declare that there is such a difference as between then and now that they want no more of the then and they want to cling to the now. At that time there were such things as national distress and stagnation all over Canada. To-day you find that agriculture flourished to a marked degree, that where there was but the prairie there are now villages—villages that have grown to towns and towns that have grown to metropolitan cities, and you find in the east of this country as well as in the west, in the two older provinces, that a large industrialism has been developed and is developing that was not known then and which is employing hundreds of thousands of men, giving them all the work they can do and at splendid wages too. Work and wages never were so plentiful and so much rejoiced in in Canada as they are to-day, and I will tell you why. It is very largely because of the sane and successful fiscal policy inaugurated in the early days of the present administration and persisted in to this hour. And, one of the greatest blessings that has come to us in connection with the fiscal policy is the very one which that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) professed to condemn this afternoon, namely the imperial preference. I want to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) now, if he is prepared to recommend to his party that that preference should be withdrawn from the mother country? He will not make such a declaration. I am glad from the political point of view that he condemned the imperial preference as he did to-day, because the people of Canada have proclaimed time and again that nothing has ever pleased them better than

the manner in which, through the channels of trade and commerce, the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has linked Canada more thoroughly with the mother country than ever before. Is it that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is simply to wave the old flag and shout loyalty on the 12th of July, and that when he is asked to render substantial service to Britain and to exhibit some evidence of true imperialism, he will, as he has done to-day, speak against a closer association with the motherland. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) dwelt in feeling terms on the woollen industry and of the farmers being deprived of a market for their wool.

Now, I happen to have a large woollen industry in my own town, one which was established a few years ago under rather adverse conditions for the firm was not then rich in material wealth. However, they began the industry there and it has grown and grown with the years until at this hour it is one of the finest of its kind in Canada, and has a plant which I suppose is worth not less than $100,000. From employing a few hands it has grown to employing many hands, and, before I came to Ottawa the president of that company said to me: Mr. Fowke, I hope you will do something to get the woollen industry on a better footing than it is at present when you go down to the session. I said to him: Why Mr. Schofield is not your industry prospering, is it not a growing industry? and he said: Oh, yes,I have nothing to complain of in respect to my particular industry but it is the woollen industry down some where else in some other part of the country. And I said: I suppose it is one of those industries which has failed to keep pace with the change in events, that has allowed its machinery to become out of date and has not applied proper business methods in order that it might grow and prosper as yours has. I told my electors on the eve of the election that any manufacturer in Canada who could not live and thrive and prosper under the present tariff ought to be allowed to perish and to go out of existence, and the manufacturers present applauded that sentiment. And, Sir, I stand here to applaud it to-day. The British preference has given us an association with the mother country in business such as we did not have before and such as we have the right to rejoice in now. It is no argument to say that the farmers are not producing sheep and wool to-day. I would like to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that the farmers of this country produce that which it is most profitable for them to produce, and that if they can raise cattle and wheat and other cereals, to greater advantage than they can raise sheep, these are the branches of industry they will undertake and the sheep raising will be neglected. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman further, that there is a large sheep industry in Canada and that it is known to be very profitable. Sheep are raised in this country not so much for wool as for mutton, and the fancy sheep of Canada are exported to the United States and to other parts of the world in large numbers and with great profit to those who raise them. The hon. gentleman attempted to compare Montana with Alberta, and because Alberta happens to be a larger district than Montana he said that sheep should be raised in Alberta even as they are in Montana. Well, I thank Heaven that Alberta is capable of producing something more than sheep, for Montana is not capable of producing anything but sheep. Montana is a country of hills and of valleys and of running water. In this country we do not have to confine our industry to any particular line, for the farmer as well as for the business man industry is diversified, and under the splendid guidance of the Minister of Agriculture we are getting something like intensified farming so that the Canadian farmer is able to make the most out of the calling in which he is engaged. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) quoted from the catalogue of the T. Eaton Company in an attempt to prove that clothing is dearer to-day than it was before the British preference. Of course the idea he was aiming at would refute his own argument because if we had not a tariff against woollen goods, woollen goods ought to be cheaper in Canada than they were before. But he contended they were dearer and he quoted this catalogue to prove it. Now, I want to tell the hon. gentleman the true state of the case in relation to that matter. Cheap clothing can be purchased to-day in Canada as cheaply as ever it could, but I thank this parliament, and I thank this government, and I thank Providence too, for the fact that the people of Canada do not have to wear cheap clothing any more. If they pay higher prices than formerly for their clothing it is because they have the money to buy better clothing. Our people to-day are better fed and better clothed and better housed and have larger bank deposits than was ever possible before Sir Wilfrid Laurier attained power. Sir, I had the pleasure of the acquaintance of the late Mr. Timothy Eaton, the merchant prince of Canada, and in the last conversation but one which I had with him I said: Mr. Eaton, what is the secret of your success in business life? And he said: Why, I have just one motto in my business life and it is this: A fair field and no favour. That was the expression of a true Britisher and a true Canadian, and the Eaton firm to-day is perhaps the largest employer of labour in the province of Ontario, and they minster to the wants and conveniences of the people to a very large extent, and they have succeeded by putting into effect the

principle enunciated by the founder of the firm. I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will review the catalogue of the T. Eaton Company again he will find that if there is a man who wants cheap garments to-day he can have them just as cheaply as he could ten years ago. But, owing to the prosperity of the country the Eaton firm bring to the attention of the people not the cheaper but the better wares and the people are able and willing to buy them. Speaking from a party point of view I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has assailed the British preference because in my judgment there is nothing in connection with the fiscal policy of this government that more commends itself to the people of Canada than the preference given to the mother country in our markets.

Mr. THOBURN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. FOWKE. Yes.

Mr. THOBURN. As one who is largely interested in this preferential tariff that he speaks so loudly about and tells of the great advantage it has been to Canada—I have asked this question before but it has never been answered to my satisfaction although perhaps the hon. gentleman will answer it now—I want to know one solitary product of the Dominion of Canada that gets a preference in the old country. In what way does Canada benefit by that preferential tariff? Is there any preference given to any Canadian product to-day in the market of England that was not given to that Canadian product before the preferential tariff came into force?

Mr. FOWKE. The hon. member has asked a question. He belongs to a party that talks very loudly about its loyalty to Great Britain. I would like to illustrate its attitude by a story I once heard. At a school gathering in a country district the British flag was placed on the wall in full view of every one present, and one of the speakers commended the teacher for having it there, and drew from it many important lessons in loyalty for the scholars. When he finished, the teacher said: 'I must tell you, Sir, how the flag came to be there; there is a very bad hole in the wall, and it is very dirty anyway, and I put the flag there to hide it.' That is an illustration of the lip-loyalty of the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, who loudly proclaim their loyalty from the house tops, but who, when it comes to giving concrete example of the fact that Canada stands heart to heart with the motherland, are ready to say: 'Our interests are here, and even though we would not be greatly hurt by it, we must not take the chance of doing anything for our mother at home.' The present government acted very differently. They said: 'Great Britain is the best market we have for the products of Canada, we wish it ever to be so, we wish to have our trade with you, both for export and import, we want to know you better, to have closer fellowship with you, and to that end the first statesman of Canada gave the preference to the mother country, the result of which is that there is to-day in the British market a sympathetic regard for the products of this country, even though that market is equally open to the products of the whole world. I am glad to know that transportation under this government is keeping pace with the marvellous development of the country, and I am sure the country will approve of what the First Minister has promised to do in a larger way when the finances of the country will warrant it, in the way of deepening the Welland canal, possibly building the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, and extending a railway line to Hudson bay. There is nothing too great to expect in that direction, as transportation facilities must be provided if we are to continue to have immigration in the volume in which we have it to-day. In that respect emphasis may be laid upon the fact that we are in a new era. You do not find that the population of Canada is simply stable, that the youth of Canada have to leave for foreign soil to make a living, as was the case formerly. We are not only retaining our own natural increase, but the best people of the United States and the best people of Europe are coming to us, after a searching investigation showing that they are worthy of admittance to this country. To-day we have an immigration of 150,000 per annum and a revenue of $100,000,000. This is something to rejoice in; but I ask hon. members to contemplate the time, not very far distant, when the immigration will be, not 150,000 a year, but 500,000, and when the revenues of the country will have gone up to 400 or 500 millions. There are gentlemen listening to my voice who will witness these things, which will come because the foundations for such a splendid superstructure are being laid by the present government. The marked difference between former years and the present time is emphasized by the trade and navigation returns. The trade of Canada under the Conservative administration was $239,000,000; last year it amounted to more than $571,000,000, showing an increase of over $332,000,000. I would like next to show very briefly how this government has materially assisted in the production of wealth in this country. The hon. gentleman who preceded me said, what is largely true, that it is by bringing brain and brawn into contact with the forces of mother nature, and compelling her to yield up her treasures that we get the advantages that we possess as a growing country

to-day. But not only by the fiscal policy of the government, but by the management of the various departments have the Canadian population been taught the way in which they can hope to make the most of their energies in the production of wealth for their own comfort and convenience, and also for the national growth and development. In no one department is this emphasized more fully than in the Department of Agriculture. The manner in which that department has assisted agriculture is of incalculable value to the agricultural interests of the country, by the experimental farms, by the dissemination of information, by the interchange of animal products with the various provinces. Time would fail me to tell of all the ways, so well known to this House and to the agriculturists of Canada, in which that department has assisted in the growth and development of agriculture. So that this government, through its various departments, is to be credited with the fact that the people of Canada, in their various callings, are so prosperous as they are known to be to-day. I have a great many statistics showing that the products of the farm have increased enormously in value; but I will not tire the House by reading them. They are in the blue-books, and may be seen by everybody. The Minister of the Interior, in his immigration policy, has pursued the policy of preserving this as a white man's country and of holding the public lands for the settlers.

The manner in which the Finance Minister presents the finances and deals with them is a subject of congratulation by all of us. And I am sure, accepting each of these departments as a great business department, I can with confidence ask you to come to a conclusion the exact opposite of that propounded by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) the other evening when he said that this is not a business administration. I am glad to believe that on the record they have shown themselves to be a business administration, and I am glad to know that by the business community, the wage-earning community, the farming community, the banking community, the government is looked to with confidence in presenting its policies, because it is known to be a business government. Now, I would like, for a moment, to refer to one other department of government, that of Trade and Commerce. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) who preceded me, asked how Canada's prosperity was to be accounted for? It is to be accounted for in part by the opening up of new markets for the products of Canada. That sort of thing has gone on and has grown with the growth of the government from 1896 to this hour.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member (Mr. Fowke) tell us what new markets have been opened up?

Mr. FOWKE. I will. In 1896, this country had only one trade commissioner to represent its interests abroad, and that commissioner was ten thousand miles away in the antipodes where there was comparatively little opportunity for trade and commerce with Canada to develop. Since then, eighteen trade commissioners have been appointed and are now engaged in their several fields, in Australla, British West Indies, China, Cuba, France, Holland, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, South Africa, Norway and the United Kingdom. It affords me pleasure to say that I have read correspondence with the department from interested manufacturers in this country, which any member of this House has equal opportunity to see, pointing to the fact that the information given to them through the department by the trade commissioners in the various countries has been beneficial in a very large degree indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not we have these markets before?

Mr. FOWKE. We had not learned to cultivate these markets before. We are cultivating them now, and I have no doubt that because of the having our trade commissioner in Mexico, the fact that they had last year a small crop of barley has led to our exporting large quantities of that cereal at paying prices from the province of Ontario to that country. Such facts being brought to the attention of the department, and the department in turn directing the attention of the business community of Canada to these facts, is helping to extend and enlarge the trade and commerce of the country in a way alike creditable to the government and profitable to the people engaged in it.

There is another department of which I have not spoken, and yet I wish to speak of it because it is a department, I believe, whose operation will be of special advantage to a very large section of the Canadian community. I wish to commend the government for the creating of the new portfolio, that of Labour, and for the appointment of Mr. King to that portfolio. There has been a great deal of talk in the past about sympathy with the wage-earners, but until the present government came into power very little had been done in a practical way to manifest sincere regard for the benefit and advantage of that class. The wage-earners are beginning to appreciate the fact that the government has manifested its interest in them in a very fitting and practical way, and that it will see to it in the future that the interests of labour

are fairly and honestly guarded, that the wage-earner shall be entitled to feel that his interests are as sacred as those of any other person of the community and that no opportunity will be given to any one to trespass upon his rights and privileges. And I am very glad to know, in this connection, that the annuities established under the Trade and Commerce Department, and with which the members of this House are more or less familiar, have been planned so that the poor man can make an investment of his savings which will be absolutely secure and profitable to him as well. I am glad to know that so fully are the wage-earners and others of the country taking advantage of the Annuities Branch of the government that no less than $340,000 has been received in premiums in that connection.

If I were to attempt further to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) I should point out that the government are helping forward agriculture and other interests of the county by means of shipping subsidies and in other ways too numerous now to mention. I shall not trespass upon the attention of the House, nor attempt to present the case more fully than I have already done. But there is one other particular in which, with your consent, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say we are constantly reminded that we are living in a new era in this country since 1896. I am glad to be able to point out the fact that the government of the day are builders up of the Dominion of Canada and of all its varied interests so far as a government is able to further those interests. But, in my judgment, there is no more striking evidence of this result than the appreciation of it in the old land as never before, as it is being appreciated by the Canadian people as never before. Is it not the fact that the Canadian people have just begun to know their standing in a national sense? I am glad to realize that under the First Minister of the day a national sentiment has been formed in the Dominion of Canada, and that its evidences are to be seen from sea to sea, and from the region of the North Pole to the international boundary in the south. And I think it is important that we note the fact of the creation and prevalence of the national spirit. I hold in my hand a brief excerpt from a speech made by that great cosmopolite, Andrew Carnegie. I want to show how a gentleman of his standing can speak of the Canadian people and to leave it with you, with you whether we may not at all suitable times emphasize the fact that Canada is a nation. Mr. Carnegie, in an address on a remarkable occasion in New York, said:

Who made the American nation? A little more than a century ago who was the American? A puny, miserable colonist, a dependent of another nation. He was nothing higher, nothing better than a Canadian, a man without a country and therefore little of a man.

I as a native born Canadian rejoice in the fact that no man is longer entitled to speak of this country as a mere colony of Great Britain. I rejoice that we can to-day proclaim that we are one of the five nations which, with the British Isles, go to make up the most magnificent empire the world has ever seen. Sir, that spirit regarding us did not exist prior to 1896 in Great Britain, nor did we possess it to any such extent in this country as we possess it to-day. Not many years ago British statesmen were willing to say : We will let the colonies go and one distinguished English statesman is even credited with saying that the colonies are as a weight about the neck of the mother country, dragging her down to sorrow and to woe. To-day what do you find? You find the British statesmen outvying each other in speaking of Canada as she deserves to be spoken of, and, as I have already said, you find the Canadian people of every name and of every nationality to-day rejoicing in the fact that we are a united people and that we are a nation. No longer do we speak of the French Canadian, the Irish Canadian, the Dutch Canadian—we no longer write Canadian with a hyphen. But no matter who we are or where we come from, standing on the free soil of Canada, facing the future as we do and rejoicing in the present as we have a right to do, we proclaim the fact that we are a nation in the true sense of the term and that we intend to live the life of a nation, of a nation of free institutions, of large hopes and of noble aspirations.

I hope I have answered, in a way at any rate, the statement of the hon. gentleman who preceded me and that I have shown that one may with considerable pride and satisfaction stand in his place in this House and voice these sentiments as a supporter of the right. hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the government who have so successfully guided the destinies of this Dominion for the last 13 or 14 years and in whom to-day we rejoice as a government which present to this country not only a budget such as that which came to us on Tuesday last, but a policy which continues to make for the greatness and grandeur of the Dominion of Canada and for a closer association with the mother country for a larger place on behalf of this country in the affairs of the great continent of which we form a part, and of the empire to which we are so proud to belong.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman will pardon me if in what I have to say I do not follow his line of argument; I have

another subject which I prefer to discuss. But should I care to be reminiscent I think I could safely recall an instance in my boyhood when I knew a man who on his own account and of his own notion undertook to preach the doctrine of protection in this country and who when he did that was not only derided but even despised. and that I, his son, have come to an age when, as a member of this House, I have seen, as I see this afternoon, both of the great parties of this country striving one with the other as to which is doing the most toward building up the industries of this country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have waited now for a long time to express my views in regard to the naval defence programme of the government. I waited last session for a good many days for some kind of tangible expression of that policy, and for a number of days this session I have waited for some tangible expression of that policy, and apparently we have got it in this budget speech. It may be that it is the policy, not only of the government, but of the whole House, because I am told that it is to be on the lines of the resolution that was unanimously carried in this House last March; so I suppose we have now got a tangible expression of their policy in the budget speech. Now, when the question of war is concerned, even when the question of defence is concerned, while sentiment has a great deal to do with it, the financial programme is everything. But in this matter of naval defence, whatever may have been the expression from a sentimental point of view, the Canadian people, the world at large, will view our naval defence policy as it is expressed in the budget statement, and a budget statement that deals with war, or even if it only deals with defence, if it has not something preponderating in it, something out of the usual, is not very much of a programme, and that is the opinion I have been forced to form in regard to the naval defence programme of the government as outlined by the Minister of Finance. All he said in the budget speech which he made the other day was that this government intended, out of the curernt revenue of the country, this year and succeeding years, to carry out their policy with regard to naval defence. There was to be no extraordinary financial arrangement, there were to be no loans incurred for the purpose of carrying out the naval defence of the country jointly with the empire, but the government intended, out of the ordinary revenues of the country, to provide a sum sufficient for the establishment of a Canadian navy. Now, that to my mind is altogether insufficient, it is not what this country ought to do, it is not what the Canadian people expect this government to do for naval defence. Let me read just what is that programme which is to be realized, as the Minister of Finance says, by an ordinary appropriation out of the ordinary revenues of the country:

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

Now, I say that if that programme is to be realized by an ordinary grant towards the establishment of a Canadian navy, it is not what this country is bound by its duty to do, and it is not what the people of this country expect parliament and expect the government to do in that matter. If the House will pardon me for a moment, I would like to refer to a statement I made in this House not so long ago, following the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, a statement wherein I tried to show that Canada was an essential, an integral part of the British empire. The right hon. gentleman put it in his way by saying that we were not only Canadians, but we were British; I put it in somewhat another way by reading from the constitutional Act of this country, namely, the British North America Act, wherein it was declared that the parliament of Great Britain created this Dominion of Canada, that the Queen was the head of it, that the Governor-General represented the Queen, and that the oath we all took, whether in connection with legislation or defence, was one of loyalty to the empire, and that we were in every sense of the term an integral part of the empire. From that I drew the conclusion that if we were of the empire and under the British Crown as intimately as we are, and that if we were British as well as Canadians, then it was our duty to do something substantial in connection with the defence of that empire and its Crown. Now, what is it we were asked to do? We were asked to do something, and I propose to read one or two sentences from the proceedings of the last imperial conference in relation to that matter. The British government was represented by Lord Tweedmouth, who was first lord of the Admiralty, and in addressing the conference he said:

> We welcome you, and we ask you to take some leading part in making more complete than it is at present the naval defence of the empire. . . . The only reservation that the

admiralty desire to make is, that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist attack and to defend the empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the Dominions beyond the seas. We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence. We want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time, if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

Now, there was a distinct invitation to the Canadian government, to all the associated states of the empire, to join in the defence of the empire. We were implored by the mother, it was the call of a mother to her children, to her sons and daughters, to these new states which have sprung from her loins, it was an invitation to join her in the defence of the empire. It was not merely a statement that you can do so and so if you like, or you need not do anything. There was a direct invitation on the responsibility of the British government to Canada, to Australia, to New Zealand, to South Africa, to all the conferees in that conference to join the mother country in the defence of the empire. That being the case, I say we are bound to give a better answer to that invitation than the proposal that is contained in the resolution which was passed here last session, notwithstanding the fact that it was said to be the unanimous opinion of this House, and is to be the policy of this government and of this House in answer to that invitation. Not only in this official invitation have we been invited to join in the defence of the empire, but there have come friends and kinsmen of ours from across the sea to visit us. One after the other they have come here, some in an official and some in an unofficial capacity. English papers have come here, English opinion has been expressed and in hundreds of ways outside of the official invitation that was given at the conference we have been asked to join in the defence of the empire. People have been looking to Canada all the world over to see what our action is to be not only in regard to the invitation that came from the British government but in regard to the invitation which has been given to us by so many who have visited us and by the English press and speakers on English platforms. So important is this question of naval defence that the budget which has caused so much trouble in England, is, to my mind, a naval defence budget. It is an effort on the part of the government there to provide for naval defence. It is an effort to raise money for naval defence. The government of the day in England have embarked on an enlarged programme of naval defence and expensive shipbuilding and in order to carry that out they have a budget which is a revenue producing budget based on the idea that the land of the country should pay a greater amount in taxes than it has paid in the past. And they believe that this additional tax should be, in a measure, used for carrying out the naval defence scheme of the home government. Not only that, but the budget programme of the Conservative party there—and this is the question before the English people to-day—is also a naval defence programme. They propose to reform the tariff so as to produce more revenue and in that way to increase the ability of the country to provide for naval defence. England to-day is busy with her naval defence. The government of the day have staked all on a programme of social reform and also on a programme that involves an increased revenue for the country. They have staked everything on that programme which means an increased revenue for naval defence; and the Conservatives in England are risking everything in the struggle for a programme which they declare means tariff reform, therefore, increased revenue and, therefore, increased ability to carry on the defence of the country and to provide for a greater navy. That is the condition in England and that condition is brought about by the fact that the whole country sees the peril ahead. It is no nightmare that the people have when they believe that England's naval supremacy is in danger of being lost. So the whole people of England, whether of the dominant party or the party that seeks ascendancy, are engaged in a great struggle, one with one programme, one with the other, the object of both programmes being, each in its own way, to increase the revenue of the country so that they can provide for naval defence and so that they can maintain what we ought to be glad to join in maintaining—the idea of British supremacy at sea, that Britannia still rules the waves and that she intends to do so. If this is the programme of the mother country and if the mother country has invited us to join in naval defence, I ask is the programme, as outlined by the Minister of Finance in his statement this week, in line with the duty of Canada, or is it in line with the expectation of the people? All that is proposed, as far as I can read it, and I do not think I misstate the minister's position, is that, out of the ordinary revenues of the country, at a time of great emergency, at a time when the empire is in peril, there shall be taken a sum of money each year for the foundation of a Canadian navy.

My contention is that that does not meet

the case, that it is not consonant with our duty to the empire, and that it is not consonant with what this country is able to do. We are a rich country. Why, when I heard the Minister of Finance state the figures the other day I was surprised at his hopefulness in regard to the buoyancy of our revenue. We are a rich country. We are a growing country. We know the great peril at our doors, and when we look at the peril to the empire I say that we are not doing our duty and that the statement of the Minister of Finance, which I suppose he made as representing the government, does not go as far as it ought to go towards realizing the views of the people in connection with naval defence.

What is it that we can do in this hour of peril? What is it that Canada ought to do at this time when the naval supremacy of the empire is at stake? We should, first of all, declare by a unanimous resolution in the most direct and pointed language, that we are of the empire, that we are glad to be of the empire, that we are behind the mother country in her hour of peril, that the resources of this country are ready to be spent generously in the maintenance of the naval integrity and supremacy of the empire and we should not only say it in words but say it in deeds and say it by a vote of money—say here, at least, is $10,000,000, or $20,000,000 of the people's money for the immediate construction of one, at least, or two super-Dreadnoughts. We will not be able to do that by the establishment of a navy of the modest pretensions that have been proposed by the Minister of Finance. If we wish to stand by the empire we must do it now. The peril may be now and to wait for years to establish a navy will do nothing to relieve the situation, will do nothing to show that we really are not only Canadian but that we are prepared now to accept our empire responsibilities. If this is our duty, and I believe it is our duty, not only to declare we are of the empire but that our money is freely at the disposal of our mother country towards increasing her supremacy and her line of Dreadnoughts, we ought to do it generously and we ought to do it now. The programme of the Finance Minister certainly does not do that. How would England be thrilled, how would the associated states of the empire be thrilled to-day if the statement came from this House that we had adopted such a measure as a recognition of our duty? It would thrill the mother country, it would give a warning to those other nations that are, to my mind, seeking to destroy British supremacy at sea.

Is there anything else we can do? Yes, there is something else we can do and we ought to do it now. What is that? Canada not only ought to declare and declare now that she is of the empire and prepared to give generously of her money for the increase of the fleet of Dreadnoughts, but she ought to say she is prepared to join the associated states in the establishment of a tariff against the produce of foreign nations, a certain percentage of the receipts of such tariff to be applied to a joint system of naval defence. It is in the air. This country, wherever you go, is ringing with this idea of preferential trade and it is in favour of giving some kind of preference. Hon. gentlemen opposite are on record, and it is to their credit and honour, let it be said, they were the first to do it. But it can go much farther. The thing can be made reciprocal and if we could set the example I say it would be the right thing to do. We should do it now and try to begin the realization of this idea not only of reciprocal trade arrangement but the idea that we are prepared to join with the other states of the empire in imposing a tariff on the products of foreign countries, a percentage of the revenue from such tariff to be set apart and devoted to a scheme of joint naval defence. The programme that I have outlined will not interfere in any way with our idea of having a Canadian navy. I am a Canadian; I want to see Canada complete in every one of the forms of nationhood; I want to see a Canadian navy; I want to see a great ship-building industry in this country; I want to see great docks in this country; I want to see this country building warships, if necessary. If we are to have them, we ought to build them here, and a policy of that kind is in the air and seems to be in the minds of the government. We do not interfere with that policy if we contribute our just share to the building of Dreadnoughts. That will come. But we in this country have been devoted mainly to the development of our country. We have not been seamen in the sense of a fighting navy. It takes a long time to develop a fighting navy, men who are masters of the art of war at sea. The mother country is competent in that respect. She has the shipyards and the men; all she wants is more ships and more men, and she can get them, but she will get them all the sooner if we show our devotion by giving the money rather than by saying that we think well of the old country and are willing to join, if necessary, in her defence. We must show our devotion in deeds, not words; in dollars, not sentiments; and we must do it now and not in the future, when the opportunity to save the situation has gone by for ever. The people of Canada are British; they are patriotic; they are prepared to do their just share in anything. They are not parsimonious. They know that British institutions are worth preserving, and Brit-

ish institutions to-day are jeopardized and British supremacy at sea is jeopardized. If that be the case, and if we are proud of our institutions, and I believe we are; if we are proud of our parliamentary institutions and our liberties, which we have derived from Great Britain, we have them by reason of British connection and because the strong arm of Britain is behind them. If that peril is on, it is our duty to join in the maintenance of these institutions. Our greatest asset to-day as Canadians is, first of all, our liberty; second, our parliamentary institutions, our free government. The greatest asset of the world at large to-day is British supremacy at sea; and these two things—Canadian liberty and Canadian institutions and British connection, are altogether dependent at the present moment on British supremacy at sea. Canadians recognize this, and if the appeal is made to them, that they should join in maintaining the naval defence of the country, they will respond as one man, and no government need be afraid to give freely and generously, to pledge the credit of the country, for the maintenance of British supremacy at sea at a time when that supremacy is threatened; and we know that if that threat is realized, these British institutions and this liberty of ours will suffer, this British connection of which we are so proud will disappear, and the mother country and the daughter states will pass into a secondary position in the world. The proposal I have made gives plenty of time to carry out the idea of a Canadian navy. Nothing is lost, but the situation is saved probably, and we get the credit, as the other nations will get the credit, of joining with the motherland in defending those institutions, and in maintaining those forms of goverment which we esteem so much. We not only ought to be prompt in doing this, but above all we ought to avoid imposing conditions in what we do. That is the danger of the situation. Some of us say that we not only ought to have a Canadian navy, but that its control ought to be absolutely in Canada.

Now, I cannot agree with that. If there is a policy of naval defence, it must be one of joint naval defence, and it must be by concessions on the part of every one joining in it. British supremacy hereafter is not to be maintained by the various British states working together with each one imposing conditions, but it is to be maintained by concessions all round, by a generous acceptance of the idea that naval strategy and leadership at present is in the motherland and that we are willing and glad to have it there. I altogether disagree with the idea of imposing conditions and making any Canadian naval movement separate and apart from the British movement or that of any of the other states. It must be a movement of unity, a movement of concessions, and not a discord of conditions imposed by one or another. It must be a unity on the line of concessions, and the leadership must be in the motherland. I say again that I will give way to no man in asserting my Canadianism. I am willing, and the people of this country, I take it, are not only willing to give generously for building Dreadnoughts or super-Dreadnoughts, but are willing to impose some kind of taxation for joint naval defence, and are willing for the present that leadership should be in the mother country, which, by long usage, by the traditions of her people and by her record at sea, is best fitted to maintain it. I read in the newspapers that the western farmer objects to being taxed for Canada assisting in the maintenance of British naval supremacy. I do not think that is so. I think that when the western farmer comes to see that British naval supremacy means for him the English market, that it may mean in a very short time a preference for the products of the western plains in the British market, he will be prepared—I believe to-day he is prepared—when he understands the question, to vote liberally for this purpose. But he has to be educated in the matter, and we who are in public life and sit in this House have a duty of leadership imposed upon us. It is for us, if what we say in this House and if the resolutions we have passed mean anything, to go to the people and tell them what we think they ought to do and try to persuade them to do it. I know there will be no trouble in the province of Ontario. There is no trouble in my own constituency. I do not believe there is any trouble in the west or in the province of Quebec or in the maritime provinces. Premier Gouin, in Toronto, yesterday, came out as boldly as an man in this country as an imperialist, a Canadian, a Britisher, saying on behalf of the people of Quebec that they are prepared to assume their part in the maintenance of British supremacy.

From one sea to the other, from the north to the south, that is the feeling of the people of Canada. All that is wanted is intelligent leadership, all that is wanted is a clear-cut declaration which the people can give their assent to, and once that declaration is made the parliament of Canada will be doing its duty and doing what the country expects from it, if it acts promptly. The only democracy in the world to-day is the democracy of England and her daughter states; the only democracy in the world to-day is to be found under the British flag; democracy is a true British institution and it is an institution worth defending. To-day Great Britain is in one of the greatest political crises in her history, but through the flexibility of her political in-

stitutions it will all be over in two months and the issue decided. There is no legislative assembly in the world that can compare in democracy to the House of Commons of England, and labour is represented there as in no other parliament. In New Zealand, in Australia and in Canada we have the only genuine examples of democracy. They boast of their republican institutions in the United States, but to-day the United States Senate has arrogated to itself all the political power in the land and it defies reform, while the House of Lords in England on the other hand has even of itself proposed reform. In the United States they have a plutocracy of wealth and although there is a theoretical democracy which says that one man's vote is as good as another man's, democracy has in reality disappeared and the banking institutions, and the railways, and the great trusts that control the supplies of oil and beef and coal are a ruling plutocracy there. Another reason why the people of Canada should be prepared to maintain British democracy in its entirety is because of its beneficial influence upon the world at large. If these British institutions are so valuable to the human race, if they constitute the best form of government, then enjoying them as we do we ought to be prepared to maintain them and the best way to maintain them is in my belief by a liberal money grant. Let us be prepared in this time of peril to take our stand by British institutions; let us declare that we are ready to do our share and ready to do it now, and let us not be led away from that idea by a mere proposal to start to build a navy which would take some years to accomplish. Let us, if you will, go on with a navy, but in the meantime let us do our duty and let it be done in the shape of a generous gift for the defence of the empire. The Prime Minister may be afraid of a bold proposition of this kind, and perhaps he may have to be led into it, but there was a time when, on his return from Chicago, he was afraid to send troops to defend the empire in South Africa, an idea which the country was glad he abandoned. And as he changed his views on that occasion, and as, when he declared for the defence of British rights in South Africa, and gave a good effect to his declaration, so in this case I believe he will come to the idea that Canada should contribute and contribute without delay. The right hon. gentleman can afford to lead this country in that matter, and I believe ere long he will go to the length of saying that Canadians are prepared to give a Dreadnought or two Dreadnoughts. Is the Minister of Finance prepared to give a Dreadnought? I am sure he is, and I am sure his province is prepared to give a Dreadnought and two if necessary. I am sure that every minister in that cabinet, if he reads his own heart and the hearts of his people, will declare in favour of coming out with a bold policy. The right hon. the Prime Minister has told us that he is prepared to stump the province of Quebec in support of a Canadian navy. Let him say that he is prepared to stump the province of Quebec in support of Canada building one or two Dreadnoughts and I will go with him, and I trust he will come to Ontario in return and help me to stump that province on the same ground. I believe that Canada is prepared to join in the defence of the empire on the lines I have suggested to-night, and no man in this parliament need be afraid to embark on such a policy. The Canadian people are patriotic, they are wealthy, they are generous, they are true to their institutions, they are prepared to maintain them. Let us give effect to the spirit of the people of Canada, let us not delay by long discussions, let us act now and act unanimously. I trust that before the holidays are over the government will complete their naval policy and that it shall be crowned with a determination that they shall propose to this House the making of a generous grant for the building of two Dreadnoughts, and when that proposal is made I believe this parliament will declare that Canada is of the empire and means to stand to the empire, and that we are ready if necessary to join in some system of taxation on foreign goods, a portion of which taxation shall be applied to a scheme of joint naval defence. Let this parliament send the message to the mother country and to the people of the sister states, that, believing as we do that British supremacy is the greatest asset the world has to-day, we are prepared to join in maintaining British naval supremacy in all its past glory.

Mr. J. R. STRATTON (Peterborough). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to join with others who have spoken on this side of the House in congratulating the Minister of Finance upon the splendid budget he has presented to the people of Canada. I believe that in the statement presented, if I may be allowed to use a general expression, honours are even; I believe that Canada is proud of her Finance Minister and I believe that the Finance Minister should be proud of his national constituency. The condition of the country being as my hon. friend the Finance Minister has presented it, we are in the most flourishing and happy condition, a condition which has continued practically from the time this administration took office in 1896. I think my friends opposite are rather retroactive in the speeches they have been delivering during the present session; I believe that there has been a tendency on their part to discuss reminiscences, matters that were settled in the

general election of 1908. And the worst sinner of them all was my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the former Finance Minister of Canada. We have been told, for instance—and what individual is there of any consequence or importance in Canada who does not know?—that the Quebec bridge dropped into the river. Who does not know that that was a matter of distressing loss of life and of serious financial loss to Canada as well? But do hon. members opposite think for a moment that the people of this country believe that the government were responsible? Do the people believe that the government neglected any part of their duty in accepting the opinions of the engineers who were appointed by them to take charge of the work after most careful precautions to be assured of their reliability and responsibility? But, that the engineers made a mistake, that the bridge would not carry its own weight, this country is aware, and we here are aware. But I do think that has passed away and that there is no necessity of taking up the time of this House in discussing a matter that has been settled in the general election of not long ago.

There is a true test of this government, and that is its administration of the country's affairs. If we can judge by the results we have seen during the past thirteen years, there is no reason to complain of the advance that has been made in that time by 'this Canada of ours.' I desire for a moment or two, to present to the House a few facts to show the progress which has been made. The first essential to the development of the country is population. If we consider the facts, we shall find a decided advance in that direction. In 1896, Canada had a population of 5,086,061. Taking the figures of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) given the other day, the population of Canada at the present time is 7,184,000, an increase in thirteen years of 2,097,945, as against an increase during the twenty-nine years when hon. gentlemen opposite had control of the destinies of Canada, of 1,714,067. And, if we accept the economic computation that each additional citizen is worth $1,000, we find that the wealth, the producing capital, of the country has been increased to the extent of over $2,000,000,000. Another criterion of the prosperity of the country is to be found in the business of our chartered banks. The stock in our banks in 1896 amounted to $62,498,183, and in 1909 to $97,436,424, an increase in thirteen years of $35,938,241, not taking into calculation the great increase in market value of the stock or the reserves created by each of the banks. During the last thirteen years of the model regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, from 1883 to 1896, there was only the paltry increase of $1,093,629. But as soon as the people of Canada had their eyes opened to the true condition of affairs and accepted the administration we now have in power things improved, and they have been going right along ever since until we have the conditions represented by the budget presented by the Minister of Finance the other day. Still keeping my fingers for a moment on the financial pulse, I find that the savings bank deposits have increased from $61,244,761 in 1896 to $89,384,146 in 1909, a difference of practically $30,000,000. So you will see that there is money in the banks for all purposes yet. If we consider the total bank deposits, we find that in 1896 these amounted to $245,020,143, and in 1909 to $771,043,090, a difference of over $500,000,000 in the total bank deposits of this contry, brought about by the efficient administration of affairs during this period.

Mr. LALOR. I would remind the hon. member (Mr. Stratton) that he has forgotten to tell us that the trees have grown also.

Mr. STRATTON. We will come to that later on. Another way we have of showing the progress of our country is in the post office receipts. In 1896, the post office receipts of this country amounted to $2,964,014; in 1909, these had increased to $7,401,624. In 1896, hon. gentlemen opposite had a deficit on account of post office of $700,000. From 1896 to 1906, a period of thirteen years, there have been surpluses totalling $4,500,000, besides a vastly better service and postal rates cut by fifty per cent. So it will be seen that there has been activity, prosperity and increase in the business world of Canada.

The postal activity is another index of the advance in the business of the country. The number of money orders issued in 1896 and in 1909 and their value were as follows:

Year.	Number.	Value.
1896..	1,131,152	$13,081,861
1909..	3,596,290	52,627,770

While the number of orders increased by three times their value increased four times.

Another index of national progress is the increase of the railway mileage. The figures of railway mileage in Canada are:

1896..	16,270 miles.
1909..	25,000 "

In the Liberal 13 years, 10,000 miles of railway were constructed and in the 13 years of Conservative administration, 6,000 miles.

Another method of gauging our national progress is to examine the figures of our mineral development. The mineral production of Canada has been:

1896..	$22,474,256
1908..	86,462,723

In these four or five instances that I have given you in order to be brief, I think I have shown that Canada has been making great progress and advancement. I desire, however, to give the hon. gentlemen opposite credit for one feature in which they excelled, that was for the number of commercial failures that took place in Canada during their regime. The number of commercial failures and the amounts involved were

Year.	Number of Failures.	Amount Involved.
1896..	2,118	$17,000,000
1908..	1,640	15,000,000

As our friends in the House well know 1908, was a year of extreme financial difficulty. If you take the year previous, 1907, the failures in Canada were only 1,278, of a very much less value. We know what stringency there was in 1908 and the extreme condition that prevailed in that period, and there is no doubt that many of these failures would not have taken place if the general financial conditions had been different. In the 13 years of Liberal administration the commercial failures have decreased year by year while during the Conservative regime they increased year by year until in 1896 they were the largest in the history of Canada

Another means of showing that our country is not going behind, is not increasing its expenditure beyond what it can bear, is by comparison with other countries similarly situated. According to the statements of the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the public debt of Canada amounted to $324,000,000 or $325,000,000 in round figures; our population amounted to 7,184,000 so that the public debt amounted to $45.33 per head. In Australia we find that they have a debt of $1,200,000,000 and a population under 4,000,000. They have no canals to construct but it is fair to state that they have built and own their own railways. But we have a railway commission, one of the greatest legal reforms that ever took place in Canada. We have recently added to the jurisdiction of that commission, the telegraphs and telephones and although we do not own the railways, telegraphs and telephones, I think we are in a better position by placing them under the control of the Railway Commission and if the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) still thinks that our policy is not sufficiently advanced to meet his views, I think he will agree that the advancement made in this direction has been one of the greatest advances, one of the greatest acts that this parliament has accomplished since confederation and that the people are reaping the advantage of having their claims and difficulties righted immediately on application to the Railway Commission, in a business-like and common sense way. It is satisfactory and effective legislation and the people are enjoying the advantage of it. In Australia, as I said begore, they have $1,200,000,000 of debt with a population under 4,000,000 or over $300 per head. Take little New Zealand with their million people and their £9,000,000 of revenue and their per capita debt of over $300 with their $300,000,000 indebtedness. That colony is offering Dreadnoughts as a man would offer a cigar to a friend. They seem to have, to use a common expression, 'money to burn' and they are offering Dreadnoughts to an empire that is able to turn out Dreadnoughts as fast as our friend Eddy in Hull would turn out bundles of laths or bundles of shingles. I do not desire to discuss that aspect of the case at present but I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that although Canada is increasing its indebtedness we have absolute value for the money expended and our per capita debt is nothing like so great as that of any other country similarly situated. Another great and favourable advance that has been made in Canada is in the revenue as it was explained by the minister in his budget speech the other day. The revenue in 1896 amounted to about $37,000,000 and it has increased until I suppose I might say in round figures it is $100,000,000. The tangible results of this improvement are seen in a score of ways. One of the great advantages flowing from the rearrangement of the affairs of this country has been the great fostering of the agricultural industry, the spread of agricultural knowledge from end to end of Canada, the improved marketing facilities that have been provided to enable the farmer to get his products to market more easily, rapidly, satisfactorily and cheaply. Another industry that has received great assistance from parliament has been the iron and steel industry of the whole country. We have had an expansion of trade, we have had to provide public buildings and public conveniences for the people, we have had to strengthen our domestic defence.

We have improvement in our postal facilities, in the cheapening of the rates, and we have improvement in inter-imperial communication between Canada and England. In a word, with the increased revenue we have been laying the foundation for the future progress of this country, a progress which was referred to by a speaker on this side of the house before we adjourned for dinner. It may be accounted a small thing, as he pointed out, that the trade of this country in 1896 amounted to $239,000,000, while last year it amounted to the enormous figure of $650,790,000, an average for the past five years of $540,000,000; and for the year 1909 it was $571,769,000, equivalent to $100 per head on an estimated

population of 6,500,000. If the strings had not been loosened, if there had not been an easing of the conditions that prevailed in 1896, we would not have been able to bring about the expansion of trade we have enjoyed during the past few years. We have now in round figures an annual income of about $100,000,000. The revenue comes, I suppose about two-thirds of it, from customs, and I am satisfied that the expenditure of that income has been made for the general advantage of all the people of Canada, and it corresponds with the commercial activity and the commercial interests of the country. If we did not have this prosperity, if we were not able to supply our luxuries or necessities, I am sure the Customs Department would not have the revenue they have to-day. But with the change of conditions that has taken place since 1896, with the added material means afforded us to supply our necessities and wants, we are able as citizens of Canada, not by drawing blood, as a speaker intimated the other day, from the people of Canada, but we have been able to satisfy our necessities and luxuries while contributing to the revenues of the country the way I have mentioned. So we have, during the last few years, reached the highest revenue in the history of Canada. I say we are to be congratulated upon the extremely satisfactory conditions that the Minister of Finance announced the other day, and I am sure that if the British Chancellor of the Exchequer had been as well able to bridge the gap between income and outgo, between what they have to buy and what they have to spend the Lords would not have sent the ship of state out on the stormy sea, they would have congratulated themselves on the successful position of affairs, they would have approved of the budget, and there would not have been that trouble which the member for South York (Mr. Maclean) complained of this evening. We welcome the increased revenue, because there are certain requirements of Canada, certain needs, that have to be met in order that we may pursue the career of national development upon which we have entered. If we are to realize the prediction of the right hon. the Prime Minister when he said that the twentieth century belonged to Canada, we have some things to do, we must do what is required of us, we must see that we realize that prediction to the full. It may cost a good deal, but it is our opportunity, we have the facilities, we have the resources, and all it needs is that we should put our shoulders to the wheel in order to make the twentieth century the possession of Canada. I am sure the Prime Minister and his colleagues have never shrunk from doing their duty to Canada, I am sure that in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and other public works that I propose to point out, they have taken the full responsibility of their position, they have grasped the great possibilities of this Dominion, and as far as they are concerned, they are bound to procure the greatest possible advantage from the expenditures that are necessary to be made. I think that for a population of 6,000,000 or 6,500,000 in Canada, we have accomplished a great deal, for instance by the expenditure of $100,000,000 upon railways and $100,000,000 upon canals. Canada has achieved a record that cannot be duplicated in the history of any country that I know of. Canada is laying the foundations of a great and prosperous nation. This country is in a far different condition from what it was a dozen years ago. At that time our revenue amounted to $36,000,000 and our annual expenditure to $37,750,000. For my part I do not attach much importance to a deficit of $1,750,000. But in these golden and hopeful days, in these days when money is rolling into the exchequer with such volume, Canadians will not be satisfied, the members of this House will not be satisfied, with conditions of that kind, because we have so much need of money, so much need of development, besides what we have undertaken and besides what we are endeavouring to complete. I have myself a good deal of sympathy for those who endeavoured at that time to make bricks without straw, and I am sure those hon. gentlemen now look with jealousy and envy upon the overflowing treasury of the Finance Minister at the present time. But hon. gentleman complain of the extravagance of this government. Hon. gentlemen mistake the meaning of the word extravagance. They desire to show that wherever this government expends money it is extravagance. No matter for what purpose this government may appropriate money, it is extravagance. If it happens to be in a Liberal constituency, it is a scandal, and the Conservative press cry out that the government are buying up the constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. STRATTON. Yes.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Kent county, New Brunswick?

Mr. STRATTON. I don't know anything about Kent county, New Brunswick, but if an appropriation has been made for Kent county, it was made in the public interest, or it would not have been made. I have no doubt whatever that my hon. friend will have some difficulty in proving the insinuation he has made at the present time. If we receive a reasonable return for the money spent, if we are getting all the people expect from the expenditure, and if necessity requires that the government should

appropriate a sum here and a sum there, if requirements have been more indicated in one constituency of this country than another, if it is necessary to get an appropriation for a public work or a public building, our hon. friends opposite say that it is done for the purpose of bribing the constituency. Yet my hon. friends will apply to the government of the day for grants for their constituencies and they will not find fault when the government makes the appropriation. But it is a scandal when money is appropriated for a constituency represented by a Liberal, and we are charged with attempting to buy up a constituency according to the statement of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. They are speaking, and they continuously speak with reproach to the members of the government because of these expenditures. Well, where have they been able to show that any public expenditure has been undertaken that is not required in the best interests of the country? They have been unable to show that any public building has been constructed that has not been required for public purposes. They may say that the government are extravagant for the time being, but I can remind hon. gentlemen opposite that in the city which I have the honour to represent they erected a post office twenty years ago which is absolutely inadequate to the requirements of the business to-day. They not only built a post office, but they had some trouble over the site which they purchased, and they afterwards, to satisfy the urgent demands of rival members of the Conservative party with corner lots to sell, erected a custom house on another property which the government of the day where forced to purchase for the sake of peace in the family. No doubt hon. gentlemen will say, although this is ancient history, that the government did right at that time in building beyond absolutely necessary present requirements. We have the advantage of the difficulties they created in their own party by not only having a custom house but a post office as well. I mention that to show that while it may look to-day as if the government are spending a larger sum than is necessary on the erection of public buildings. I hope that in twenty years from now there is no part of this fair Dominion that will not outlive any building that the government may erect for public purposes. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will go on in the way in the which he is going and erect buildings that will be in keeping with the advance of the country and that he will not be ashamed to look back twenty years from now upon what he has accomplished and that his judgment will not have been found at fault in having led him to erect buildings that had outlived their usefulness.

Mr. STRATTON.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), if I took his words correctly, said that this government had taken from the pockets of the people $922,000,000, and, after endeavouring to create a misleading impression by an insinuating statement before the people of the country, with one sweep of the hand, he asked: What have they to show for it? Let us take one instance alone. The revenue of the Intercolonial railway, thirteen years ago, amounted to $4,000,000. To-day it amounts to about $10,000,000. That would account for $50,000,000 of expenditure alone. Yet, he asks: What have they done with the money? The money has been spent in the improvement of the rolling stock, in the extension and the renewal of the railway, in increased wages to the employees and in betterments. I would ask if this country has not received full value for the $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 which has been expended upon immigration? Have we not received full value for the work which we have undertaken? I see it stated in a newspaper to-day that 'the farmer, not Fielding' has produced the good times. The man who produced the good times in this country was the man who, thirteen years ago, assumed the full responsibility of the inauguration of a thorough immigration policy. That policy has been of such advantage to Canada that the farmers who have gone to the west have been able to produce the wealth that was spoken of the other day, and it is the man who instituted that immigration policy, who gave to the people of other lands the information which it was absolutely essential to let them have, who distributed broadcast, I suppose upon the doorstep of every farm house in the western United States, pamphlets setting forth the advantages of Canada, to whom must be given the credit in large measure for the prosperity we are enjoying to-day. Farmers came from the United States, two or three at a time, saw the great advantages of the west, and to-day we have them coming in hundreds, yes, in thousands, taking up the lands in the western portion of Canada that have proved so valuable, and it is this immigration that has done so much for our country. We have, I repeat, spent $7,000,000 and $8,000,000 in thirteen years. But hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, only spent sufficient to show us that the money was wasted and that no good return came from it. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary to have money expended in a more effective way. The hon. member for North Toronto endeavoured to point out that the $922,000,000 had been expended improperly, or rather wasted. I have shown that $50,000,000 have been expended in connection with the Intercolonial railway. I have shown that $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 have been expended for immigration and

that Canada is having the full benefit and advantages therefrom, and I have shown that hon. gentlemen opposite only spent about enough to be wasted in the time that they were in power. I would like to ask if he thinks the improvements that have been made in our waterways, in our lighthouses, and in our coast line, not including large expenditures for services of similar usefulness, that have cost large sums of money have not resulted in advantage to the country? Does he think that the expenditure upon the St. Lawrence channel, which has been made almost as safe for navigation as a small mill pond, is not of general advantage to Canada? Was he justified in making the insinuation that he did make? When we see the Montreal harbour, which has been made an ocean port, when we see Montreal rivalling New York as a grain port, when we see the greatest vessels afloat landing their cargoes in the harbour of Montreal, can my hon. friend or any one else say that the expenditure which has been made upon this harbour has not been for the general advantage of Canada and for the improvement of our shipping facilities? Does he say that the money expended on Toronto harbour—from $500,000 to $750,000—is wasted money? He referred the other evening to the St. Andrew's rapids. He would hardly make that speech in Winnipeg; at least I am told that he forget to deliver it when he was in Winnipeg very recently, because we all know that the money that has been expended is of the greatest advantage to the people of Winnipeg and of the tributary district. He pointed to the premier of this country and told him that he was the custodian and president of the board and that the other members of his cabinet were his directors and jointly the custodians of the funds of the people. We know that he is the president of the council and that his colleagues are his directors, and we also know that they are prepared to take the full responsibility of the expenditure they have made. The advantages which the people of this country have derived are greater than the expenditures the government have made. Does my hon. friend say that the $500,000 spent on the western gap of Toronto harbour was money thrown away? If he does, the hon. member for West Toronto will not agree with him. Will my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) say that the money spent on the Trent Valley canal has been wasted?

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. member want an answer?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say that this government has been sorely negligent in not expending the full amount in proper time on that canal. That canal should have been completed long ago. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stratton) would only join me in seeing that the money is expended on the Trent canal instead of on ditches like the Newmarket canal we would accomplish something.

Mr. STRATTON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the last thirteen years in which the Liberal government has had control of the affairs of this country, they have expended more on the construction of the Trent Valley canal than the party which the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) supports expended during the previous forty years. And as to the Newmarket canal I may tell the hon. member that we have not forgotten there was at one time such a thing as a Haggart ditch otherwise called the Tay canal, and I do not know that to-day I would swap the Newmarket canal for the Haggart ditch. Will the hon. member from St. John say that the money proposed to be expended on improving the harbour of St. John is an improper expenditure? Will the Conservative members who come from the west say that the money that is being expended at Fort William and Port Arthur in making these harbours fit for the accommodation of the growing trade of the west is an expenditure in the wrong direction? Will these hon. gentlemen opposite say that the new piers in connection with the Quebec bridge should not be built? Will they say now that the Grand Trunk Pacific which has cost a great deal and is costing a great deal should not be constructed? We knew when it was undertaken that it would cost a great deal of money, but we believed it was the right thing to do for we knew it would be necessary to provide transportation facilities for the vastly increasing products of the western country. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that the subsidies to the different provinces of this Dominion which have increased per year five million dollars, is money wasted? I do not think they will. I see by the papers that the premier of Quebec is consulting with the premier of Ontario to-day, and I would surmise that possibly one subject of their conference is that the provinces should ask more from the Dominion treasury. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that the increased expenditure on the public service, the increased remuneration of employees, is not in the public interest? Will they say that the one and one-half million dollars expended on the militia in the days of the Conservative rule would be a sufficient expenditure on the militia of Canada to-day? My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) knows the condition our military forces were in during the Conservative regime, and he knows that although our militia service is probably not perfect at present, that it is vastly superior to what

it was then. And yet in view of all this the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rises and sets all these things aside with one sweep of the hand and he asks: What has become of the $922,000,000 expended by this government in twelve and three-quarter years? If time permitted, it could be easily shown that it was well expended and easily justified, the insinuation involved was most unfair. Will any man on the other side of the House say that the Minister of Agriculture has made any bad expenditure in giving to the farmers of Canada the advantages which they now enjoy? Will they say that the Minister of Agriculture did wrong in spending money to provide transportation facilities for the products of the farmers, and for enlarging and improving their markets?

Now, I have not asked the Minister of Agriculture for anything, and I may tell him in advance that I do not want anything, and therefore hon. gentlemen will recognize that I am disinterested in any compliment I may pay him. I will take the liberty of telling the right hon. the Prime Minister that if all the ministers in his cabinet have presided over their departments as acceptably to the people as the Minister of Agriculture has presided over his; if they have displayed, as I am sure they have done, the same anxiety for the public welfare as the Minister of Agriculture has displayed for the welfare of the farmers of Canada, if they have conducted the affairs of the country in as progressive a spirit as the Minister of Agriculture has, then the right hon. gentleman has been happy indeed in the choice of his confreres. And, if the government should see its way to increase the expenditure for the benefit of the farmers of Canada, I think I can safely say that we on this side of the House will give any proposal of that kind our warmest support. Now, let me point out that the fisheries of Canada last year gave a return of $25,451,985, and let me ask these gentlemen opposite if they can honestly complain of the money expended to stimulate that great industry? Will these gentlemen opposite say that the money that has been expended on immigration both by the former Minister of the Interior and the present minister is money that has not been well spent? Our friends from the west will tell us that fifteen years ago there were large areas of land as barren as the rocks of Muskoka, and which to-day are as productive as any soil in the world, and that as a result of the policy of this government. Will these gentlemen opposite say that the flower of the American farmers who are leaving their homes to the south of the line and flocking into this country are not welcome citizens of Canada? From 1903 to 1909, 299,603 immigrants came to Canada from the United States, and 700,391 came from all countries. In ten years, from 1898 to 1909, im migrants, cash and effects equivalent to over 200 millions of dollars have come to this country from foreign lands. Is that not a condition of affairs indicating the prosperity which the hon. member for North Toronto could not see about him? Does it not show that the $120,000 spent in 1896 on immigration by the government of that day was only sufficient to be ineffective, whereas in 1907-8, when an immigration policy that was a policy was adopted by the government, $1,074,697 was spent on immigration, and the results have justified the government in adopting an aggressive policy.

We on this side of the House are reproached, and perhaps properly so, for not contributing our fair share towards the defence of the empire, and to remove that reproach the Minister of Finance has placed in the estimates of this year a sum of $3,000,000. Will that be improper use of the public funds? I may again point out to my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) how the militia was starved in 1896. In that year there was spent on the militia a little over $1,136,000. They were not in a satisfactory condition. The annual drill was inefficient; the brigades throughout the country were in anything but a satisfied condition, but when this government came into power, they adopted a different mode of conducting the militia affairs of the country. They increased the expenditure year after year, until last year it amounted to six and half millions of dollars, and we have to-day a force perhaps as efficient as that of any colony or any country. Some time ago both sides of this House decided upon the beginning of a naval expenditure and upon assuming a share of the imperial burden. Last session a naval resolution was adopted unanimously by the House, but some on the opposite side have deserted our ranks. Some of our ships have sprung a leak; some of them have been foundered on the rock of Dreadnoughts, others on the rock of a cash contribution; and one noble barque has completely foundered in the deep water of no navy at all. There must be a divided opinion among the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House with regard to how far they are prepared to go in a naval defence policy.

Mr. NANTEL. On the other side, what is it?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes, on the other side. They seem to be very much exercised about what the government policy will be on this matter. The Minister of Finance stated the other day that an appropriation would be made, and we are about to make a consider-

able expenditure in that direction. But we want our friends on the opposite side of the House, if possible, to have their minds made up to some course that will be loyal and patriotic to the empire, and if they do, we are satisfied that they will support the policy of the government when it is brought down.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He has asked this side of the House to support a policy on the naval question, of which he himself is in favour. Will he be kind enough to state to the House what that policy is, if he knows what it is?

Mr. STRATTON. My hon. friend has before him the resolution of the House which was adopted unanimously last session, and for which he voted; and before he will be asked to vote on any question of policy, a Bill or resolution will be laid before the House by the government, and hon. members will then be asked to support or oppose that.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask my hon. friend to implement what he has just said by stating whether the policy he has been speaking of is contained in that resolution, or whether he refers to something further?

Mr. STRATTON. The policy of the government will be presented at the proper time.

Mr. BOYCE. And yet my hon. friend was in favour of it, although he does not know what it is.

Mr. STRATTON. I said that the policy of the government when introduced would be such that I hoped hon. gentlemen opposite would have their minds settled and would be able to support it. I have never yet found the government of the day asking their supporters to vote blindly for anything.

An hon. MEMBER. They could not do it.

Mr. STRATTON. No, it could not be done. We desire to have some of the money of this country expended in other directions. In the province of Ontario, if I may be allowed to refer to a personal matter, while I was a private member of the local legislature, I made an address on the budget in which I endeavoured to point out to the people of the province that we had a large territory yet undeveloped and unexplored of which the ordinary member of that House and the ordinary citizen of the country knew practically nothing, and I pressed upon the government the desirability of having a development and exploration policy. The government adopted my view, and in the following year, when I was a member of the government, I had the pleasure and privilege of helping to put into force what I had advocated as a private member of the House. We sent about ten exploration parties into what was then known as New Ontario. They returned in the course of a year and reported to the minister that they had discovered a clay belt of about 1,500,000 acres, that they had found pine timber of considerable extent, and great areas of spruce and poplar of immense value as pulp wood to the people of the province.

Then the question arose, how were we going to get into that country? It was decided by the government to build a railway. No one came forward with offers to construct it, and the government of the province undertook the work. This was the first railway constructed by a provincial government in this Dominion, if my memory serves me correctly. In the construction of that railway, the object of which was to reach the clay belt and to bring into consumption the pulp wood of the north country, silver was found;—what is now known as Cobalt was one of the results of the building of that road. Since then, the people have had the advantage of about $29,000,000 taken from the mines of the Cobalt district. And my opinion is, Mr. Speaker, that if we spend a little more money in the development of our country, in the exploration of portions that have not yet been explored, we shall make other finds valuable as these in the province of Ontario. We have pulp-wood in this province that is not now available, we have minerals still undiscovered. We know that the route of the Transcontinental is through the rear portion of Quebec and Ontario, and the reports of the Transcontinental commissioners show that there is a vast quantity of agricultural lands in that region. They tell us that the line from Moncton to Winnipeg is divided into three sections. Section C contains 5,800 square miles, or 3,712,000 acres; section D contains 10,100 square miles, or 6,464,000 acres; section E contains 3,000 square miles, or 1,920,000 acres, a total of 18,900 square miles, or about 12,096,000 acres. And of this sixty per cent is of value as agricultural land. Passing down Sparks street in this city the other day, my attention was attracted by a photograph in a shop window. It was a photograph of a silver nugget of 2,100 pounds weight. It suggested the great wealth which has yet to be uncovered in this new territory of ours. I am hoping to see—and expecting every day to see—that, in the construction of the Transcontinental railway through Quebec there will be discovered mineral wealth equal to or greater than that we enjoy in the province of Ontario. I am hoping that the forest wealth, agricultural wealth and mineral wealth to be made available will be such as to more than ever attract attention to

our great resources. The area in the three sections mentioned from Moncton to Quebec is seven or eight times as large as Prince Edward Island. That is a territory of some importance to the people. And when we consider the great territory now being opened up west of Winnipeg by the Transcontinental, we find that over 200,000,000 acres will be made available for grain-growing. The hon. member for North Toronto stated the other day that in 1900 we had from the west 32,000,000 bushels of grain, in 1907 160,000,000, in 1908, 230,000,000, and in 1909 the crop amounted to 313,000,000 bushels. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to point out that the farmer, not Fielding, had brought these good times. But I would like to ask the hon. member, were he in his seat, who put the farmer in a position to give to Fielding the revenue that gave to the government the opportunity to present the budget we are now discussing? The hon. gentleman says that the increase produced by the farmer is worth $50,000,000 and may be more, and he asks what particular praise and honour are due to the government for that? And I say, the honour is due to the government for their foresight in the administration of our affairs, for adopting a policy when they came into power that has brought about the conditions we see to-day. Praise and honour are due the government for the wise immigration policy they adopted. In 1895-6, we received from Dominion lands $219,326.14. But what did this government receive last year? In 1908-9, our receipts from Dominion lands were $2,175,214.31. In 1900, the product of the west under the government of that day was 32,000,000 bushels. I do not know what it was in 1896; we have no returns to show. But, as I have already said, the crop in 1909 was 313,000,000 bushels. Deduct from this the 32,000,000 bushels produced in 1900, and we find an increase in nine years of 281,000,000 bushels of grain. And if we are able to induce the same influx of population into the west as has been going on—and I hope and believe they will come in far more speedily—we shall be able to demonstrate that which we have said so often, that Canada is the granary of the empire. Hon. members opposite deprecate expenditures; they criticise every appropriation made by the government to carry on the affairs of the country. Well, my experience is that there are no angels in the management of worldly affairs, but I believe the government are doing all they possibly can. They are liable to make mistakes, and the mistakes liable to our common humanity. But, on the other hand, if there are any angels on the other side of the House, they have taken good care to disguise themselves, for I have not found them since I had the honour of knowing them or knowing the way in which the country was being conducted under their regime. There is a provision in the estimates of $3,000,000 to assist in the maintenance of the navy, but that is being proposed by the government. I am not in favour personally of contributing any sum of money by way of cash contribution to the imperial defences. I believe that is against Liberal policy and against Liberal principles. I am opposed to that for two reasons. I believe that no British people should provide money to be expended except under their own supervision, that there should be no taxation to be expended by other people. It violates a broad principle that actuates this government and the people of Canada, and I do not believe that the country would be at all satisfied if a contribution were made by this government to the imperial government for the purpose of building Dreadnoughts.

I attempted to show that we still have in this province great mineral wealth, and that in the development of these now unexplored regions, we will be able to show the people of the world that Canada is as rich in minerals and other valuable natural resources, as we are sometimes fond of stating. We do know that the Cobalt district is the richest district of its character, in the world, and I hope that in the country yet undeveloped there will be opportunities for the uncovering of mineral rocks that have been moss covered and weather beaten for ages and that we will have more than one Cobalt district in this country.

Coming to the administration of our natural resources generally, I believe that we should adopt a policy that will give to our own country, all the development it is possible for it to have, that we should manufacture into the completed state all the iron and steel and pulp wood and nickel that it is possible for us to do in this country. By quoting a figure or two, I will be able to show the House—and I am speaking only for myself and not at all discussing the question of any export duty—what amount of money we are permitting to leave our country by allowing our timber to be exported in the condition it now is. At the same time, I believe that that perhaps can be better regulated in another parliament than this. A cord of pulp wood, whether in the tree or on the wharf, is worth from $2 to $7 a cord. In low grade paper, it is worth from $38 to $45 a ton, and when it is made into high grade paper it is worth $50 to $100 per ton. The quantity of pulp wood exported last year was 794,986 cords of a value of $4,356,391, or about $5.75 a cord. If that were made into paper at $50 per ton it would amount

to $37,749,300, a difference of $33,000,000 in favour of having it manufactured into paper in this country. That would be a ninefold increase. If in the next 10 years we exported 1,000,000 cords at $5.75 that would be $57,500,000. Taking the same quantity manufactured into paper at $50 per ton it would realize $513,750,000, a difference in favour of Canada of $462,250,000. That difference represents the gain between exporting raw products and manufacturing them to their completed condition — the employment of labour and industrial gain in the building and operation of machines.

If we take 1,000 feet board measure of pine lumber and have it cut, it would have a value of about $18 to $20 per thousand feet. The labour in that would represent about $7 or $8. Converted into paper, a similar quantity of pulp wood its value would be about $31.50, the labour being about $12. The proportion of investment would be about $5 in a sawmill to $41 in a pulp mill, so that from the point of view of investment of capital, there is an advantage in favour of the pulp mill of about $36. This will demonstrate to the people of this country that if we adopted a policy of having our pulp wood manufactured into paper,—I do not say for the government to do it, that is not my intenntion or desire—we would benefit our national industries to an extent almost beyond computation, that in allowing raw pulp wood to be exported to other countries we are sacrificing the great advantage it would be to Canada to have it manufactured here. If we allowed to be exported in the next ten years the proportionate quantity equal to the present export, we should only realize fifty-seven and a half million dollars. If we manufactured at home the same quantity of pulp wood into paper at the small value of $7.50 per ton, it would amount in round numbers to five hundred and fourteen millions of dollars. Deducting fifty-seven millions, the value of the raw material, from the gross value of the manufactured article, we have four hundred and sixty-three million to represent the positive gain to Canada by this manufacture of her pulp wood. I desire further to impresse on the House that our chief natural products, such as silver, nickel, iron and steel, steel being in my judgment a raw material, should, where it is at all possible, be converted into the manufactured article within the borders of Canada. I desire to see the equipment of the defensive sea force or, if it is necessary, the offensive sea force, manufactured in this country if it is at all possible. We have in one portion of the province of Ontario to-day, the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company. That company has done and is doing a great deal, and with proper encouragement, might become a stil more important industry. It can build ships for our inland waters and for our seas as well. The hon. member for South York, this afternoon, endeavoured to make, as he usually does in his newspaper, a scoop. He presented to the House a policy which I wish to discuss. It has been said that in the coal fields of the eastern provinces, we have the steel and the coal lying alongside of each other and I think it was Mr. Schwab, President of the United States steel corporation, who said there was coal and iron lying alongside each other in Nova Scotia, sufficient to last for 100 years. We have the same conditions on the Pacific as on the Atlantic, and we have similar conditions in the intermediate portions of Canada. I would like to see the government of the Dominion endeavour to have created in Canada a ship building industry that will give the people of Canada an opportunity of commencing to build their own fleet, their own navy on the soil of Canada.

As we have marked our great Transcontinental railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific with steel rails made in Canada, so I hope we shall have a navy with the same brand upon it, 'Made in Canada.' If this can be done, it would be a very satisfactory state of affairs. We see to-day a great Canadian combination of iron and steel capitalists, perhaps the greatest combination that Canada has ever seen, and yet I believe that combination is for the benefit of the people of this country as well as of those more immediately concerned. I hope that the government will call the attention of those great capitalists to the fact that it is possible to establish the nucleus of a ship building industry in this country that will give to our manufacturing establishments an impetus they never had before. The ship building industry of England was not created in a day; it was like Topsy, it 'jest growed,' it was like the British constitution, it was not created, but it grew. I suppose that Great Britain, if it were necessary, could turn out all the Dreadnoughts that she requires. I am not one of those who fear the downfall of England. I am just as loyal a British subject as any other member of this House, and I have no fears of England's bulwarks falling to pieces, and I have no fears that this Dominion and the other colonies will not do the best they can, and will not go as far as the people of this country desire them to go, in assisting in naval and imperial defence. I am satisfied that when the policy of the government is made known, the country will find that the government has done all that it is their duty to do.

There is one other question I desire to touch upon, and that is the expenditure in connection with Crow's Nest Pass railway. When the hon. member for North Toronto was telling what the government had done,

he forgot to say that this government had expended $3,500,000 in endeavouring to give the railway accommodation that is required in the country traversed by the Crow's Nest Pass railway. If he will turn to the customs receipts, he will find that from the territory served by the Crow's Nest Pass railway the customs receipts have amounted to three times over the cost of that railway, as far as government aid was concerned. I believe this government has done the best they could for the country. Of course they are human, and like every one else they will make mistakes, but I believe they have done the best that could be done. This country is increasing its expenditure, but at the same time it is growing rapidly in wealth, and I think in the main all the expenditure has been justified. I do not know that, having in mind the relations and record of the government in the matter of expenditure of public money for public purposes, I could say anything more suitable in closing than to repeat the remarks made by Sir Charles Tupper at a political meeting in the city from which I come, when he said:

> Although this country is increasing its debt, it is being incurred in the erection of those triumphs of peace—in public works that will stand for ages as the monuments of an energetic people who laid the foundation of Canadian nationality amid the wilds of North America.

I am sure that this utterance of Sir Charles Tupper, made thirteen or fourteen years ago, was justified, and would apply with greatly intensified force to the conditions of to-day under the present administration. I think it is the very general belief throughout Canada that we have never had in the history of this country a government that endeavoured more faithfully to act fairly and squarely by all the provinces, by all the varied interests of this country, than the government which we on this side have the pleasure of supporting.

Mr. ALEXANDER McCALL (Norfolk). It is not my intention to criticise at any length the speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Stratton). The hon. gentleman strove to make it appear that in the great prosperity and development this country has enjoyed in recent years, the Conservative party had done nothing and that it was all due to the Liberal government. He intimated that the increase in population of this country has been due to the Liberal party, assisted by immigration. Does he really think that the Conservatives of this country have done nothing towards building up this country and towards peopling it? For my part I do not wish to be denied the credit of having done something to promote the prosperity of this country, and I am sure that my Conservative constituents also claim credit for having done something to bring about the prosperity which Canada now enjoys. That style of argument in which the hon. gentleman indulged is one well known throughout this country, and has been heard in every schoolhouse during the last eight years. It is just such an argument as one may hear in a corner grocery among politicians who sit around the stove. Sir, I think we have got beyond that, at least in this House and at this day. Now I must make some reference to the claim he and his friends make of having discovered New Ontario. If they discovered New Ontario they were a long time doing it. They were in power since 1873, and only during their last eight years did they make an effort to find out what New Ontario really was. When the Conservative government came into power they found the pulp wood areas parcelled out among a few friends of the government, a country equal to several of the smaller kingdoms of the old world, with an area larger than that of Belgium or Denmark, kingdoms containing a population of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000. These pulp wood areas were divided up and held until the change of affairs came. Then the concession was very promptly cancelled and the pulp wood was put on the market and sold to the highest bidder. The same thing is true with respect to the timber areas. Sales of timber were made in the closing days of the Ross administration in large blocks, townships and areas of 36 square miles at prices which did not exceed one third of the prices obtained by the present government by the method of putting timber up in small parcels and allowing the small jobber or mill man to come in, make his bid and get his limit. I venture to say that there was not a limit sold under the Ross regime that brought over $5 a thousand feet. Sales have since been made under the present regime at $13 per thousand feet, with $2 dues added; so that the reference to the methods that prevail in Ontario is not happy.

Mr. STRATTON. No timber was sold in Ontario under the Mowat government, the Hardy government or the Ross government except by public tender or public auction.

Mr. McCALL. I would ask the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) to say if he knows any thing about the burnt lands along Sturgeon river and if they were not parcelled out among the friends of the party and cut under permits. If I chose to take the time I could cite a number of other instances but I do not know that this really belongs to the discussion.

Reference was made again to the Trent Valley canal. This is an old scarred veteran of many an election campaign and

many an election speech. The hon. gentleman was mistaken in saying that more had been done upon that work since the Liberal party obtained power than had been done in forty years by the other party. But, he will bear me out in saying that the Trent Valley improvement was a provincial work and was carried on as a provincial work until quite recently; so that whatever failures or successes were achieved belong not to the old Conservative party alone. Objections have been taken in this House to the Trent Valley canal, but I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing it further than to say that in the estimates this year we find a very considerable sum provided for expenditure upon the Trent Valley canal, but we find nothing for the branch feeder known as the Newmarket canal. It is not unlikely that this has been hiding behind its big brother and so escaped observation. But, if the Newmarket canal is justifiable, and hon. gentleman say that no part of the expenditure can be pointed out as unwarranted, what is to prevent other towns in that vicinity from seeking the same facilities? Remember that these canals are called feeders. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will appreciate this phrase—feeders. It represents a branch of the farm stock that is allowed access to the trough day and night; so that those communities that get access to the canals or railways of the country may be well termed feeders because they are upon the public treasury and will be as long as time lasts. I dare say that Aurora, Schomberg and other towns near Newmarket will be glad to have the canal extended to their limits. Doubtless applications will be made on the eve of the next election for an expenditure. These people will not be deterred from applying for public money because the distance is too great. They will realize that the longer the canal the greater the expenditure. It is about time we heard some thing about the Georgian bay outlet of the Trent canal. That question has been before the people of North Simcoe and North Ontario for many years, but it will be in order, in about a year, or a year and a half, for engineers to go through there again and set the old farmers guessing whether it is the canal again or whether it is the election.

In discussing the budget, perhaps, like other hon. members, I have found it is a somewhat difficult matter to attempt to master all the details of our fiscal system and I will venture to say that an ordinary member like myself, coming from the common walks of life into this House, feels, to a great extent, that in our tariff and our transportation system there are a great many things that are of such a technical character that he cannot very well master all the questions that he would like to discuss intelligently. I acknowledge my inability to master all these details and I have heard from a great many others that they are in the same position. As this country developes, by the grace of the Liberal party here, not by the efforts of the Conservatives, our tariff will become still more complex. Our transportation problems will become more complex, the social and industrial questions which we have to face will be more pressing and the question has occurred to me if there was not some method by which all these questions that are out of the ordinary character could be discussed by people who had special abilities in that direction. I might venture to suggest to the House a remedy that has occurred to me. If the Liberal party desire to adopt some general scheme of reform would they not apply to the Senate such a reform as would bring into that body talent specially qualified to deal with these more difficult and complex questions? I know that I am trespassing upon dangerous ground. My hands are trembling as I speak upon the subject. I dare not touch it except in this casual way, but would it not be possible to limit the appointment to five, six or seven years and, by a convention between the two parties, make it a condition that the class of men who had made a special study of the problems we have to deal with should be appointed—some of the men who bulk big in the eyes of the people of this country, the big financiers, the big transportation men, and the men who have made a special study of industrial, social and tariff questions that perplex us. These questions could be discussed and threshed out in the upper Chamber and then passed along to this House. In that way we would save a great deal. With reference to our transportation affairs we would save duplication of railways from one end of this country to the other. If we had had the benefit of the advice of such men as Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Mr. Hays, and Mr. McGuigan it would have prevented the duplication of the Intercolonial Railway and the New Brunswick section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, it would possibly have prevented the duplication and paralleling of tracks all through the west. It certainly would prevent two rival canal schemes traversing the country. I do not know that it is worth while for a member on this side of the House to offer a suggestion to the government, but nevertheless I throw this hint out as to one way in which this parliament and future parliaments can deal with these questions as they come up. Now, the tariff is complicated; we have a minimum tariff, and a maximum tariff, and a free list, and a list of articles upon which taxes may be put on or taken off, and we have the British Preference surtax, and we have treaties with several countries, and when the ordinary business man tries to under-

stand all this and to apply it to some fluctuation which may have taken place in the trade of the country he finds it incomprehensible. I think our present tariff could be easily simplified and it would be better for every one concerned if it were. Now, the keynote of this discussion has been the $100,000,000 budget, and I notice that while the Finance Minister did not take credit for securing all of this vast revenue, his friends and supporters seem inclined to make the people believe that it was the policy of the government which brought about this very prosperous fiscal condition. Well, $100,000,000 is a very large sum of money and it is well worth looking after. The complaint is made by the government and by gentlemen who support them that we on this side find fault, and criticise, and rake up old scandals. Well, we represent a large section of the people of this country, and is it to be thought that the Conservatives in this House are to take no part in the discussion of how this money has been raised and how it should be expended. With the evidence before our eyes that a great deal of this money of the people is wasted, are we to sit here dumb and not criticise the government for its extravagance? No; it is our duty to protest, and I would think very little of the members of an opposition who did not protest in view of such facts as we have before our eyes. Surely there is ground for our objecting to the manner in which the Minister of Public Works doles out his favours in public buildings. We have spent a great deal of time this session in trying to find out upon what principle grants of this kind are made by the minister, and I think we must conclude that there is no principle at all unless it be the principle of helping political favourites. We have in the estimates appropriations for buildings in towns with a population of 1,400 and thereabouts, and we know that these towns present no very strong claims for such consideration. It is true that they may be very common place towns before the item appears in the estimates, but the moment the Minister of Public Works decides that he is going to bestow his benevolence upon them he finds abundant reasons. Did he not tell us that Parrsboro, Nova Scotia, is quite a nice town, that Wolfville, Nova Scotia, was a very rising town, and that Fairville, New Brunswick, is a very important town which has mills and factories, as if it were something new to us to hear of a town having a mill and a factory. Did he not tell us that Grand Falls had a fine water-power, and that other towns were beautifully located and had fine residences, and that in consequence of these characteristics they were entitled to a public building. But, there are other towns which have all these qualities and more and which do not get public buildings from the Minister of Public Works. It would seem that the moment the hon. gentleman has decided to grant a sum of money for a building in a certain town he immediately applies his very great abilities to discovering some reason why that town should have a public building, and when the Minister of Public Works gets going in that line he is irresistible. Now, what is the result of all this? A few of my hon. friends around me are expecting public buildings for their towns and these gentlemen are just as meek as possible in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. They are not going to criticise the hon. gentleman while that promise is hanging over them; to use an agricultural expression, they are so tame that they will feed out of his hands. We had an exchange of compliments the other night between the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) pointed out that the town of Aylmer in his constituency had a population of 2,500 and a postal revenue of $6,000, and he pressed his claim modestly but firmly, and the Minister of Public Works complimented him that he was not like some of his colleagues who were disposed to criticise unfairly and he thought he ought to do something for the member for East Elgin. Now, do you think the member for East Elgin will criticise the Minister of Public Works while he is waiting for a public building in Aylmer? Not a bit of it. You will find he will stay quiet the rest of this session until he gets the post office, and the same applies to other gentlemen who are sitting near me. Of course, I can speak boldly so far as I am concerned, for my town has got a post office without any effort on my part. I can hardly believe that it was given solely as a compliment to me, and I rather suspect it was intended to help the other fellow, but be that as it may, we have a public building. Well, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness this is not a proper condition of things. Would it not be far more honest if a rule were established that when a town had a certain population and gave a certain revenue to the Dominion it would be entitled to a public building without any other consideration than that it was in the public interest to erect a building there? This holding out of a public building as a gift from the minister is altogether improper. I can imagine that possibly next summer the Minister of Public Works will go to Ontario, and he will be invited to the good town of Aylmer, and they will call a holiday, and the band will turn out, and the school children will march, and the band will play 'See the Conquering Hero Comes,' and the children will sing 'the Maple Leaf for Ever,' and speeches will be

made by the mayor and by the minister, and figures will be given as to the prosperity of the town and its factories and industries, and its beautiful location will be described and all that, and then the Minister of Public Works will say: You have made your case good and you shall have a post office from me, unless indeed you would prefer a wharf or a bridge, or one of these reversible wharfs that will be a bridge if you want it and a wharf if you prefer to have it so, and if there is no water near the town we will give you a wharf in the open field. I repeat that it would be in the interest of the country, and it would add to our dignity as a people, if the public works were bestowed where they are deserved and not as a bait held out by the minister for political support. I have no doubt that if a rule were established by which when a town arrived at a certain status it would have a public building, my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) would claim it as a right to have two or three buildings erected in his county, but at present I question if he dare even criticise the policy of the government, for if he did he knows what his fate would be.

I say again, it is not dignified for this government to spend the people's money for public services in this manner. I earnestly hope that this will receive the attention of the government, and that next session we shall not have to question and cross-examine the whole night to get a definite answer as to what policy prevails in the distribution of public works, and then not get it. With regard to the expenditure of this $100,000,000, I wish to urge respectfully on those who have the expending of this money that no opportunity for scandal be given, but that the money be expended properly. Matters such as we have had discussed in this House this session and last session should not occur under any system of government. I wish to call attention to the sources from which this money comes; it comes through the custom house and the excise office. It comes from men whose hands are knotted and twisted with their daily toil, from men who are stooped with their labours until they will never see the bright sunlight again in the stature of a man; it comes from men working in mines, the forest and the fields, from men working on a railway section for $1.18 a day; it comes from the factory girls who rise in the morning at six o'clock, go two or three miles to their labour, work all day, and return; it comes also from the wrecked homes and the broken men who have paid their part of the tax through the internal revenue. Is it not, then, fair to say that money gathered from the people, and so much of it gathered through stress and toil, should be regarded as a trust of the most sacred character, and be expended in a way to benefit the people. Bear in mind that about 85 per cent of the people of this country get no other dollars than handmade dollars—dollars which they only obtain by exchanging them for their labour. This fact ought to be of value to those who have the expending of this money. Now, I am not one who is disposed to take a narrow view of this country. I can join with the gentlemen who have spoken in appreciation of the people who came here when this country was in the days of small things, and I claim the right, with all those who are not of the Liberal faith, to be accorded our fair share in its development, and this I believe the people of this country are willing to accord. There are hopeful signs all along the line. The discussion we had a few days ago regarding those who are attacked by the dread disease of consumption, participated in by men on both sides of the House, revealed the brotherhood of the family—the knowledge that was strong in the hearts of the members of this House, and the responsibility of the strong to protect the weak. The same thing was shown by the efforts of the Department of Labour to adjust the differences between capital and labour, giving, I trust, at all times to the man who toils an opportunity to secure his competency and the things that make his life desirable. We are drawing near to the holiday time, when we are going home to express good-will to our friends and all that it means in our lives. Would it not be well for us to part from here determined when we return in the early days of January, to try to conduct the affairs of the country in a worthy and dignified manner. The spirit expressed by the Minister of Finance at the close of his budget speech will rest with me, as I think it will with all the members of this House, when he said that we all must do our parts and acquit ourselves bravely as Canadians should.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, like other gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House, I must extend my congratulations to the Minister of Finance on the splendid financial statement which he has been able to present to this House on this, the fourteenth occasion that he has had the pleasure and privilege of presenting such a statement. I must say that I have been rather surprised at the kind of criticism, if it can be called criticism, which has been directed by hon. members on the other side of the House to the budget speech. I have watched, but watched in vain, for any real criticism of the financial statement for this year. It is true, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did deal to a certain extent with the finances of the country; but if you examine his speech closely, you will find that by far the greater part

of it is taken up in going over the history of the government for the last ten or twelve years, and selecting what he calls scandals. Some of the instances he gave were particularly unfortunate from his own point of view. He said that while in the city of Winnipeg, he had seen St. Andrew's locks, where the government is spending so much money. But when he was in Manitoba, the hon. gentleman did not venture to say anything against the expenditure on the St. Andrew's locks.

Mr. STAPLES. May I inform the hon. gentleman that Mr. Foster did discuss the St. Andrew's locks in a banquet that was given to him in the Royal Alexandra Hotel.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. It is quite possible that the hon. member for North Toronto did discuss the St. Andrew's locks, but I venture to say that he did not say anything in Manitoba against the construction of that work.

Mr. STAPLES. Exactly what he said on the floor of parliament a few days ago.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. The hon. member for North Toronto went farther west, the province of Saskatchewan, and selected for criticism the sale of land to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. If the hon. member had carefully examined everything that has taken place in this country during the past twelve or thirteen years, he could not have selected a more unfortunate instance, from his own point of view, for criticism. Let the best dozen or half dozen Tory orators in the country stump the province of Saskatchewan on the question of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company's land grant, and I venture to say that, if they criticise it, they will not gain a single vote.

What was the contract with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company? I may state for the benefit of hon. members opposite that, though they do not know it, the fact is that when this government came into power in 1896 every odd-numbered section of surveyed land in the Northwest Territories was tied up to some railway company and out of these lands the company had the right to make their selections. Between Regina and Saskatoon there was an area of 3,500,000 acres out of which the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company had the right to select 839,000 acres. Railway engineers and valuators were sent over the land, but the company refused to take it on the ground that it did not fulfil the agreement as it was not land fairly fit for settlement. And in 1902 the railway company had threatened to bring suit to compel the government to set apart another 3,500,000 acres out of which they would have the right to select 839,000 acres. The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company was formed and agreed to buy 839,000 acres out of the odd-numbered sections from the railway company, and they said they wanted also 250,000 acres out of the even-numbered sections. The price that the railway got was $1.65 an acre with no conditions attached. The government agreed to sell to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company 250,000 acres of even numbered sections at $1 an acre, but on condition that the company should settle 32 homesteaders on every township before the grant should be earned. The first year that company brought in more than enough settlers to satisfy the terms of the grant. Further, the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company is the only instance that can be pointed to in which the present government sold any lands to or had any dealings with a colonization company. More than that, I contend that it was the Sasaktchewan Valley Land Company whose work led to the beginning of the tide of American immigration that has continued to come to this Dominion during the past six or eight years. When we look at the history of the late government, we find that it had dealings with 26 colonization companies. I have the names before me, but I will not trouble the House with them. The land set apart for the benefit of these companies made a total of 2,842,742 acres The companies chose from this 1,421,371 acres. And how many immigrants did they take into the territories? Only 1,243. It is estimated that, in addition to these immigrants having cost the country 1,421,371 acres of land of the Northwest Territories, each immigrant cost the country $475. That is the history of the Conservative party in relation to colonization companies.

The hon. member for North Toronto spoke of the reduction of the tariff under the present government, and he spoke with all the sophistry of which he is capable. He said that from 1896 to 1909 the present government had reduced the tariff by 89-100 of 1 per cent. But he did not take into consideration the goods that had been placed on the free list. I submit that it is only fair, in estimating the average duty on goods coming into the country that we should take into consideration non-dutiable as well as dutiable goods. If hon. gentlemen opposite will take the trouble to turn to volume one of the Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for 1909, page 15, they will find that the average rate of duty on dutiable and non-dutiable goods in 1896 was 19.12 per cent and the average rate of duty at present is 16.58 per cent, a reduction of almost 3 per cent on the average of goods coming into this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure the hon. member does not wish erroneous figures to go in 'Hansard.' He has made a mistake. What he is talking about is only one class of goods, the dutiable goods, instead of

both classes as referred to by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I have before me the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I say that the figures I have given are absolutely correct. The figures given by the hon. member for North Toronto do not take into consideration goods that have been placed on the free list, and I say that to make a fair statement of the reduction in the tariff you must take into consideration non-dutiable as well as dutiable goods. On this basis, as I have said, the reduction is almost 3 per cent. This may seem a small reduction, but the amount saved to the people of the country up to and including 1907—I have not the figures for the last two years—was in excess of $50,000,000.

The hon. member for North Toronto also travelled through the west and went over some of the railways in that country. He calls a part of the western country the 'double-track' country'. He says that you can sit at your car window and drop a pea on the track of some competing railway. There are only one or two places that I known of in the western country where there are what may be called parallel railways. Of course, railways may be parallel if one hundred miles apart. But the impression that these hon membes try to convey is that the two railways are not serving different parts of the country. If we consider the country between Winnipeg and Edmonton and take the main lines of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific, there is not a place where you can say the railways are parallel. It is true that the two lines converge at Portage la Prairie, but it is necessary that they should converge at competing points. They converge again at Saskatoon. And it is true that for some distance west of Saskatoon they run close together. But there is this fact to be remembered that the Grand Trunk Pacific had completed their survey and commenced construction before the Canadian Pacific Railway got there. West of Edmonton again, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific run close together. But that is made necessary not only by the conformation of the country but by the fact that they both use the Yellowhead Pass to get through the mountains.

Mr. HUGHES. Who was there first?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I do not know that that matters. The Canadian Northern was probably constructed first, but the main point is that they are both going to use the Yellowhead Pass. This brings up the question of transportation in the west. I was bold enough to make an assertion here last session and I was sarcastically commented upon by some of the newspapers for saying that the transportation question was the most important question in the west to-day. Well, I risk another sarcastic reference by repeating the statement that the transportation question is the most important question to be dealt with in the west at the present time. It is true we have got practically three transcontinental railroads today, but we now need branch lines to feed these railways. Last year when I spoke in this House in connection with the loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway I said the farmers could not get their grain out of the country. The railways did not appear to be prepared to handle the grain, they had not sufficient cars or they were not capable of handling the large production of wheat and other grains. Owing to the railways having provided better facilities this year and also partially to the fact that the farmers have not marketed so much of their crop there has not been any scarcity of cars in Saskatchewan up to the present.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems by the returns they have marketed more of the crop.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. That is a later report than I have seen. That goes to show only that the transportation facilities are better than they were last year. I am glad to hear that from my hon. friend because I believe he was one who opposed the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the west.

If there is one thing more than another that characterizes the present financial statement and the condition of Canada it is the word 'prosperity.' A great deal has been said about the natural resources of Canada but I believe, and no doubt other members in this House believe that the mineral resources of Canada will gradually become depleted. Our great timber resources are being gradually pushed farther, north by the axe of the lumberman and the ravages of forest fires. Our fisheries, if they have not reached their zenith have almost reached their zenith of production. There will come a time when all our great natural resources will be more or less depleted. When that time comes I believe Canada must resort to agriculture, as some one has said the prosperity of a country depends altogether on its basic industries, and in Canada the chief basic industry is agriculture. Has the government, the Department of Agriculture been doing anything towards the assistance and development of that industry in Canada? One thing that has been done has been the establishment of experimental farms.

Mr. SPROULE. They were all established before this government came into power.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I was just going to say something about that if the hon. gen-

tleman will give me an opportunity. It is true that the great majority of these experimental farms were established before 1896. Two have been established since 1896 in Alberta, and were established as soon as the needs of that province required it, and one additional agricultural farm has been estabilshed in Saskatchewan, at Rosthern. I wish to refer for a moment to the amount of money that has been expended upon experimental farms in Canada. The figures for a few years of the total expenditure and revenue on experimental farms are as follows:

Years.	Total Expenditure.	Total Revenue.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
1908-09	142,424 08	14,354 58
1907 (7 mos.)	102,555 12	*6,699 18
1906	110,452 24	11,864 51
1905	100,000 80	9,997 45
1902	101,940 55	5,329 40
1898	77,500 00	7,474 86
1896	77,500 00	6,338 58
1892	75,500 00	4,985 08
1888	95,569 04	201 88

*7 months only of revenue from Central Farm included.

I bring these figures to the attention of the House to show that throughout the whole history of experimental farms in Canada the object apparently has not been to make money out of them. I understood from the Department of Agriculture that owing to the system pursued of giving away free seed, &c., it is not possible to make money out of the experimental farms. I do not think that any hon. member expects that a revenue will be derived from the experimental farms, that was not the object of their establishment. But to show you what can be done along the lines of making an experimental farm pay, let me refer to the central experimental station at Ottawa, in connection with their dairy business. They have 55 cows and the revenue from the milk, cream, butter and buttermilk, amounts to $3,148.58, or about $58 per cow.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the government competing with and rivalling the farmer in producing the dairy products?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. The only object is to teach the farmers what can be done with a proper handling of stock which I would say is a very laudable object for the Department of Agriculture to pursue.

With reference particularly to western Canada, I would point out some things that have been done by the Department of Agriculture in recent years to assist the farmers in raising their crops. It is quite true that in western Canada we have a great many new people coming in. A large number of these people had farmed in the east, and they possibly do not need the same teaching and the same example in the line of farming as some of the people who came from foreign countries. The American immigrants are on a par with the immigrants who come to western Canada from Ontario, but we have a large number of immigrants coming to Canada from Europe to whom a great deal of good can be done by having proper experimental farms or stations throughout the west. Some ten years ago the Department of Agriculture established what is known as the Canadian Seed Growers' Association, and for five years managed that association. Some five years ago it was decided by the department that it would be better to place the association on a similar basis to the various other associations in Canada, so that the management of its affairs might be under the direct control of the seed growers themselves who had identified themselves with it. The department has continued to supply the association, from year to year, with grants and such funds as this association can use. Over 600 farmers, most of them in western Canada, are at present growing seed for the Canadian Seed Growers' Association. These farmers are visited yearly by an officer of the department, and I understand that a great deal of good has been done in improving the variety of seed grown by the farmers in all parts of the country on account of the efforts made by the Seed Growers' Association. I might also refer to the competitions in fields of standing grain which take place every year throughout the west, and also to the provincial seed exhibitions and seed fairs held at different points in western Canada, at almost a hundred points last year, to exhibit seed and give the farmers a chance to get the best seed on the market. I believe, however, that a great deal more could be done by the Department of Agriculture in the west along the line of establishing small experimental stations. These experimental stations could be maintained at a very small cost. A very small quantity of land would be required, some eighty acres probably, would do for each experimental station, the idea being to make the farms smaller and have more of them so as to give every farmer in the neighbourhood a chance to go and see the most improved methods of agriculture and to learn the proper rotations of crops, the proper method of handling stock and other matters that interest the farmers, and go to build up a prosperous community. Now, in this connection I would like to refer to a statement which I saw in one of the papers the other day, and no doubt other members of this House saw it also. It was a statement made by Mr. James J. Hill, the great rail-

road magnate of the United States. Speaking, of course, of the United States, he said:

Within 20 years 125,000,000 people, and before the middle of the century more than 200,000,000 people must find room and food and employment within the United States. Where are they to live? What are they to do? By that time our mineral resources will have been so nearly exhausted that the industries related to them must fall into a minor place. By that time it is apparent that our dream of conquest of world markets will be a burst bubble.

He goes on to say:

The government should establish a small model farm on its own land in every rural congressional district, later, perhaps, in every county in the agricultural states. Let the Department of Agriculture show exactly what can be done on a small tract of land by proper cultivation, moderate fertilizing and due location of crops.

I would recommend these sentiments to the Minister of Agriculture and to the other members of this House. I would also like to call attention to an article which appears in the current number of McClure's Magazine entitled 'No deserted farms in Germany.' It shows what Germany has done by a system of intensive cultivation. I do not need to say that the west at the present time is scarcely prepared for intensive cultivation; but there are other portions of Canada, particularly of Ontario, that are ready and prepared for a system of intensive cultivation. But the west which is now filling up with new immigrants on new land, is not possibly in a position to adopt such methods of cultivation. But that time will come, and it may come within the lives of members of this House. This article entitled 'No deserted farms in Germany' says this:

The policy of conservation that made German forestry such a success is applied also to agriculture. As we have stated before, Germany is not at all a land flowing with milk and honey. In enormous parts of northern Germany the soil is decidedly poor. With that of the United States it cannot compare at all. But proper care did wonders. While the methods of farming used by many Americans resulted in the utter decline of good land in a comparatively short time, the farm land of Germany, even though they have been under cultivation for centuries, bring forth rich crops year in and year out.

Then it goes on to make a comparison between the average crop product in the United States and that in Germany, and it cites what Mr. James J. Hill said.

He made the remarkable statement that the soil of America, once the envy of every other country, gave during the ten years beginning with 1896 an average yield of 13·5 bushels of wheat per acre, while Germany produced 27·6. For the same decade the yield of oats was in America less than 30 bushels, in Germany 46. For barley the figures were 25 against 33, and for rye 15·4 against 24.

The article goes on to argue that the increased production of these lands in Germany, which are said not to compare with the average lands in the United States, is due entirely to the fact that the Germans have embarked upon a system of intensive cultivation. Now that the government will meet with approval in further establishing experimental farms, I think is shown by a statement which I see in an address delivered by one of the ex-presidents of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, who says:

It is indeed a pleasure to note the steps our federal and provincial governments are taking to foster the growth of this important industry, and to establish it upon a sound and economic basis. No one will rejoice more heartily than the manufacturer in the success which has followed the work of the experimental farms. In so far as they have contributed to a better understanding of the scientific side of agriculture, and made it possible to grow two blades of grass where one grew before, they have benefited not alone the farmer, but the entire country. The same is equally true of the encouragement given by the government to agriculture in other ways.

He goes on to mention other efforts made by the various governments and I commend that statement also to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and of the House generally. There is one other point I would like to refer to in connection with agriculture, and that is the working of the Fruit Marks Act. I do not know whether my experience has been the same as the experience of other western members in regard to the quality of the fruit imported into the western provinces. But I do know that the quality of fruit that has come into the province of Saskatchewan this year, has been beyond anything we ever had before. I believe that a part of that credit is justly due to the rigid method of inspection put in force by the Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the provisions of the Fruit Marks Act. Previous to 1909, there were only three inspectors in the west, one at Winnipeg, one at Calgary and one at Vancouver. The work was then extended last season by the establishment of a new inspector at Regina, whose territory included Moosejaw, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Indian Head and other local points. A new inspector was located at Lethbridge and an assistant was appointed at Winnipeg, the Winnipeg district including Kenora, Portage la Prairie, Brandon and other Manitoba towns. There is also this fact, which no doubt will cause satisfaction to hon. members on both sides of this House, namely, that the

shipment of Ontario apples to the prairie provinces was largely increased during the past season. The fruit I refer to when I say that the quality has improved, was not fruit from the state of Washington, but from British Columbia and Ontario, and in both cases it was better than we ever got in the western provinces before.

Before I resume my seat, I want to say a few words on the question of the immigration policy of the government. The Department of Immigration has recognized the principle that Canada's growth and Canada's prosperity must, to a great extent depend upon the agriculturists, and to that end the department has always favoured the bringing in of men who will take up vacant land in the west and cultivate it. Now I have looked up the records in the Department of the Interior to find the instructions that were sent by the Commissioner of Immigration to the various agents in the different countries of the world, and I find that the following instructions have been sent out:

1. Money is expended and administration is exercised with the object of securing immigrants whose purpose in life is to occupy farm lands, either as owners, tenants, or labourers.

2. Money is voted and administration is exercised with the object of excluding those whose presence in Canada would tend to add to the congestion of our towns and cities.

Immigration effort is made in those countries which are considered most likely to furnish the people coming within the first of the two classes above specified.

Now the countries in which immigration effort is made are Great Britain and Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States, all of which countries can supply to Canada the very best farmers, men who have been brought up to agriculture. Possibly the most important and useful immigrants we have got during the past two years have been coming from the states. We have got a certain amount of immigration from Sweden, and so far as I can judge from the habits of the Swedes, they make the very best settlers in the Canadian Northwest. They cultivate the soil well, they are industrious, they save their money, they make good citizens, and quickly adopt Canadian institutions. The same of course can be said of the immigrants who come from the south of the international boundary. Now one can scarcely estimate the wealth that is brought into Canada year by year by the American immigrants alone. I have here some figures which I would like to commend to the attention of this House in regard to the nationality of the various kinds of immigrants we have been getting during the past two years. I may say, before giving these figures, Mr. Speaker, that I must congratulate many of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House on their change of front with respect to our immigration policy. It is not many years since the hon. member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated on the floor of this House, that we were getting into the country, the scum of the London slums. It is not many years since the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) said in this House, that he would rather have a Hindu as an immigrant than a galvanized Yankee. We all know from what took place in the House yesterday, that there has been a great change of front on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to repeat that again?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If the hon. gentleman is not paying enough attention to hear what I say he will have to search 'Hansard' to find out. I must congratulate hon. gentlemen on their change of front with respect to the question of immigration. Hon. gentlemen who represent western constituencies on the other side of the House are beginning to vie with one another, to actually fall over one another, in their endeavours to pay compliments to the Galicians and Doukhobors whom, a very few years ago, they criticised so severely in this House. We are getting in this country now an average of nearly 200,000 immigrants or more each year. It is impossible that among this large number there would not be some that we would be better without. We might say that even in our own country there are some people whom we would be better without.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I did not refer to anybody on the other side of the House.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It was on that side.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. In a growing country like Canada it is necessary that we shall have men who will perform all kinds of labour. The average Canadian who goes to western Canada does not go there to work for some one else. He goes there to make a home for himself, to become independent, to own his own farm and in a great majority of instances Canadians who go from eastern Canada succeed in doing that. We need other men to perform construction work on the railways. You all know the situation that exists in British Columbia, where the Transcontinental railway was practically held up in its construction on account of the fact that they could not get labourers to perform their work. We must have in that western country a large number of men who will perform construction work. We need farmers and

we need the labouring man, and if the Department of Immigration devotes its attention, as it has in the past, to bringing in agriculturists and labouring men, it is performing a duty it owes to Canada and Canada will prosper under such a policy of immigration. I desire now to give the House some figures with respect to immigration taken from the records of the department. In the year 1894 we actually got 20,829 immigrants; in 1895, 18,790; in 1896, 16,835, and so on during the years following until the number has grown to such an extent that in 1907-8 we received 262,469. Why was it that under Conservative rule immigrants did not come to this country? It was not because the Conservative party did not try to get them in. I really believe that hon. gentlemen opposite worked hard to get immigrants into this country. I am informed, and I believe it is correct, that in 1896 they actually had an officer in Galicia trying to bring to this country the very people whom hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised this government so severely for bringing in. In nine months of the fiscal year 1907 we got 55,791 immigrants from Great Britain, 34,217 from continental Europe, and 34,659 from the United States. In 1907-8 we got 120,182 from Great Britain, 83,957 from continental Europe, and 58,312 from the United States. In the seven months that have passed of the present fiscal year we got 42,295 from Great Britain, 30,184 from continental Europe, and 65,755 from the United States. Let the increase of immigration from the United States continue, because every one of the American settlers brings settlers' effects and money. The value of the effects per capita of the immigrants coming from the United States in the fiscal year 1908-9 is estimated at $998. Taking the total immigration up to the present time at 59,835, it will be seen that these Americans have brought into Canada wealth estimated at $59,712,336.

I think that covers the points for which I rose to address the House and I have only to say in conclusion that I congratulate all the members of this House and the people of this country on the prosperity that characterizes Canada at the present time and I express the hope that the prosperity of future years will be equal to that of the years through which we are just passing.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B. C.) Mr. Speaker, when I heard the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in delivering the budget address the other day, I felt for a moment a cheery opulence stealing over me, but when I commenced to consider how this exceptional budget was going to affect the province which I have the honour to represent and when I began to search the estimates and to find out how much of the many millions which came tripping off his tongue he intended to expend in British Columbia I came to the conclusion that as far as I could see it did not matter very much to that province whether he had a large or small amount of money at his disposal. In going over his estimates and in going over the public expenditure as contemplated for the coming year I have made some little research into the blue-books and I wish to draw a few contrasts between the expenditure in that province and other provinces of Canada as they appear to me. In doing that I may say that I do not wish particularly to quarrel with what has been spent in the other provinces of which I am going to speak. I have not been in these provinces, I do not pretend to say whether that expenditure was all justified or not, but I do say that if it was justified in those provinces it is more than justified in British Columbia and that that province should have received equal treatment with those other provinces. The two provinces to which I now particularly refer are Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and I wish to refer to them in connection with a subject which is very dear to the hearts of the people of British Columbia at the present time in the question of expenditure upon harbours and rivers in that province and the question generally of navigation.

Last session I gave to the House some figures as to the general expenditure by the government on harbours east of Port Arthur as compared with the expenditure on harbours on the Pacific coast. In those figures I find that in the period from 1898 to 1908 there have been expended on eastern harbours $7,396,446, while during the same period there have been expended on the harbours on the west coast of the Dominion only $256,178. I find from these same figures that the city of Halifax up to the year 1908 had expended on its harbour the sum of $1,695,732 and that the city of St. John had expended on its harbour $988,442. In the year 1909, St John harbour received a further appropriation of $475,000 and in the estimates for 1909-10 there is a sum, made up of three items, amounting to $538,500 for that harbour, so that at the end of the year 1910 there will have been expended on the St. John harbour the sum of $1,999,142. In the estimates for the present year I find further that the province of New Brunswick is to receive, in addition to the $538,500 for the harbour of St. John, a sum of $375,850 for harbour and river improvements generally. I find also that there is provided for the two provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick a sum of $750,000 for dredging and assuming that one half of that will be spent in each province, the total amount appropriated for the province of New Brunswick in the present year for this service amounts to $1,241,850.

Now, in these same estimates I find a general appropriation for the province of Nova Scotia of $649,000 and adding to that half of the dredging vote ($327,500) there will be a total of $1,076,900 for the province of Nova Scotia. But, when we come to the province of British Columbia we find a very different condition of things, we find that the harbour of Victoria is receiving $65,000, that the harbour of Vancouver is receiving $90,000, that the province of British Columbia generally is receiving for dredging $225,000, that there is a general appropriation for harbours and rivers of $138,850 making $418,650 in all for the province of British Columbia. That is to say, that the province of British Columbia is to receive on account of these expenditures a sum amounting to a little less than twenty per cent of the total appropriations for the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In trying to find out a reason for this, which appears to me unjust discrimination, I have examined the tonnage tables and I find that the tonnage of sea-going vessels entered and cleared in 1909 is as follows:

Tonnage of Sea-going Vessels entered and cleared, 1909.

	Tons.
Nova Scotia..	4,367,946
New Brunswick..	2,099,189
British Columbia..	6,386,315

This shows that the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined have only 80,000 more tons than the province of British Columbia, and that the British Columbia tonnage is more than three times that of New Brunswick. But notwithstanding that fact the province of British Columbia receives for its harbours only forty per cent of the amount that is to be expended by the government in the province of New Brunswick. I have also taken the figures relating to the vessels engaged in the coasting trade, and I find the following result:

Tonnage of Vessels in the Coasting Trade.

	Tons.
Nova Scotia..	4,136,956
New Brunswick..	1,727,930
British Columbia..	8,820,616

That is to say, that the province of British Columbia has a larger coasting tonnage than the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick combined by 2,955,730 tons, or the coasting tonnage of British Columbia is more than double the coasting tonnage of the province of Nova Scotia and more than five times that of the province of New Brunswick. These figures relate to the steamships only. The sailing vessels are a very small proportion, and the foreign vessels, which I am not taking into consideration, only amount to 10 per cent. The figures in connection with sailing vessels and foreign vessels make no change in the result.

Mr. BARNARD.

Now, it occurred to me that possibly this was a new condition of affairs, and, therefore, I thought it would be advisable to take the tonnage of ten years ago and to compare it with the tonnage of to-day, and see which province was increasing the most and the proportion of increase. This gave me the following results:

Tonnage, Sea-going Vessels.

	Tons.
New Brunswick, 1899..	1,490,243
" 1908..	2,099,189
Increase..	608,946
or 40 per cent.	
	Tons.
Nova Scotia, 1899..	2,773,200
" 1908..	4,367,946
Increase..	1,594,746
or an increase of 57 per cent.	
	Tons.
British Columbia, 1899.. ..	3,595,438
" 1908.. ..	6,386,315
Increase..	2,780,877
or an increase of 75 per cent.	

I find that the increase of tonnage for the province of British Columbia in that period is 2,780,877 tons, and it is not only greater than the increase of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick combined by some 500,000 tons, but the increase of tonnage for the province of British Columbia is greater than the whole of the present tonnage of the province of New Brunswick. Now, in case it should be said that the figures with regard to tonnage are not a fair criterion of the amount of business that is being done at the ports of these provinces, I have taken the figures relating to the revenue received by the Dominion from imports and exports from the different provinces and the following is the result:

Year 1908-9.

New Brunswick exports...	$27,214,741
" imports. .	9,508,306
Total..	$36,723,047
Nova Scotia exports.	$17,363,405
" imports.... ..	13,257,960
Total..	$30,621,365
British Columbia exports..	$22,240,699
" imports. .	20,898,381
Total..	$43,149,070

That is to say, the imports and exports of the province of British Columbia are six and a half million dollars more than those of the province of New Brunswick, and twelve and a half million dollars more than those of the province of Nova Scotia.

Then, with regard to the duties paid by these different provinces, I find the following result:

Duties paid, 1908-9.

New Brunswick..	$2,164,694
Nova Scotia..	1,533,046
British Columbia..	4,469,970

That is to say, British Columbia paid three quarters of a million dollars more than both the other provinces combined, more than twice the amount that was paid by the province of New Brunswick, and nearly three times the amount that was paid by Nova Scotia.

In regard to the excise revenue, I find that the following amounts were paid in 1908-9:

New Brunswick..	$232,551
Nova Scotia..	156,725
British Columbia..	633,506

That is to say, in excise duties the province of British Columbia pays $244,230 more than both the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, nearly three times as much as New Brunswick, and more than four times as much as Nova Scotia. The postal transactions of the three provinces are as follows:

	Net postal revenue.	Money orders issued.	Money orders paid.
New Brunswick..	$366,531	$2,306,280	$1,792,153
Nova Scotia.. ..	516,630	3,863,258	2,963,677
British Columbia	596,800	6,136,009	2,756,447

In other words, the total of money orders bought and paid in the province of British Columbia is more than it is in the province of Nova Scotia by $3,165,521 and more than it is in the province of New Brunswick by $5,794,023. I also took the trouble to obtain the clearing house figures for the cities of Halifax, St. John, Victoria and Vancouver, and found that the figures for Victoria and Vancouver exceeded those for St. John and Halifax, the largest commercial cities of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, by $80,000,000 in one year. I wish to ask the government, and particularly the Minister of Public Works, for justice for the province of British Columbia in view of these facts. Never at any time were the prospects of that province as bright as they are to-day. We have now building, the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is going to open up a new port in the north; we have the Canadian Northern coming to Vancouver; the Panama canal will be finished very shortly; I have noticed in the daily press that the Tehuantepec railway is double-tracking its line because of the great amount of traffic crossing the Pacific ocean; and we have the movement in the province of Alberta to ship wheat through our ports on the Pacific coast. Only the other day I saw the statement in the press that one of the ministers representing the government of Alberta had a consultation with the government of British Columbia with a view of establishing in Vancouver elevators, to be owned jointly by the two governments, for the shipment of wheat. In the near future the trade of the Pacific is going to more than equal that of the Atlantic ocean. We see annually in the estimates a very large sum, I think this year it is $675,000, for the purpose of ice breaking in the St. Lawrence river. Any money that is spent in British Columbia is not going to be spent without producing a return, such as that for ice-breaking, because our ports are open the year round, and for any money spent this government will have a good asset. I can only attribute the attitude with regard to these expenditures to the fact that I suppose no one minister has time to read the blue-books issued by the department of another minister, otherwise they could not justify for one moment the contrasts to which I have drawn their attention. In conclusion, I trust that the government will take this matter into consideration and see fit to make some further appropriations for public works in that province.

Mr. ERNEST ROY (Dorchester). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer answering in English to the remarks uttered by the hon member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard, who has just spoken. However, as I am more familiar with the French language, I hope the House will bear with me while I address it in my native tongue. The discussion of the budget, if I understand aright the rules of parliament, affords an opportunity to review freely the policy of the country under its various aspects, and for that reason its importance is very great. Of course, Canada's policy is that followed by its government, which is for the time being a liberal government. Under a system of representative government such as ours, the task imposed on the leaders is a comprehensive, responsible and difficult one. They are bound to respect the rights of citizens, and if they have a clear understanding of their duties, they feel it incumbent on them to forward the welfare of the community in all spheres of action. In brief, they are called upon to exert all their powers towards insuring the happiness of the inhabitants of Canada as a whole.

What does that happiness consist in? Thinkers, writers, poets, philosophers of all nations, of all times, of all epochs, have agreed in acknowledging that worldly happiness is essentially relative. It embraces an almost infinite variety of forms. Neither should we wonder at this, since happiness is the state of the soul when satisfied, and since the soul, being infinite by nature, is also infinite in its manifestations. Since the opening of this discussion on the budget, human happiness has been considered, more especially in its relation to money matters. Those who have approved of the policy of the Liberal government have made the welkin ring with the sweet sounds of

the silver and gold pieces gleefully jingling and singing the material prosperity of the country. On the other hand, those who, in the best of worlds play the part of the pessimist, have filled the air with their desperate wailings, not noticing that such wailings find no echo here, no more than in any other part of Canada.

I said that the happiness of a people was a very variable entity. If the happiness of a people consists in wealth, it must consist in wealth under its various forms. What is wealth to the aged man who fears to look ahead, thinking that death lurks near by and calls to him? What is a million dollars even to the young man replete with health, physical vigour and self-confidence? The young man relies on his strength, has confidence in himself, and looks with confidence to the future. He knows that by dint of energy and ambition he will succeed in conquering all difficulties on the way to happiness, and it is in that happy disposition that his wealth consists, while the old man's wealth consists in the wisdom which he has gained through life from day to day.

What is Canada's particular wealth at the present time? The Dominion has not as yet reached maturity; it is still in its youth, a vigorous youthfulness which betokens a bright future. Such is the real wealth of the Dominion. Canada is full of self-reliance, a self-reliance which is not the result of giddiness, of inexperience, but rests on solid ground, for that young Dominion has just tested its strength in a venture which might have proved fatal, but from which we have come out victorious. Two years ago, in 1908, a financial crisis swept as an immense wave over all the nations of the world.

Canada, like every other nation, was to feel the force of it. Would it stand the shock? One well knew that Canada had increased considerably in strength of late years, but so far had met with hardly any but favourable circumstances. How would Canada make use of its strength when confronted with a serious obstacle, with this severe test? That was the question which the government answered in the affirmative, and which the opposition, in their usual pessimistic mood, answered negatively. That depression is now over, and of all the countries whose economical life came under our observation and judment, none better than Canada withstood the test. And if I were not afraid my modesty would overshadow my truthfulness, I would even assert that no country under the sun underwent the ordeal better. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) gave us a convincing proof of it on Tuesday night. To-day, I say it again, Canada is self-reliant because it knows its strength.

Why is it that Canada in so few years acquired so much importance? Why is it that Canada is everywhere known, respected and courted, if I may use the expression? Why is it that those nations having interests at stake with Canada make so much of its opinions and of its understanding of justice? Why is it that young Canada is treated with due respect and fairness in England, in France and at Washington? The reason is this, and was given by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) himself when he stated that the trustees of the people since 1896 knew their responsibilities and discharged them properly. That is the reason, Sir and the reason is moreover that these trustees understood that their trust consisted not only of the material wealth of the country, but of the moral and intellectual wealth of its people as well. In fact, no country could take its place among the nations, despite all the riches of the world, unless the heart and mind of its people were developed, as well as its natural resources.

The government had a hard task to fulfil. The programme which it laid down was vast, immense, difficult, but not above its strength, and it has pursued it unceasingly and with undoubted success ever since. In our days, when money cuts such a large figure, the first thing to be done after finding out what unbounded undeveloped wealth Canada had was to find the means to advertise these resources to the world. How did the government proceed to do that? In the first place, we must recognize that the premier's personality had, as early as 1896, drawn the attention of Europe upon Canada. His masterly eloquence had turned all eyes towards this country But the Prime Minister had also surrounded himself with active, intellgent and clever men in his cabinet, and these soon showed that Canada, from 1896 to 1898, had not been a sleeping country, but a hustling country. Canadian products were to be seen everywhere, in every exhibition, and on the markets of Britain, France and America. Our commercial agents were met all over Europe, and not only that, but we have seen Canada grant a preference to the British market and upon such conditions as fairly stunned powerful Germany. Some hon. gentlemen opposite found fault with the British preference. If you narrow down to a mere question of economic proposition, possibly it might, to all appearances, be folly on our part to have given something for nothing. But can it be forgotten that this preference has ensured Canada's economical independence by getting new markets for us, which taught us to straighten up our backs and show our mighty neighbours that we are not dependent upon them, although they thought they had us at their feet. This would more than indemnify us for what we gave Britain. We must not overlook the fact

that the British market is the most important of all, and that England stands at the head of all nations in that respect. Our introduction to that market, thanks to the preference we gave Great Britain, has advertised us more extensively even among our rivals. Is it not a magnificent advertisement from a business point of view? What is trade's foremost object, if not to secure customers. And in order to secure such customers, you have to advertise yourself. Thus, Canada in seeking competition on the British market made itself known to the markets of the world. To that point of view, the preference would rank among the cleverest political deals of this government.

Having spread Canada's reputation broadcast, having advertised its mining and lumbering resources, something still remained to be done by the government. Wealth does not lie in undeveloped resources. There remained to open up the great Northwest, and the older provinces understood that the best way to recoup themselves of the money lavished upon the Canadian Pacific railway in the Territories was to create there a market for the manufactures of the east. It was then necessary to direct immigrants to these provinces, and it will be this government's everlasting glory that they have initated this stream of immigration in the Northwest. Numberless populations were almost unable to live on the impoverished soil of old Europe. Did it not belong to us to invite them here on our uncultivated fields, rather than allowing them to starve in their native land, while we had absolutely idle farms in our Northwest, on which they could live and acquire some wealth?

The government realized that they were consulting their own interest and at the same time achieving a humanitarian work, when initiating a great movement of immigration to that region.

What happened, Sir? It happened that in every immigrant induced to come over to Canada from Germany, Norway, Austria, France and Great Britain, we had forthwith an agent who, satisfied with his position, wrote to his own friends in the old country and told them what an immense and magnificent country this Canada of ours was and what a happiness it offered to many of their countrymen who starved in their native country.

That active immigration policy has produced great results. We are told that we are too lavish in the expenditure of public money in the Northwest, that the Grand Trunk Pacific is going to cost many millions of dollars.. Quite true. But since we started building this railway, is it not a fact that over one million people have settled upon the vacant lands of the Northwest, and so they already help us to bear our financial burdens? Is it not true that the millions of bushels of grain produced by these new settlers and which supply our railway companies with freight have already begun meeting the expenditure incurred by Canada in developing that portion of our territory?

I do not intend to speak at any length on these matters, by indulging in too many statistics, though I am free to say that statistics sometimes serve a good purpose in adorning an otherwise arid and uninteresting subject, a fact which has been well illustrated the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It would be useless to dilate any further upon the already well known causes of our material prosperity. If the government have joined in the friendly conspiracy of events to make us prosperous from a material standpoint, they have also realized their duty and their mission, by contributing to our intellectual development. And how did they do so, Sir? By readjusting the subsidies granted to the provinces. The provincial governments, having under the constitution, the control of educational matters are now able to devote larger snms in favour of education. So, the province of Quebec, —to mention a province with which I am more familiar—was enabled by that increased subsidy, to make an additional appropriation of half a million dollars for educational purposes. Schools are being built everywhere. Technical schools are being established—a matter which was mooted, the other day before the House, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, having at their head devoted teachers and scientists.

I may further mention the founding in the city of Montreal of a high commercial school. Montreal, it is true, is a city of the province of Quebec, but it is the commercial metropolis of Canada. This high school will serve a useful purpose in allowing those of our countrymen who wish to take special courses in certain branches of commerce and industry, to receive in that school the scientific training which they need.

As to moral progress, it is a trite saying that a contented man is a virtuous man and that poverty is the mother of all vices. Now, never before did the morality of Canada rank higher than nowadays.

When you inspire a man with hope, when you point out the future to him and when, by focussing his eyes on that future, he foresees happiness in store for himself, for his children and his posterity, he shrinks back from crime. Now, in Canada an era of moral progress, so to say, has been ushered in. Therefore I say that the government have fulfilled their mission

and they have acquitted themselves with honor.

True, there is always room for criticism. But this is what must be expected in the work carried out by a political party and this is what is understood by the Canadian people, by our enlightened electorate. Instead of criticising minor details, mistakes which may have been made and which only small minds are prone to criticise you have to take a general view of the achievements of those men, as a whole. A man should be judged in the light of his achievements, as a whole. It is but fair that a government should be judged in the same way. Should the blunder or mistakes of that government outweigh their good deeds, then it is the duty of the electorate to turn them out, as happened in 1896. When, on the contrary, the sum of their achievements is found to be considerable and their faults are a negligible quantity, the Canadian electors do just what they did in 1900, in 1904 and in 1908: Vote confidence in those men who have so well administered the public affairs.

I could reply in a few words to the statement made a little while ago by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) about the maritime provinces. He said: You are spending a great deal of money and making large appropriations for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and yet these provinces yield less revenue than British Columbia which is receiving less than the maritime provinces. I could give to that statement a reply which any intelligent man would understand and it is this: If to-day British Columbia is able to make so much money, it is indebted for it to the Eastern provinces which placed that province in the position which enabled it to realize those gains, and it is but fair that the Eastern provinces should now get compensation for that expenditure.

But additional argument could be brought forward in connection with the naval question. The government is criticised for having spent $1,000,000 upon the harbour of St. John and $400,000 on the harbour at Halifax, and yet, there is only such and such a tonnage of sea-going vessels passing through those ports. Let us be fair and say that if we made such large expenditures for those ports in order to allow the port of Montreal to develop and assume the importance it is enjoying to-day, why is it that up to 1896, out of the seventeen or eighteen lines of steamships which had been using the St. Lawrence route, only three, namely the Allan line, the Thompson line and the Donaldson line, did really survive?

It is because their trafic was regular during summer only, and a tramp business during winter.

Now, in order to give to the harbour of Montreal the possibility to compete with the ports of New York and Boston, we had only one way to choose, it was to afford a trafic during summer and winter for our lines. After having supplied with modern implements St. John and Halifax we could keep for us a part of the trade going by New York, Portland and Boston. Therefore the province of Quebec is concerned in that expenditure, because these three harbours, Montreal, St. John and Halifax are bound up together for summer trafic and the others for winter trafic.

After all what kind of objection has the opposition against this government? Up to the present time I have heard some arguments made during last election. Imagination is the only creating power which remains with our friends opposite. Before the last campaign they had found some scandals relating to the Intercolonial or to the North Atlantic Trading Company and others fantasticals. There were dreams from their imagination but those poor dreams were brutally disappointed by the general elections of the 26th of October, 1908. To-day the members of the opposition contemplate those dreams with tears in their eyes. Let us respect those tears ; they belong perhaps to people stung with remorse. Let the opposition with its sadness and sorrow. Let the dead bury the dead and let the government well alive continue the work of the living.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this debate will continue to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. This debate will be continued. If concluded, we will go into Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 17, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LOSS OF LIFE ON LAKE ERIE.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Yesterday the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) made reference to the subject of wrecks on Lake Erie. I have received the following statement from the officers of my department:

On December 8 and 9 a terrific storm passed over Lake Erie. At that time of the year most of the vessels were in winter quarters and navigation was practically closed. A few vessels were, however on the lakes, and several wrecks occurred, with, unfortunately, the loss of a number of human lives, and great damage to marine property; among these casualties, one of the most serious was the wreck, or disappearance, of the car ferry 'Marquette & Bessemer No. 2,' running from Conneaut to Port Stanley. This boat is a United States register vessel built in 1905. She is 338 feet long, 54 feet beam and 19½ feet in depth, with a tonnage of 2,514 tons. This vessel being a foreign vessel and not doing any Canadian coasting trade, and not being a passenger boat, is not subject to the inspection clauses of the Canada Shipping Act. She is inspected at her home port, which is Erie, Pennsylvania, and is manned by officers having American certificates.

From the information available, it would seem that this vessel had sailed for Port Stanley and was caught in the storm of the 8th instant and went down in the middle of the lake. No trace has been found of the vessel, but one of her boats was picked up with several members of the crew frozen to death.

The harbour of Port Stanley is provided with two lights guiding vessels into the harbour. The main light is a very satisfactory one and is visible far out on the lake. A new gas beacon has been installed on the outer end of the enlarged breakwater, specially to accommodate the car ferry.

There have been no complaints made to the department as to deficiency in aids to navigation at this harbour, and as a matter of fact these aids are efficient and in good condition.

On Saturday last the car ferry 'Ashtabula,' plying from American ports to Port Burwell grounded on entering the harbour. This grounding took place at 8 in the morning, on a clear day, with the aids to navigation perfectly visible.

This vessel is also of American register, of a tonnage of 2,670 tons, her home port being Cleveland, Ohio. This vessel, like the 'Marquette & Bessemer No. 2' is manned by American officers, and does not come under Canadian inspection.

The cause of the accident at Port Burwell was probably owing to lack of water in the entrance to the harbour.

The Department of Marine issued a notice to mariners on the 16th October, describing the aids to mariners at Port Burwell, and giving warning that there was a shallow spot in the approach to the entrance. At this time of the year the water in the lakes is low, and the water might be further lowered by the storm which raged last week. This is probably the cause of the accident to the 'Ashtabula.'

The aids at Port Burwell consist of one main coast lighthouse and two pairs of range lights, of a fog bell on the outer end of the pier and of a small bell buoy at the entrance of the channel, 2,000 feet from the piers.

In the matter of fog alarms, it is not usual to instal fog whistles at narrow entrances so as to guide vessels towards these points. These whistles are rather used as indications of danger and vessels are supposed to keep clear of the points so marked. It is very difficult for a vessel to steer exactly on the sound of the fog whistle, and these alarms are reserved for points of danger, which should be avoided.

It is also extremely difficult to operate fog alarms at exposed points in the winter season, as the spray from the water freezes on the alarms and prevents their being operated. This is especially the case on the lakes where the fresh water freezes much more easily than on the coast and where the temperature is liable to be lower.

In the case of the accident to the 'Marquette & Bessemer' and 'Ashtabula,' it does not seem as if these accidents were in any way due to the lack of proper aids to navigation on the Canadian coast, and it does not seem as if any additional fog alarms, or other aids to navigation, would have prevented these casualties.

The president of the Lake Carriers' Association is quoted in the American press as authority for the statement that all navigation should close on the lakes on the 1st of December.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Yesterday the leader of the opposition asked the Prime Minister with reference to five or six motions on the Order Paper, that they be passed unopposed, and the Prime Minister stated if the matter were mentioned to-day he would say if they could be moved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection to any of the motions except No. 33.

The following motions were then severally agreed to:

For a return showing:—1. A description by sections, townships and ranges with areas of all lands included in the area controlled by the Southern Alberta Land Company under agreements with the government, and the date of expiry of such agreements?

2. A description by sections, townships and ranges with areas of all lands held under grazing lease or leases or assignment of leases and now controlled by Messrs. Cowdry and Maunsall, or either of them, of lands which lie between the Bow and Belly rivers, bounded on the east by range 12 and on the west by range 19, west of the fourth meridian.—Mr. McCarthy.

For a copy of all certificates recommendations, letters, memoranda and documents in connection with the promotion of Mr. McIntosh, on the 16th of November, 1908, from the position of division engineer, division No. 6, district F, to the position of assistant district engineer, district F, and the increase of his salary from $200 to $275 per month; also of all complaints against the professional conduct or efficiency of Mr. McIntosh made to the Transcontinental railway or the Railway Department before the date of promotion. —Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all papers, reports, correspondence, etc., between the Department of the

Interior, and its officers and agencies, and any other persons, relative to the s.w. ¼ section 16-30-9 w. 3rd M., and the respective claims thereto of Thos. Paterson and J. F. Sibbard.—Mr. Lake.

1. For a return showing the names and addresses of the engineers who surveyed and located the line of the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, and the part of the railway covered by the work of each engineer.

2. The name and address of the engineer who prepared the estimate of quantities and prices of the section or portion of the line covered by each contract.

3. The names of the engineers acting upon behalf of the Railway Department or Railway Commission, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, in determining upon the form and wording of the specifications, as provided for by the seventh section of the agreement between the government and the company.

4. The names of such of the engineers acting in any of the capacities aforesaid, as subsequently acted in connection with construction, when and for how long in what capacity, where their services have been dispensed with, and for what cause.

5. The names and addresses of all the engineers in the service of the Railway Commission, or Railway Department, on districts B and F of the said eastern division, since the commencement of the construction of the railway, the capacity in which each was employed, the salary in each case, the promotions, increases of salary, retirements and dismissals which have taken place, the cause for promotion, dismissal or retirement in each case, and a copy of all complaints lodged with the commissioners or their chief engineer or the department, against any of these engineers.

6. The names of the engineers now in charge of or engaged upon districts B and F, and the official position and salary of each.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all documents and papers relating to the western shipment of grain.—Mr. McCarthy.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

BOUNTY TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. TURRIFF moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 87) to amend an Act to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa. He said: My object in introducing this Bill is to enable either a South African veteran who has located his half section of land, or his substitute who may have located it, and who afterwards finds that the land is practically worthless, to substitute another half section within a certain time for the one originally located. At the present time, if one is unfortunate enough to have made that mistake—and a few have done so—he suffers a total loss of the value of the warrant.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to amend that part of the Dominion Lands Act affecting purchased homesteads. At present a man who is not entitled to take up a second free homestead, may secure a purchased homestead by residing six months in each year for three years on the homestead and doing the necessaray improvements, and in addition paying the sum of $3 per acre. When he makes his entry he is required to pay $1 per acre in addition to the $10 entry fee. The same thing has happened in a few of these cases as has happened in the location of South African warrants, that a purchased homestead for which a man has made an entry afterwards turns out to be worthless; and this amendment is to enable the minister to give him credit for the $160 he has paid on account of the purchase, and allow him to make entry for another quarter section.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there many such cases?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, but there are a few, and they occur in this way. A man goes out and spends a month or six weeks and $100 or $150 in locating a quarter section. He selects half a dozen, but there is such a rush now for land that five or six townships may be put on the market on a certain day, and when he goes to the land office he finds perhaps a hundred men lined up at the door. He may be the 40th or 50th in the line, and by the time he reaches the counter every one of the five or six quarter sections he has selected may have been taken up. A man beside him suggests another quarter section to him as a good one, and he, to avoide the trouble and expense of hunting up another, with possibly the same process to be gone through again, makes entry for the quarter section suggested to him, pays the $10 entry fee and the $160 on account. He then goes out and looks at the land and finds it worthless. The law at present allows him to take up another purchased homestead, but does not allow him to get credit for the $160 he has paid. The object I have in view is to enable him to get credit for the money he has already paid on the land.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman in order in introducing a Bill dealing with the revenues? Does that not pertain to a member of the government?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the Bill affects the revenue of the land in any way, it is subject to the rule.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman that it does not affect the revenue. I am not asking that the money should be refunded. I am only asking that another quarter section should be substituted for the first one selected.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think that is a matter that affects the revenue. There is no provision made by any of our laws that money can be refunded by any officer unless it comes out of the consolidated fund. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before ruling, I should like to look into the matter. If the Bill has to be preceded by a resolution, it will have to stand. In the meantime, will it be read a first time?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to me that it ought to be read a first time. If a question is raised and you are not prepared to rule, but wish to take it into consideration, I think the Bill should stand.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have no objection to allowing it to stand.

Bill allowed to stand.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 88) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act. He said: This Bill is an exact copy of the Bill of last year, which provided for the weighing of grain at all terminal elevators, as well as at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. The grain is weighed there by government officials, and the vessels when they unload at the lower end of the lake find a very large shortage. This shortage amounted last year to thousands of dollars, I then gave the figures. It has been a great loss to vessel owners who carry the grain. The Bill provides that the Act should apply in the same way to terminal elevators at the lower end of the lake as well as those at the northern end of the lake. It simply provides that in all cases where the grain is deposited in a terminal elevator it should be weighed in and weighed out.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION OF OTTAWA.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I beg to inform the House that having been elected at the last election for the electoral division of Quebec East, and also the electoral division of the city of Ottawa, I now elect to sit for Quebec East, and hereby vacate my seat for the city of Ottawa.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I want to read a short paragraph in a newspaper, and ask the Finance Minister a question with reference to it. I find a despatch from Paris which says:

> During the consideration of the Tariff Bill in the Chamber of Deputies to-day a blackeye was given to the importation of agricultural machines by the adoption of an amendment fixing the maximum rate on machines of over 400 kilograms (881·6 lbs.) weight at 15 francs (approximately $2.85) per hundred weight and the minimum weight at 12 francs. On machines under 400 kilograms weight the maximum is 23 and the minimum 15 francs. The present rates are: Maximum 15 and minimum 9 francs, irrespective of weight.

I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he has any knowledge that this has taken place other than what appears in the newspapers; and if he has not, and cannot therefore give an answer, will he be kind enough to keep it in mind and give the House an answer after recess?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I have no information except that contained in the public press. I judge from the reports that the matter is under consideration in the French Chambers, and that nothing definite has been determined. Of course, it is unquestionably the right of the French Chambers to change the figures of their maximum and minimum tariff. We could not deny them the right to do that under the terms of our treaty. In like manner we can change the rates on importations under our intermediate tariff on most of the French products mentioned in the treaty. However, during the recess I will endeavour to obtain more accurate information about it.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

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

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro). Mr. Speaker, another year has added to the history of Canada, and I feel sure we are all grateful to the Giver of all good that Canada has been so prosperous. My hon. friends opposite will be ready to join me in that sentiment, for I am told that since they have been in opposition they are more inclined to acknowledge our dependence on Providence than they were when they occupied seats on this side of the House. I wish to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the fact that it has been his pleasant task to make known all this prosperity to the House and to the country. Was ever a Finance Minister in Canada as fortunate as the present Finance Minister? He has had

the same cheerful story to tell us for the past 13 years. Last year it was feared by some of his friends, and perhaps it is not too much to say that it was hoped by those who are not his friends, that his good fortune had deserted him. But he is here again this year to tell us of the bountiful harvest, of increasing population, of expanding trade, and of a revenue that has reached a point that was never before touched in the history of this country.

Now, Sir, in listening to the debate since its commencement I could not help contrasting the hopeful tone of the Minister of Finance with the doleful forebodings of some of our friends on the front benches of the opposition. For my part I was sincerely thankful as I listened to this debate, that I belonged to a party in Canada who believe that Canada has a future, a party whose leaders are not driven on occasions of this kind to talk about such post mortem questions as the adverse balance of trade and reciprocity with the United States. The expenditure has been made the chief ground of attack upon the government. We are condemned for what our friends opposite choose to call the alarming increase in the expenditure of this country. Now, Sir, it is quite true that there has been an increase in the expenditure since 1896, but instead of being alarmed about il, we ought to congratulate ourselves that we have been able ta make this increased expenditure. It has been said in this debate, and it will be found, that this expenditure can largely be accounted for by reason of the expansion and prosperity of the country. Take for example the expansion of our postal service. The expenditure on the postal service in 1896 was $3,650,000, and the revenue was $2,964,000. In 1908 the expenditure was $3,592,386.40; on the other hand the revenue was $7,401,623.93. Now, Sir, is any sane man in Canada losing sleep over the fact that we doubled our postal expenditure since 1896, especially when he looks at the other side and finds that we have collected nearly three times as much revenue, on a lower rate of postage, as we did in 1896. But that is what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would call taking money out of the pockets of the people. We can get a similar illustration in the case of the Intercolonial. The expenditure on the Intercolonial in 1896 was $3,029,304.08, and the revenue was $2,994,201.93.

In 1909, the expenditure was $9,364,256.10. But in the same year the revenue was $8,583,100.79. And is there any man in Canada alarmed at the fact that we have more than doubled our expenditures on the Intercolonial railway when, on turning the page, and looking at the other side of the account, he sees that we have more than doubled the revenue during the same period. I submit that the Canadian people are not opposed to a generous expenditure of money, especially if that money is used in the construction of railways or other works that will develop the resources of the country. The question of expenditure has been submitted to the people of Canada three times during the last ten years. Our friends opposite will remember that they raised that question in the elections of 1900; they stumped this country and condemned the government in every school-house and hall throughout Canada for having raised the expenditure during the time they had held office. But when the returns came in it was found that the country had sustained the government notwithstanding all that had been said on this question of expenditure. In the following election, in 1904, these hon. gentlemen were even more emphatic on this question than they had been in 1900, and they got a more emphatic answer from the people. You will remember, Sir, that in the election of 1908, this question was again brought to the attention of the people. We all recollect how this little book, 'Facts for the people'—they were not all facts, but that was the name on the title-page—was sent out from this building in cartloads day after day prior to the election. And in that book was page after page condemning the government for the increase of expenditure. But when the election came, when the boxes were opened and the ballots counted, it was found that the government was again sustained; these hon. gentlemen got their answer. And, Sir, if this question were submitted to the people of Canada to-morrow, I have not the slightest doubt that they would get the same answer as they got before. Their leaders, I have noticed, sometimes try to formulate some policy on which expenditures should be made. Only a few days ago, the hon. member for North Toronto endeavoured to lay down a policy in regard to the expenditure on public buildings. He said that, in the smaller towns of Canada, where buildings could be rented at a cheap rate, we should not go to the great expense of erecting expensive public buildings, and he condemned the government for its expenditure in such cases. The present policy, he said, was wrong. I notice that he did not get the same cheers from the gentlemen sitting behind him that he usually evokes when he makes a speech. I watched the proceedings for a few minutes, and what happened? Why, man after man of his own supporters rose in his place and demanded a public building for his own constituency. That is the way his principle was received by his supporters. My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall), last night, said it was very important indeed that some principle of that kind should be laid down. And I should not be disposed to disagree with him very much,

but I would ask him, in the first place, to do some missionary work among the men who sit around him and see if he can get two of them to unite in the laying down of a principle or policy for regulating this matter of the erection of public buildings. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not satisfied to leave the question there. He brought it up again in the debate on the address last night and condemned the government again in very severe language indeed for constructing so many of these buildings in small towns. He charactorized this way of doing business as not a policy at all, but a mere piece of 'paltry, petty patronage,' if I recollect his language. But let me ask, who began this practice and continued it for so many years of our history? I recollect very well that in the old days, when my hon. friend from North Toronto was Finance Minister of this country, two of these buildings were erected in towns in the county in which I live, neither of these towns being very large. Take, for example, the town of Pictou. The population of Pictou at that time was about 3,000—I think it was a little less. Rent was very low in Pictou at that time; a building could be secured at a very low rate; I question if the government would pay more than $200 or $300 for the post office that was serving the people in that town in those days. And what did my hon. friend do, when he was Finance Minister and held the purse strings? He advised the House to vote the large sum of some $40,000 to erect a post office in the town of Pictou, and the post office was accordingly erected.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Post office and customs house was it not?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, a building for a customs house had been erected in the town of Pictou prior to that date, and this was a new building devoted altogether to the post office service. Now, suppose that I should use the language of my hon. friend in describing on characterizing that transaction and apply it to himself. His language thus adapted would read something like this:

What does it mean? It means that the trustee sitting yonder——

In that case, of course, the trustee was my hon. friend from North Toronto.

—allows to be taken out from under his key where he has it in charge $40,000 of the people's money for a mere matter of paltry petty patronage; that is what it means, nothing more and nothing less.

Now, I do not want to be understood as objecting to a post office being built in the town of Pictou. I would have voted for the post office in the town of Pictou at that time if I had the honour then of a seat in the House. Pictou is the shire town of the county, an old historical town—no greater in that way in Canada. In its crooked and narrow streets, when this country was a forest, walked the men who struck the first blow for responsible government in this country. The town of Pictou is worthy of anything of that kind which this government can do for it. But I would ask the question, is it a seemly thing for an hon. gentleman, as long as he occupies office, to carry on the distribution of money in this way and as soon as he is voted out of office by the people to turn around and say that his successor in doing the very thing he did himself is committing a breach of trust and is actuated by motives of petty patronage? I say it is not seemly to do that.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. It is not very fair to compare Pictou, with a population of 3,000, with Richibucto, with a population of 600.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am discussing the principle laid down by my hon. friend who said that if a building could be rented at small rent it was a breach of trust to expend all that money in erecting a post office. He says that in a place where a building could be rented for $300, you spend $40,000 in the erection of a post office, you spend $1,500 or $2,000 a year to keep it heated and attended to after you have built it. That is the kind of doctrine my hon. friend has been placing before the House day after day and year after year, and if his principles were applied to the town of Pictou, the town of Pictou would not have received a post office. If it was wrong prior to 1896 then my hon. friend was the chief sinner because he was the trustee, as he says; he held the purse strings, and so far as I know he has never shown any signs of repentance and he does not seem to have shown any yet. I have not the slightest doubt if he was in office to-morrow he would do the very same thing again. People who are apt to be disturbed about the conduct of other people ought to set a good example. It is a bad sign when a man is more solicitous about the conduct of his neighbour than he is about his own.

Since 1896 this country has enjoyed a period of enormous expansion. You may refer to any department of the government you please or to any blue-book you please, and you will find the same splendid story, a story which is perhaps unequalled in the history of the world. Take, for example, the traffic in the Canadian canals. In the year 1885 the number of tons of freight that passed through the Canadian canals was 2,673,641 tons. Ten years afterwards, in 1895, the number of tons was 3,336,068. In ten years the increase had been only about 663,000 tons But take the period after 1895, and you find that in the year 1908 the figure is not 3,000,000 but 17,502,820 tons, an increase of 14,166,752 tons in the freight passing through the Canadian canals, dur-

ing the period of this administration as compared with 663,000 tons in the ten years of the prior administration.

Then look at the traffic on the Canadian steam railways. In 1885 the number of passengers carried on the Canadian steam railways was 9,672,599. In 1895 it was 13,987,580. In 1908 it was 34,044,992.

Mr. LALOR. Is the Minister of Finance responsible for the increase of travel on the railways?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not referring to the Minister of Finance at all in this matter especially. I am referring to the splendid progress the country has made during the present administration and there would be no difficulty at all in connecting it with the government of the country if I chose to take the time to do it.

Every one remembers the condition of the west prior to 1896. The west had made very slow progress. We had spent a great deal of money, we had poured out our millions to assist in the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway but we seemed to get very small returns. We had millions of acres of the richest land in the world but we had no men to till the soil. These rich prairies were the home of the coyote and the gopher. Then came a change of government, then came a Minister of the Interior who knew the west, who knew how to make the west known to the world. He bent his great energies to the task that was given him and he succeeded. You know how he made the west known; he performed his task with great success and we see the splendid results of his work to-day.

While the country has enjoyed a period of enormous expansion, as I have said, the trouble with my friends opposite is that their minds and ideas do not seem to have expanded in the same proportion as the country. Many of them are still living in the old days before the fall. Some of them actually appear to consider that it is a calamity that with a lower rate of taxation we have a revenue of about $100,000,000 instead of $38,000,000 or $40,000,000. They think that is a very serious thing indeed and they are fretting over it. Let me tell hon. gentlemen who look at it in that way that their troubles are only commencing, that if they are going to keep mourning over this thing they will have much more mourning to do, that if they live ten years longer we will have a revenue in this country of $200,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as at present.

I would like to point out some of the benefits that have accompanied and flowed from these expenditures which these hon. gentlemen have been condemning, and I shall confine myself in what I say on this point to that part of Canada with which I am best acquainted. Prior to 1896, the fishing population on the Atlantic coast were not making much progress; the fresh fish business was almost unknown, bait was scarce and sometimes impossible to get at the seasons of the year when it was most wanted. There were few coasting steamers to carry the products of the coast to market. In many ports there were no wharfs where a passing steamer could call. Now, Sir, all this is changed. Bait freezers dot the coast from one end to the other, enabling the fishermen to carry on their work at all seasons of the year Whistling buoys, bell buoys and gas buoys are found along the shores marking the rocks and dangerous shoals and enabling the coaster and the fishermen to get into harbour in darkness and fog. Breakwaters have been built in many places along the coast to afford protection to shipping. Public wharfs have been built in many harbours, harbours that were inaccessible before have been dredged, and subsidized steamers are calling at these harbours, collecting the products of the people and taking them to market.

All these improvements have cost a great deal of money, but they have had splendid results in the country, and while hon. gentlemen opposite have been complaining about these expenditures, while they have been obstructing the passage of the estimates, by which these things were done in many cases, there have been growing up on the coast of Nova Scotia, thriving villages, where these expenditures were made and our young men are remaining at home and establishing themselves there in place of going to Gloucester or Boston, or some other point in the United States. These are the things that are resulting from the expenditures that these hon. gentlemen have complained about so much. There is one phase of the policy of the present government for which I wish to give them a good deal of credit, and that is that they have given a great deal of consideration always to the little places notwithstanding the opposition of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and some other gentlemen on the other side of the House. We cannot all live in the big cities, and it would be a bad thing for Canada if we could. The best blood of the country, or of the nation comes from the country districts, and what we should aim at, what we are endeavouring to do in this country, is to make the life of the common man who lives in a country district as prosperous, contented and happy as we can.

Something has been done in this direction, but I do not mean to say that the government have done everything or done as much as they might or ought to have done. We must give the people of the country a better postal service, and we must also give them better railway facilities if we expect the young men to remain

at home in the country districts, or if we expect the people on the coast to remain on those hamlets and harbours which are so isolated. A few days ago, in reply to a question I asked the hon. the acting Postmaster General, I was informed that there are 101 post offices in the province of Nova Scotia alone that receive only weekly mails. I was also informed that there are 292 post offices in that province that have only two mails a week, and that there are 586 that have only three mails a week. This does not reflect too much credit on the Post Office Department, and I trust that something will be done to improve that condition.

The hon. the Finance Minister pointed out the other day in his address the gratifying success that had followed the policy of granting bounties on steel and iron. He suggested that the country had received their money back through the customs offices in those places where thriving towns had been built up as a result of this expenditure. I think that it was my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) who felt inclined to dispute that fact. I can not concerned very much whether it can be proven or not. We have established the steel and iron industry of Canada and that is the main thing; that is what we tried to do when we agreed to give this bounty and we have succeeded in doing it. We had the raw material, we had the iron ore, we had the limestone, we had the coal, we had everything that was necessary, but we did not have any steel industry. Now, we have the steel industry established in two Canadian provinces and a commencement has been made in a third. If we had never got a dollar out of the customs house I would say that we had made a good bargain if we had spent these millions in establishing the steel industry in Canada, and if there is any gentleman here who would like to have the money back again and turn back the clock to where it was thirteen or fourteen years ago without any steel industry in Canada, I would like to see him stand up so that we can get his photograph. I do not believe there is a man in Canada who would wish to go back to those old days.

I was very much interested in the proposal of the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to acquire the right to take over branch lines along the route of the Intercolonial railway. I cordially support that policy. I would go farther, Sir, and I would build branch railways in places along the Intercolonial railway where they are not now in existence and where the traffic would warrant the expenditure that would necessarily have to be made. We have eight or nine railway companies in the province of Nova Scotia alone and each of these companies has a board of directors. Each company has a head office staff, repair shops and all the expensive paraphernalia of a railway company. Most of them are at present unprofitable. If they were merged into one great company with one central office and were used as feeders for the main line, a great deal of money that is now wasted in keeping up these establishments might be devoted to extensions and improvements. I am told that there is an idea, or rather let me call it a delusion, in some parts of Canada, that the Intercolonial railway in some way is a great advantage to the people of the maritime provinces at the expense of the rest of the people of Canada. It is not the case. The people of the maritime provinces pay well for what they receive from the Intercolonial railway. The rates on passenger traffic are the same there as they are on the other great railways of Canada. The through rates on freight are the same. If there are slight differences along the line they are accounted for largely by the competition of water carriage or some other reason. As a matter of fact the Intercolonial railway has in some ways been rather a handicap on the progress of the maritime provinces, and the reason why it has been is that it has not been progressive. I have some doubts whether it ever will be progressive under government management. The machinery we have here is too cumbersome to run a business enterprise. We have to wait sometimes eight or nine months to get a little money voted to build an ice house on the road to keep business going and to keep the refrigerator cars supplied with ice. For any special expenditure we must come here. The directors of a great company could arrange that at once with a stroke of the pen. There are difficulties under government ownership that have been a handicap on the maritime provinces for many years in connection with the Intercolonial railway. I will tell you some of the things that they feel to-day to prove the point I am now making. For example, instead of establishing an express business of their own at the time the road was built, they handed the express business over to an incorporated company, which has bled the people of the maritime provinces for a generation and is still bleeding them. The fact they had to wait for thirty years before they wakened up to get leave from parliament to acquire the branch lines shows you how slow they have been as a business proposition. They never made any genuine attempt to acquire or increase traffic along the line. The Intercolonial railway only touches a few points on the sea coast—such places as St. John, Halifax, Mulgrave and the Sydneys. At these places the population occupies chiefly a narrow fringe along the coast. Any

up-to-date railway company operating there would have provided boats to collect traffic from the towns and villages along the shore and deliver it to the railway.

The Intercolonial railway never did anything of the kind; it was left altogether to private enterprise. If the traffic came the Intercolonial railway carried it, and if the traffic did not come the Intercolonial railway did not care. That is the way that railway has been managed all through its history. This last proposal of the government to take over the branch lines and operate them as part of the system has been satisfactory to the people of the maritime provinces, and it gives us a little ray of hope. I am quite sure that the present Minister of Railways is anxious not only to make this road satisfactory to the people living along the line, but also to make it a good business proposition. Let these branches be taken over under the legislation we have passed this season; let new branches be built where the traffic probably warrants the expenditure. Let the Intercolonial railway take over the business of the Express Company and develop that business. Instead of controlling every little detail of management from Ottawa or from Moncton let the superintendent of each division be given full charge and make him responsible for the results. Let more energy be expended in the task of developing traffic along that railroad; cultivate what is known in the United States as business snap, and I venture to say that in five years the Intercolonial railway will not only pay working expenses but will have a good balance to its credit for extensions and improvements.

Just one word more. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) in his speech last night, took occasion to criticise the naval policy of the government, and he suggested the presentation of a Dreadnought or two at enormous cost. The speech of the hon. gentleman (M. Maclean) was interesting because it was the first note we had from the opposition benches during the session on this very important question. They have sat tighter on this than on any other question since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. But, as the hon. gentleman from South York sometimes appears to try to head off his leader and sometimes kicks over the traces, it is difficult to say how much importance we should attach to his speech as foreshadowing the position that the opposition are going to take. In the resolution passed by this House on the 29th of March last we voted for the establishment of a Canadian naval service to act in co-operation with the imperial navy, and the resolution to that effect was very plain and very clear cut. There was no suggestion in that resolution of presenting any Dreadnoughts to anybody, and there was a direct negative given to the other proposition for a cash contribution. Now, when we on this side voted for that resolution, we did so in good faith. We intend to live up to the resolution; we stand for a Canadian navy manned by Canadian seamen, officered as far as possible by Canadians, and absolutely controlled by the government of Canada. We stand as one man behind our chief on that question; there is no dissention in our ranks. I wonder if my hon. friend from South York can say as much for the men who are sitting behind the leader of the opposition. If we are to judge by the Conservative press, our friends opposite are not a happy family on that question. In Nova Scotia, the Halifax 'Herald' is regarded as the organ of the leader of the opposition, but occasionally it gives currency to a blunt statement, and in a recent issue I find the following pronouncement:

> If the Conservative party ever expect to gain power they must do something more than follow in the footsteps of the government on national questions.

I would call that a pretty plain hint to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. It will be recollected that when the Liberal party came into power in 1896, Sir Charles Tupper, who was then the leader of the Conservatives, gave the new government only six months to live. He said that the Liberals did not have the genius to govern Canada, that he could not see any statesmen in the Liberal party that were equal to the task of government, and with the eye of an experienced leader he swept the horizon of Canada to the sky line, and he declared: there was no Napoleon of finance in the Liberal ranks to take the place of the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and there was no captain of transportation to stand in the shoes of the hon. gentleman from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart). And, Sir Charles Tupper prophesied the complete and utter downfall of the Liberal government within the short period of six months. But, Sir Charles is an older man to-day, and I suppose a little wiser, and after thirteen years and six months of additional experience he is now imploring his dear friend the leader of the opposition to stand by this policy of the Liberal government. I have shown you that the leader of the opposition's own organ in Halifax is asking him to get on deck and take the tiller and steer a course for himself; I have shown you that Sir Charles Tupper asks him to support the government; which will he do, I wonder? Under the circumstances is it strange that the leader of the opposition is perplexed and embarrassed? But, Mr. Speaker, the very fact that he finds

himself in this dilemma is the highest compliment that can be paid to the policy of the government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House as one of its youngest members while I offer a few remarks on the financial questions discussed by the Finance Minister in his budget speech. I have listened to two of the hon. gentleman's annual financial statements with a good deal of interest. On the first occasion he was evidently labouring greatly to turn what was palpably a deficit into a surplus, and on the second occasion, while he still laboured to make the best of a bad bargain, there was a cheerful note in his speech. The Minister of Finance is a student of affairs who recognizes that the historian of the future stands at his elbow, and when he comes before this House and claims a surplus when as a matter of fact he has no surplus, what can he expect the future historian will say of him? There is no question at all but that the Minister of Finance has burdened posterity with a huge debt for which they will have the privilege of paying, and as to the incurring of which posterity, of course, has had nothing whatever to say. The hon. gentleman is a student of history, and doubtless hopes to attain to a niche in the Temple of Fame. No wonder he hesitates and inwardly groans at the story he has to tell The ghost of the future historian confronts him. The name of the Minister of Fiannce will be associated with this carnival of extravagance as that of the great Colbert was associated with the ruin of old France. For the hon. Finance Minister is playing the same part to a master as absolute politically and as reckless financially as any Louis of France. Sir, the people of this country still have recollections of the system of the Intendant Bigot, but they are prone to forget that they have instituted in the affairs of government to-day a system more odious and more exacting than any established under the old regime.

Let me point out that in discussing the finances of this country it is extremely difficult for a young, or even for an old member to secure what may be called definite information. We have various sources of information, most of it published by various departments of the government. We have the Trade and Navigation returns which are the product of the Department of Customs. We have the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce; we have the Yearbook, which is published by the Census Department; we have the Canada Gazette; we have the speeches of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; and we have what we call the Grit campaign literature. Leaving out of the question the last named publication and also the speeches of my hon. friend and the Canada Gazette, we have three sources of information left in the publications of the country, and when we compare the figures of these three publications we find that they do not agree, but show vast discrepancies in the figures for the same items. What are we to understand from this? Each of these departments have the same source of information, and yet there is a vast difference in their figures. Let me quote, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance and the House, some of these figures. Take the simplest table contained in the three volumes, that is the comparative statistics of the exports and the imports of the country from year to year:

Year.	——	Exports.	Imports.
		$	$
1896	Statistical Year Book	117,684,799	110,587,480
"	Trade and Navigation Report	121,013,852	118,011,508
1900	Year Book	186,433,212	180,804,316
"	Trade and Navigation Report	191,894,723	189,622,513
1901	Year Book	196,487,632	181,237,988
"	Trade and Navigation Report	196,487,632	190,415,525
1906	Year Book	256,586,630	290,360,807
"	Trade and Commerce Report	256,586,630	294,286,015

The members of this House naturally suppose that these figures are given by disinterested parties and must be accurate. If they are, they must necessarily agree in all these books. But when we find a discrepancy of millions of dollars in the corresponding statements given in these blue-books, what must we expect to find in the other accounts? Is it a fact that we are standing on a volcano, and that the statement as given every year by the Finance Minister is a cooked statement? I do not want to accuse him of that; but the fact is that when a banker is wrong in his accounts the first thing done is to examine his trial balances to see if they are correct.

Mr. FIELDING. The figures first quoted are not mine, but are those of the hon. member for North Toronto in 1896.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The books are those published by my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING. They are all right when you get the explanation.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Another point which I wish to discuss in this connection is the question of the surplus. My hon. friend has assured the House time and time again that we have a surplus. He has made this out by charging up a number of items to special accounts. I would like to ask

him what authority he has for charging up anything to special accounts. I have read the Consolidated Revenue Fund Act and I cannot find any authority there which permits the government of the day to charge anything to a special account. The custom in England, previous to the days of Pitt, was to keep the accounts separate, so that it was impossible for any one to tell from month to month how the country stood financially. Pitt had an Act passed providing that the moneys paid to the government should be paid into one fund and that all the payments made should come out of one fund. That Act was passed in 1786, and, to quote the language of the Act, its purpose was 'to provide a fund into which shall flow every stream of public revenue, and from which shall issue the supply for every public service.' By this system treasury management was unified and strengthened, and the people of the country were able to ascertain the exact state of affairs at the end of the year —whether the country had a surplus or a deficit. I do not wish to be partisan in this matter, but it is a fact, according to the statistics published by the government, that if you balance the statements from year to year, you will find that since confederation we have only had surpluses in 1871, 1882, 1900, 1903, 1904 and 1907.

Now, the hon. Minister of Finance will say that his predecessors adopted the plan of charging up bonus accounts and other accounts of that kind, as outside charges, not against the Consolidated Revenue Fund in order to hocus pocus the public into the belief that there was a surplus. Now, whether that is the case or not, and possibly it may be the case, the fact remains that it is not correct. It is not right, and I do not see that the law gives him any justification for doing so. For that reason, I think that in considering the exact state of the finances of the country, we should consider this fund from the standpoint of whether there is a surplus of revenue as a whole against expenditures as a whole. Let us now see what the hon. gentlemen, in the past twelve years, have got in the way of surpluses. I propose to take the figures and examine them as they are taken and treated by the British Treasury.

Surpluses and Deficits—Deficits on Consolidated Revenue Account, June. 1895.

Year.	Deficits.	Surpluses.
1896..	$ 5,422,506	
1897..	3,041,163	
1898..	2,417,802	
1899..	2,317,047	
1900..	.....	$ 779,639
1901..	2,986,197	
1902..	3,349,086	
1903..	.....	10,222,101
1904..	.....	739,270
1905..	5,356,448	
1906..	818,811	
1907..	.....	3,371,118
1908..	14,289,000	
1909..	45,969,419	
	$85,967,479	$15,112,128
Total deficits..		$85,967,479
Total surpluses.. ..		15,112,128
Net deficits ..		..$70,855,351

Roughly speaking the total deficits during the regime of the hon. gentleman was $85,967,479, and his total surpluses amounted to $15.112,128, or a net amount of deficit of $70,855,351.

Mr. FIELDING. Has my hon. friend a statement for the preceding regime?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I could get it out of the blue-book. No doubt there had been a great many deficits and surpluses in previous years, but what I claim is this, that my hon. friend assumes that there is a surplus when his deficit is so very large, and amounting altogether to $45,969,419. Still he states that he has a surplus of revenue, because he cuts off $47,000,000 of the total expenditure, and he says: We will charge that up against a special account, we have not spent that, and when we do that we have a surplus. Now, Sir, if a man pays out money, for instance, for a bonus, it is not an asset. There is nothing to show for it. It is nothing tangible that I can see. It is like money paid out for charity. Now, why shall that not be charged up against the revenue of the country, and not be put down as a charge against anything else? Why should it be put into a special account and kept out of the total revenue and expenditures of the country? I claim that the hon. gentleman is deceiving the public. His predecessors in the Ontario government adopted the same plan. Every year the Prime Minister of Ontario, now Senator Ross, came down and told the people of Ontario that they had $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 of a surplus, and the surpluses were piled up until the public were led to believe that the money was so plentiful in the treasury that they could close the lid down. But when the new government took hold of affairs and made an examination they couldn't find even a bad quarter of a dollar. They had to go to work and recast the accounts in order to show a true statement of the affairs of the province. Now the hon. gentleman, as I say, is actually deceiving the public by not following the system adopted in England. It would look far beter in the end when he had to go into foreign markets to borrow money to make up the deficiency

The Minister of Finance took unction to himself that he had been able to make favourable loans for this country, and when he was taxed with the fact that the

loans were at too high a rate, he said that the rates for this country were no higher than other countries were paying. I took the trouble to look into this matter of loans. I find that Australia was in the market for loans about the same time as the hon. gentleman, and I find that the Dominion of Australia secured its loans at a much lower rate, at the same time, than the Dominion of Canada. The reason of it is, without any doubt, owing to the great expenditures of this country, the adverse balance of trade, and also to the fact that our accounts really showed an annual deficit; because you can not fool a banker. He will look at the figures in the way I am looking at them, and he can tell how much you have spent more than you have got in. Now, I find that the Minister of Finance raised £20,800,000, and Australia was in the market at the same time for £25,600,000. Australia paid before redemption of its loans 4·07971 per cent, whilst after the loans were redeemed the rate of interest was reduced to 3·42337 per cent. That is a very substantial reduction, showing that their financial system was sound, even though their foreign trade balances did not show so large an expansion as ours. Now, this is the table in Australia.

—	Interest—Old Loans.		New Loans.	
	Amount	Rate.	Amount	Rate.
	£	p. c.	£	p. c.
New South Wales...	178,547	4·12	159,286	3·65
Victoria	611,455	4·14	521,128	3·35
South Australia.....	118,154	4·00	107,637	3·62
West Australia.....	68,239	3·77	63,277	3·21
Tasmania	26,863	3·52	26,384	3·23

The hon. Finance Minister is paying, since redemption, 4·9 per cent, 3·7 per cent, 4·3 per cent, 3·8 per cent, 4·5 per cent and 4·4 per cent. That does not speak well for the financing of the hon. Minister of Finance, and it shows that the financial affairs of this country are not looked upon with such a tremendous amount of favour as hon. gentlemen opposite look upon them. Now, I have explained the deficits as they should be taken in accordance with the English practice of finance, and it is the only correct practice that we should take.

Now, let us consider the question of expenditures. Hon. gentlemen opposite take great credit to themselves that they are expending large sums of money. It is one of the principles they lay down to everybody who wants to go on the stump for them; you must talk big expenditures to the people; they like it. We have heard it proclaimed here: Wait for eight or ten years more and we shall have $200,000,000 revenue to expend. Who provides this money? Does it not come out of the pockets of the people? I do not think that anybody, even on the other side, denies that the people pay for these large expenditures. These revenues do not come down like manna from the heavens. The people have to pay in 'hand-made dollars', as my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall) says. We are told that the foreign trade of this country is growing by leaps and bounds. So it is. But when we consider the ratio of our expenditure to the foreign trade, we find that we are expending virtually fifty per cent of our total exports which are really the surplus of the earnings of our people. In 1906, our exports of home products amounted to $235,483,956, and our expenditures for that year were $67,204,641, or 27 per cent of the exports. In 1909, our exports amounted to $245,603,584 and our expenditures to $112,578,680, or 49 per cent. Where is the county council or municipal council that would dare to expend nearly half of the surplus products of the municipality in public works? The ordinary municipality will produce about $250,000 of surplus to be sold in the town. Would the township council dare to expend $125,000 a year on roads and in other public services? The government stands in the same capacity as trustees of the whole people of the Dominion, and it is from our exports, our surplus products, that they must derive their revenue. It is indeed a startling fact that the expenditures have reached such enormous figures, and that they are increasing so rapidly that if we continue, we shall soon see the time when we shall expend more than the total of our exports.

Now, compare Canada in these relationships with other countries, and we shall better understand our position. Canada, with a population of seven and a half millions, according to hon. members opposite has a revenue of $85,093,404, and a total trade of $571,268,707. Switzerland, with a population of eight millions, has a revenue of $25,000,000 and a total trade of about $500,000,000—practically the same as our own. So we are virtually spending the money of the people of this country nearly $60,000,000 more than is spent by the government of Switzerland for a similar population. That is one fact that goes to explain why our finances are not so rosy as those of Australia, as shown by the table I have already given.

Another question that is discussed in this debate is the question of capital account. The question is a very difficult one. What is capital account? It seems to be something like the question Pilate asked: What is truth? In an ordinary business, a man considers his capital to be what he pays for land, buildings and plant

and what he keeps for working cash in his business. If he puts money into a machine and that machine breaks down and proves a failure the expenditure is written off to profit and loss. But this government has been adding to its capital account without taking into consideration whether there was an asset to represent each expenditure. There is no loss account. The increases in our capital account since this government came into office have been as follows:

1896	$3,781,311 00
1897	3,523,160 00
1898	4,143,503 00
1899	5,936,343 00
1900	7,468,843 00
1901	7,695,488 00
1902	10,698,638 00
1903	7,052,725 00
1904	7,881,719 00
1905	11,933,492 00
1906	11,913,874 00
1907	11,329,144 00
1908	30,429,907 00
1909	49,224,000 00
	$172,392,154 00

This is the total of additions to capital account made by the hon. gentlemen opposite since they came into power. As the total addition to capital acount since confederation has been $372,535,315, this means that the additions made by previous administrations amount to about $200,000,000. For its share of these expenditures, the Conservative governments could show the Canadian Pacific railway, the northwest lands, the Welland canal, the Sault canal, the St. Lawrence canal and the Intercolonial railway. These are all substantial assets. Many of them are yielding an actual return. The canals would pay to-day if the government chose to charge for ships going through them. No doubt, the policy of not making a charge is a wise one. The Intercolonial makes no money return to the government. But private management would change it from an expensive luxury, as it is now, to a valuable and profitable asset. I believe there are railway men in America who would pay the government dollar for dollar what the Intercolonial cost if that road were handed over to them, showing that it is a substantial asset notwithstanding that under this government it is losing money every year. The northwest lands are returning about $2,500,000 a year of revenue. Thus, on the capital account expenditures made by Conservatives we are having satisfactory returns. In the majority of cases, these were capital expenditures in the true sense. But the capital expenditures of the hon. gentlemen opposite, in such things as post offices and so on, are of an entirely different character. I do not see how these can be counted capital expenditures, for I do not see that there is any substantial asset to represent them.

The question of trade balances has been touched on several times. There is a good deal of difference of opinion amongst financial men and political economists as to the value of trade balances. Some claim that what is known as an adverse trade balance is an advantage to a country like Great Britain. We must leave Great Britain out of the calculation altogether because we must remember that the vast amount of revenue of England and the English people is derived from one source, and that is that they have placed a tax for the carriage of goods, for transportation, upon all the commerce of the world. Their chief revenue is from that source, not so much from the actual trade done in Great Britain itself. I will leave that altogether out of the calculation and come down to our trade balances. If we have an adverse trade balance it must be paid for in some way. Hon. gentlemen may raise the point that then commodity must pay for commodity and that gold is only a commodity. We will satisfy them and say, for the time being, that gold is a commodity, include coin and bullion in the trade returns and find out where this country stands and whether we are going back or forward in relation to trade. That is the only true test. If you add in the gold and the goods you export and import; the question whether or not gold is a commodity does not arise at all. I have here a table giving the balances of trade for and against us during the present administration. The figures are:

Year		Amount.
1896	For	$ 749,319
1897	"	22,709,102
1898	"	28,826,947
1899	"	285,782
1900	"	5,628,896
1901	"	15,249,644
1902	"	7,848,671

Thus there was a total balance of trade in our favour from the beginning of the administration of the hon. gentleman up to 1902 of $87,646,381. The world began to realize that Canada was becoming a great country the moment the trade balances changed in that way in our favour, and times became good, as every hon. member knows.

From 1903, there has been a series of adverse balances as follows:

Year		Amount.
1903	Against	$ 7,840,791
1904	"	37,443,097
1905	"	58,608,682
1906	"	33,774,177
1907	"	51,977,685
1908	"	52,422,010
1909	"	48,244,449

Thus there has been a total adverse balance since 1903 of the enormous sum of

$290,310,892. If we subtract the favourable balances from the adverse balances during the administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite we find a total adverse balance of $202,664,511.

The hon. gentleman from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) is a great believer in the doctrines of Adam Smith and also of Jean Baptiste Say, his great disciple in France, Adam Smith says that a balance of trade being against a country is not good for it, because commodity must pay for commodity.

Mr. M. CLARK. Will the hon. gentleman tell me in what part of Adam Smith's work that occurs?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am sorry I cannot find the book in the library, they have only a precis on it (The Wealth of Nations).

Mr. M. CLARK. I carefully reread and marked Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations this summer and did not come across any such statement.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does he not say that commodity must pay for commodity?

Mr. M. CLARK. But he does not say that an adverse balance of trade is bad.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is all I say, that commodity pays for commodity. The most advanced economists, such as Ricardo and Thorold Rogers, accept gold as a commodity, and I have added it here, by including the coin and bullion, and I find an adverse balance now of $200,000,000 against us. There is no denying that you have $200,000,000 to pay back in some form more than you had before, and I believe it is being paid back by extensive borrowings on the part of the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that almost every railway and even the government has gone into the markets for large sums of money. My claim is that the evil day is coming, there is no question about it. The hon. gentleman made an unfortunate remark last session in comparing the growth of this country with that of Egypt. If the hon. member examines the figures for Egypt prior to the time when bankruptcy overtook her and she refused to pay her bonds, he will find that the figures for trade and borrowings and expenditures corresponded almost to a dollar with what we are doing. Two very bad crops would put our customs houses in charge of the foreign. creditor The difficulty which the Finance Minister has experienced in floating his bonds shows that the world has not the same confidence in this country's finances as hon. gentlemen opposite.

The question of trade balances has to be considered in this way. It is really a question of whether domestic trade is better for a country than foreign trade. I do not think that any one will for one moment question the statement that a dollar put into trade at home is better than two dollars put into trade abroad. The number of times that dollar will turn over will increase its value or the earnings from it at a ratio three or four times greater than that of the dollar invested in foreign trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite point out that the export trade of the country has shown a great expansion and claim that as a point in favour of Canada. Let me point out that when there are hard times in any country, its total foreign trade is larger than when there are good times in the country. The question is simply this, if you are going to turn all the people in this country into producers of raw materials, and if they have to send these materials abroad, they must necessarily buy finished goods abroad and bring them into Canada. That will give you a large foreign trade. You are putting our people then in the position of those of whom the English traders said that they were forced to sell the hide for sixpence and buy the tail back for a shilling. Foreign trade in the first place is not so remunerative for the simple reason that a dollar expended in domestic trade gives a gain to two men who are in the country, the one who buys and the one who sells, whereas if that money is expended in foreign trade, it benefits only one person living in the country, the other beneficiary residing in a foreign country.

I do not wish to go into any long dissertation on the political economy of this question or the question of trade, but I want to point out that the tariff policy of the Finance Minister is not one that should commend itself to the country. There does not seem to be any effort on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to find out exactly what policy they have. The Minister of Finance is a tariff-for-revenue-only-man. The right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is a free-trader, I understand, that is his ultimate goal, he is a Cobden man. Others who have spoken in this debate are of another school altogether. The young men in this country and in the United States who are studying political economy are not overshadowed with that dead hand of Adam Smith and those old economists who taught only one thing and would not see outside their own narrow views These modernists have catalogued the various schools of economists, just as doctors are catalogued. If a doctor is a homeopathist, there is no other opathy for him. If another doctor is an osteopathist, there is in his eyes no cure for the human mind or body except osteopathy. It is the same way with most of these economists. Political economists of one kind think there is nothing good in political

economists of any other kind. They will argue blindly for their principles and in opposition to those of any other school. But the only true test of any form of economy, as it is with any of our modern sciences, is the actual test of experience. I said that I would, for the benefit of the hon. member for Red Deer, give him a list of a few of the schools of economy as they are catalogued. I do not wish to delay the House, but, while it is not of very much importacne to some hon. members, perhaps there may be people outside of this House who do not look upon it in that way.

We find first of all, in the history of economy, what is known as the Mercantile school. The Mercantile school claimed that the principal end of government was to have plenty of money in the treasury. I think that stamp of economy would fit the Minister of Finance to a nicety. The only thing that this government thinks essential to-day is to have plenty of money in the treasury. Amongst the men who advocated that theory of government was Turgot. The right hon. Prime Minister has quoted very often that famous old saying of Turgot that colonies are like ripe fruit; when they attain a certain ripeness they fall to the ground. Turgot was the first man to enunciate that doubtful principle and he was one of the leaders of that school. Colbert, the great French Finance Minister was a believer in the system of the Mercantile school advocated by Turgot. The result was that under this system of economy the country was exploited for the benefit of the treasury. I do not think any body can justly say but what this government are trying to get every dollar they possibly can out of the people in the form of the duties which are at present in force because they say that we must have more revenue in order that we may have more expenditure. This, I believe, places the Minister of Finance amongst the followers of the mercantile school. We come now to another school, that known as the Agricultural school. That school is represented by Quesnay, a French economist, who laid down the principle that there was no wealth in anything except agriculture. That agriculture alone produced wealth and that all other industries were sterile. That school flourished for a number of years led by Quesnay and his associates. Its teachings prevail to-day to some extent amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. They would like to drive manufacturing and other industries out of the country and have nothing except the agricultural interests. But that school, was not of very great importance. The next school that succeeded it was the cosmopolitan school. The cosmopolitan school claims Adam Smith as one of its leaders but Smith was too clear-headed a man to be a leader of the cosmopolitan school, and we find, in reading the books of Adam Smith, that his arguments are sometimes very strongly protectionist. Adam Smith was a clear-minded man and he had clear views on economic questions. Other economists of this school whom I might mention are Ricardo, Cobden, Thorold Rogers and writers of that description, coming down to Lloyd George who is the latest advocate in the field of this system of political economy. The principles of the school are that material interests as well as national interests are best advanced by being unobstructed by the intervention of government and that there should be free trade between the various countries. That is the school which prevails in England to-day. There is another school of which we have not heard very much, perhaps not enough, and that is the Indstrial or national school founded by Alexander Hamilton, the great financier and economist of the United States and a friend of General Washington. The principal laid down by Hamilton was that it was in the highest interests of the country that diversified industries should be fostered and that the United States government should be called upon to act in such a way that these industries would be protected from time to time especially in their infancy. I have stood in the churchyard of Trinity, at the corner of Wall street and Broadway, New York, and I have looked on the plain marble shaft that marks the spot where that man now rests and where he was laid after being slain by the bullet of an assassin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. It was a duel.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In a duel with Aaron Burr.

Mr. FIELDING. Not an assassin.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Well, his own friends claimed that he was assassinated. You look around for several miles on each side of his grave and see signs of prosperity based upon the doctrine which he laid down. You can go for miles and see large buildings and factories costing millions in that city to-day and there is no question that the policy of Alexander Hamilton is at the base of the system of finance in the United States which made possible this prosperity and wealth. Any one who reads the state paper that he wrote to General Washington on the industries of the United States will find that it contains the germ of the principle of industrial protection which has brought the United States to be such a great country as it is to-day. But we find that the United States did not follow the system of Hamilton always. This country adopted that system. We adopted the protective system in 1878, but the pro-

tective system that we adopted in 1878 has not been adopted in its entirety or in line with the system which was adopted in the United States. This school of protection is not called the protective school. It is called the industrial school of economy. There is another school which followed, and which is not thought very much of by the people of this country, but which has attained to some eminence in the United States and that is the high protective school whch lays down the doctrine that it would be to the interest of the country to foster nothing else but the manufacturing industry. I do not think there is any hon. gentleman in this House who believes in that doctrine, although the Finance Minister is always very fond of calling some hon. members on this side of the House high protectionists. I do not wish to be considered a high protectionist. I believe the proper policy for this and every other great country should be the policy of industrial protection. I could, if time permitted, outline the struggle that took place between the school of Hamilton and the free trade school in the United States. The history of that struggle shows that on nine separate occasions the free traders scored a majority at the polls, and that on every occasion on which they succeeded in gaining their point one thing occurred—and we have it in this country—and that is that there was an excessive land speculation followed by panics, because the currents of trade ran too strong in the direction of agricultural pursuits. I could show that in one year, away back in 1846, $24,877,179 worth of public lands were sold in the United States. Those who have written on that period will tell you that town lots in places of two or three hundred population were selling for as much as some lots are selling for to-day in some villages in our Northwest. The natural tendency of any disposition to adopt free trade has been to accentuate land speculation in the country at the expense of legitimate trade. I do not think the House will object to my embalming in 'Hansard' the words of one of the most noted writers on this question in the United States. I shall do this for the benefit of the Finance Minister, who, I hope, will read them over carefully and will study the experience of the United States. The people of the United States are an extremely practical people. They will not accept the theory of any school or any principle, either in their science or arts or politics, without having satisfied themselves by the test of actual experience, because they have found that all their advancement has been made by following inductive principles rather than the deductive methods of the old school men. Professor Thomson, of the University of Pennsylvania, who is one of their leading economists, says:

> Nine times in one hundred years the American people have changed this fiscal policy. Sometimes carried from protection towards free trade by the influence of specious theories but as often driven back to protection by hard experience. The two periods of highest continuity under any policy is the protective period which follow the establishment of government, 1789-1801, and the protective period in which we are now living. Four times the scaffolding of the tariff has been thrown down from the uncompleted edifice of our industrial development, and as often the work has been begun again, if not from the foundation yet from a point much less advanced than has been reached under the previous protective tariff. This time it seems to be the nation's purpose that the scaffold shall be kept up till the roof is on.

Now, Sir, some of us have memories dating back to 1893, and we remember the troublous times they had in the United States, and that these troublous times were due to a strong agitation that had arisen for free trade. That free trade agitation was succeeded by a financial panic and the panic of two years ago was accentuated largely in the United States by the fact that no great enterprises were undertaken because they did not know whether the country was going to go back on the tariff or not. Some people in the United States threatened they would reduce the tariff, but as a matter of fact they did not do it. True, they revised the tariff in the United States last year, and, although there may be one or two small items of local significance on which the duty was reduced, yet, taking it on the whole, what they have done is to increase their tariff. I do not deny the United States the right to increase their tariff, but I do say that we should meet the United States with tariff for tariff. Let us see how the trade between Canada and the United States works out. In the fiscal year 1909, we purchased from the United States goods to the value of $170,056,179, and we sold to the United States only $91,022,389. Every year the balance of trade with the United States is against us to the extent of close on $100,000,000. But look at our trade with England: Our total imports from the United Kingdom were $70,682,101, and we exported to the United Kingdom $133,745,123, showing a large balance of trade in our favour. It is the same story every year, and the reason is that in spite of the so-called preferential tariff the average rate of duty upon British goods is higher than on goods purchased from the United States. Last year the average rate ad valorem on British goods subject to duty was 25·775, whilst the average rate on goods on which duty was paid coming from the United States was 24·868. This shows that in spite of all this flub-dub about loyalty and flag waving, and all this cry of Dear old England and the preference which we hear from the Lib-

erals nowadays, the actual fact is that the average duty on British goods is fully one per cent greater than the average duty on American goods. Now, I say that is not fair. Look at how the farmers who live along the boundary line between Canada and the United States are hit. In New Brunswick they have been shipping potatoes into the United States, but the American government has raised the duty on potatoes to 40 cents per bushel and our duty on potatoes coming into Canada from the United States remains at 20 cents per bushel. The Americans send thousands of bushels of potatoes into Canada because their potato crop ripens earlier than ours and yet the Canadian farmers in New Brunswick are practically prohibited from sending potatoes into the United States. In view of such things as this, I ask the House, and I ask the government, is it not fair that we should adopt the principle of putting tariff as against tariff. I think I have demonstrated conclusively that so far as this boasted preference is concerned, so far as this three or four column tariff is concerned, it works adversely to British interests and in favour of United States interests.

Now, the Macdonald National tariff was revised in 1894, and to my mind that revision was very unsatisfactory From the time the tariff of 1878 was adopted by the Conservative government there was a constant agitation by hon gentlemen opposite against it. They ask us to-day to forget the tariff and to take the tariff out of politics, but when they were in opposition, did they take the tariff out of politics? Not for one moment. They created an agitation in this country which in 1892, 1893 and 1894, led the people to think that they might wake up some fine morning and find Canada a part and parcel of the United States. The Liberals of those days spread a cry through the country which was closely akin to treason, and they railed as loud as they could against what they called the terrible tariff then in existence. The Conservative party wavered in the face of that struggle and they changed the tariff and to my mind they changed it in the wrong direction. I am a young member of this House, but in the honesty of my conviction I must say that the change which was made from a specific to an ad valorem tariff basis was not in the interest of Canada. That ad valorem basis is still present in the tariff to-day and how does it work out? When the Liberal party came into power they said they wanted an ad valorem tariff and they decided to keep the ad valorem tariff that was then in existence, and by it they declared that whilst the manufacturer might manufacture a few goods in this country they would see that half the stuff that goes into consumption is brought in from the outside and the government would collect a profit on it. What the government did was to divide with the manufacturer of this country half of his profit and put it in their pockets. What is worse, they divide a large proportion of the profit that the farmers are making, and they put that in their pocket also. Every one who reads the trade figures knows that the farming industry has suffered enormously from an ad valorem tariff. Let me say that if this country had during the last four or five years a tariff based on specific duties, we would not have been affected by the financial panics in other countries, because the producers of other countries could not have thrown into the Canadian market their surplus products. With an ad valorem duty in force they are enabled to do that. Do we not know that the government had to establish a dumping duty so that officials could be sent abroad to make sure that foreign goods were not dumped into this country at too low a valuation? Is it not plain to any man that if the duties were specific it would be much simpler and much better and that as a result we would not have had the panic accentuated as it was last year and the year before? I do not think there is any one who believes more in his heart than does the Minister of Customs that this is the absolute truth. We on this side of the House have been asked by the government what fiscal policy we would propose These gentlemen opposite are always very anxious to know from us what should be done, and of that we have had examples since this debate commenced. We have seen them trying to read the riddle of the sphinx. We have heard them asking what is the Conservative party going to do on the navy question. Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple enough. The Conservative party will give that answer when the First Minister lays his policy on the table and not before, and that answer will be in the interest of Canada. In the language of Mrs. Pankhurst: We will be there, and the Conservative party will offer the country at least as good a policy as gentlemen opposite have to offer and we will be united on that policy.

Mr. LALOR. If you tell them now they will steal it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Certainly, they would adopt it at once as they have in the case of other policies of the Conservative party. Let me point out how the present ad valorem tariff works disadvantageously to the farmers generally. I suppose everybody believes that the farmer is the happiest man in the world, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of boasting that the Canadian farmers were never as prosperous as they have been under this

government. They try to show that they are the people who make the sun shine and bring prosperity. These hon. gentlemen forget that if governments bring prospsrity there are certain sections of this country that are exceedingly prosperous at the present time. Let us see where they are. British Columbia is prosperous beyond a shadow of a doubt, with a local Conservative government. Oppressed for many years by the shadow of the Liberal government, with the withering hand on them, the people of that province never succeeded until there was a change, and they got a good Conservative government. Go to Manitoba, and what do you find? Since the Conservatives came into power there, every local interest has received a fresh stimulus. Come to the province of Ontario and you find that the prosperity there is due to the fact that the local interests of the province are looked after by the Conservative government of Mr. Whitney. Is the same measure of prosperity to be found in the province down by the sea? Ask any member from Nova Scotia. I would tell the gentleman from the maritime provinces that if they hope for prosperity in those provinces, they can bring it about, in both Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, only by turning out Liberal administrations and putting in Conservative administrations. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance takes all the credit to himself for the existing prosperity of the country; but the contrary is the fact. Wherever any of these provinces have tried to do something for their local interests, this government has been against it. I could enumerate a great many instances. They dis-allowed the anti-Japanese law in British Columbia, which was intended to preserve the labour of the province for the white people. The province of Ontario has tried to improve the facilities of manufacturers by providing cheaper electric power. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not dared too utter too strong a voice against that, but they have always made a silent attempt to put it down. Now, let us see whether the farmer has been benefited by this tariff or not. Let me remind the Minister of Finance that his government has never dared to go to the country on the question of a tariff for revenue only. Only once in the history of this country was that issue fought out at the polls: that was in 1878; and the hon. gentlemen opposite know the result. The hon. Minister of Finance and his leader know that if they dared to disclose their true form on that question, they would not come back with a majority. I have said that the present system of a low tariff that shifts both ways and takes a chunk out of the manufacturers and the producers and puts a lot of revenue into the public treasury, works adversely to the farmer. I will quote some figures of imports of foreign farm products to show how it works:

Year.	Amount.
Provisions—	
1905	$1,694,623
1908	4,155,908
Lard—	
1904	$ 67,914
1908	1,074,466
Eggs—	
1905	$ 74,107
1908	222,207
Butter—	
1906	$ 64,519
1908	192,663
Green fruit—	
1904	$2,676,648
1908	5,312,798
Canned fruit—	
1904	$4,925,499
1908	8,310,615
Vegetables—	
1895	$ 219,985
1908	1,117,253
Mits and gloves—	
1904	$ 945,495
1908	2,002,823
Woollen socks and stockings—	
1904	$ 420,588
1908	1,379,317
1908, Total imports of agricultural products:	
Grand total, 1908	31,585,114

These figures show that the farmers of this country are suffering from the effects of foreign imports just as much as the manufacturers. Something like 30 or 40 millions of dollars worth of products that the farmers of this country could produce have been rushed into the country from the United States—why? The reason is that across the line there is also a farming community, who can ship goods into this country at a good profit. This government has done nothing to protect Canadian farmers from the depreciations of the American farmers. Until it does that I do not think it can claim any credit for having established a fiscal policy that benefits Canadian farmers. Hon. members from the west are fond of pointing out that the production of wheat in the west now amounts to over 100,000,000 bushels per annum. If they look into the trade returns, they will find that 44,000,000 bushels of wheat is the largest amount exported from this country in any one year.

	Exports of Wheat. Bushels.
1904	18,225,525
1905	12,512,641
1906	34,159,082
1907	21,584,176
1908	44,504,327

Thus the other provinces of the Dominion are the best consumers of the wheat, oats and other crops of western Canada.

This shows that the bulk of the wheat produced in the west is con-

sumed by the diversified industries of Ontario and the east. You will find that we have been paying $2,000,000 a year in subsidies for foreign ships trading with this country, and to ships to trade with this country in return. Our total foreign tonnage is something like 7,000,000 tons. Now coming to look at the railway tonnage of the interior, you will find that the figures are something like 67,000,000 per annum. Therefore the local tonnage between the local consumers and the local producers is seven or eight times greater than the foreign trade. Now, if the northwest continues to grow wheat while constantly extending her area as she is doing now, it is only a matter of eight or nine years until the northwest is going to be capable of producing all the wheat we eat in this country, and also all that Great Britain will need. When that time comes, when their surplus grain is greater than the surplus requirements of the British empire, the price of wheat will not be $1 a bushel. The foreign trade will always endeavour to beat down the price as against the exporter, and the exporter always has to pay the burden of transportation, and he has got to pay the transportation of goods back from the other country here. He has got to pay interest on the money, and the result is that after all, the policy adopted by the United States whereby their enormous production of wheat is consumed in the country, is the only proper system to be adopted by this country.

Now, we have a country of great resources. We have had a committee appointed by this House to consider the conservation of our natural resources. I think one thing that must have struck every member in that connection is that if we have those great natural resources we should do our best to utilize them so that our own young men, our own people with money, and our own people without money, may be able to reap all the benefit possible from these great resources. Everybody knows that cheaper methods of transportation are every day placing the various countries more and more on a level, as far as raw products are concerned, and the country that will succeed in the future is that country which applies the modern system of industrialism and the modern system of tariffs in the fight against the combined nations of the world. Now, Sir, I think that the province of Nova Scotia, in view of its great natural wealth, should be the greatest manufacturing community on this continent. It has greater and better harbours than the United States; it has coal on the sea-board, which the United States has not; it has an intelligent population, possibly the most intelligent of any portion of this country; and yet we find that the industries of that province are not keeping pace with the development of trade and manufactures in other parts of the country. The same is true of New Brunswick. What is New Brunswick going to do when all its forests are cut away, and when its streams fail? What is it going to do with its population? I contend that it should be the policy of this government, and of every other government, to endeavour to maintain the population of these provinces at home and to keep their natural growth within their own borders, by the encouragement of natural provincial industries that will keep their population busy. Now, take the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec has the finest industrial population of any part of Canada. No other men on the continent are such industrial workers as the men in the province of Quebec. They are the leaders in the arts and manufactures. Everybody who has seen one of them working an intricate machine knows that. The province of Quebec is largely interested in the rough lumber trade. What is it going to do when that lumber is gone? And we can already see the day when it will be gone. The forests of this country are destined to come to an end unless we take steps at once to stop the depredation by exporters, and turn the products into some profitable form of industry. It is the duty of this government to do something to arrest the process. It is their duty to propagate the industries which are best suited for the province of Quebec, and especially the industry of manufacturing paper and pulp in the province itself, and other articles along that line. The province of Quebec is destined to be, and should be, necessarily one of the greatest, if not the greatest, manufacturing provinces in Canada. The right hon. gentleman who leads this House is a representative of that province, and he should see to it that nothing is done that would adversely injure the condition of the people of Quebec, or that will stop the future progress of that province. The province of Ontario has an agricultural and industrial population who have grappled successfully with diversified industries. They have a diversity of agriculture, they have a diversity of manufacturers, and by those means they have brought prosperity to the province. But the production of wheat in that province is not sufficient to maintain its industrial workers, the other products of the province are not sufficient for the demand of the local factories and the diversified industries you find in almost every small village and town in the province. It is only a matter of a few years when they will have to settle that great question of how its industrial progress may keep pace with the growth of the country. Go to the United States, go to Pittsburg,

go to Cleveland, and what do you find? You find there enormous factories producing millions of dollars worth of products. You ask: Where does the money come from to build these factories? The answer will be that these factories were all without exception built out of profits. Have there been any factories built or enlarged out of profits in Canada? In the last five or ten years the Manufacturers Association has given the leader of the government an answer to that question on more than one occasion, but I do not believe they have spoken with a loud enough voice. In the United States the policy that was laid down is this, that the money invested in a factory should not only return a fair dividend, such as bank stock will do, but that that factory should duplicate itself in seven or eight years out of profits. Where would these great factories have come from if that had not been the case? Can you point out a single industry in the United States that has had to go abroad to get money to build it? The men who are running the factory built it themselves, we have not that condition now in this country. Now, take the province of Manitoba and the Northwest provinces. Anybody acquainted with those provinces knows well that it is the hope and aspiration of their people some day to be also rich in diversified industries. Take the city of Winnipeg with its cheap power, which in a few years will rival that of Niagara Falls as necessarily as daylight follows the sun. Manufactures will follow the advent of that cheap power in the city of Winnipeg. Take the other provinces. Where can you find in the whole United States greater natural riches than are contained in those provinces? Go to Medicine Hat and you will find greater gas wells than at Pittsburg. Go into the Rockies and you will find greater coal areas than in Pennsylvania, than in any other state of the union. Do you not think it should be the duty of any government to utilize those great resources? Those provinces will not always be wheat growing provinces alone. Shall this government say to the people of those provinces: You must not be manufacturing provinces, you must be wheat growers, we are going to make a tariff that will keep you wheat growers. I do not believe that is a policy which will appeal to the people of the northwest. Look across the borders, and find how that question has been answered by the people of the United States. Look at the manufacturers of St. Louis? Do they believe in that policy that the people of the west country should be wheat growers and nothing else? Look at Kansas city and other great western cities in the United States, and you will get the same answer. The province of British Columbia is also rich in mineral wealth and coal, and that province is also destined to be one of the great manufacturing provinces of this country, as great as the province of Ontario. I say it should be the duty of this government, and of any other government that hopes to see this country prosper, to carry out an industrial policy along those lines.

Now, I wish to point out another matter in this connection, which, I think, will interest the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). This government has not been content merely to narrow down the tariff in the lines I have indicated, but, with the strong desire to secure personal power in one or two individuals, they have come to this House and had passed by this House a law which virtually abrogates our charter. They have this Customs Act so amended that they can reduce duties, not by Act of parliament, but by the will of council. Mr. Speaker, that was the question of ship money in England. This government is endeavouring to make out of council a star chamber ruling over the Acts of this House in the matter of the tariff. That is a serious charge to make, but it is a fact nevertheless. The hon. gentleman knows very well the clause to which I refer; he knows that it gives them power to make almost any differences they please in the duties without coming to this House. It has always been the privilege of the House of Commons, both in England and here, to say what the taxes shall be and to grant supplies. But the hon. gentlemen opposite have secured legislation which gives them power to reduce taxation to suit themselves. Clause 286 of the Customs law says:

> The Governor General in Council may from time to time, and in the manner hereinafter provided, in addition to the other purposes and matters in this Act mentioned, make regulations for or relating to the following purposes and matters:—
>
> (k) Transferring to the list of goods which may be imported in Canada free of duty, any or all articles, whether natural products or products of manufactures, used as materials in Canadian manufactures;—
>
> It does not matter how they are used, nor how slight the manufacturing process which they go through.
>
> —any such materials transferred to the free list by such order in council, to be free of duty of customs for the time therein appointed for that purpose.

I claim that that is a direct challenge to the right of parliament to legislate on matters of taxation, and I think it is a——

Mr. PATERSON. Is there any power conferred in that under which the Governor in Council can impose taxes?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is the power there to reduce taxation, and, having taken

that power, it is the most natural thing that the government will soon seek the power to impose taxation.

Mr. FIELDING. Don't you give it to them.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not ship money, is it?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It is pretty near it.

Mr. HUGHES. They could wreck a business.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Of course they could wreck a business. One man carries on business; he is a good Reformer and he wants his raw material free; that material is admitted free. Another fellow across the road, and also happens to be manufacturing something of raw material which he would like to have admitted free. But he is a Tory and he does not get any reduction. The hon. gentleman knows that that was one of the strongest levers used against the manufacturers of this country in the last election. They were told: You keep quiet; you follow in line with this party, and if you are good we will see if the raw material used in your factory cannot be introduced free. I think this parliament should consider in this budget debate whether it should approve a system of that kind.

Mr. NESBITT. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie) a question?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Certainly, two or three of them. Is it an insurance question?

Mr. NESBITT. Does the hon. member know of any case in which the government has made exception in favour of a party follower?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why, we have shown examples again and again. The leader of the government——

Mr. NESBITT. I mean with regard to manufacturing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Let the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) wait. He will get his answer. He knows, as everybody in this House knows, that his leader and others on that side have said, again and again, virtually, that to the victors belong the spoils. They won't deny it——

Mr. NESBITT. Name the place; you needn't make a speech about it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Let me point out another instance of giving an advantage to a party friend, one sitting opposite me now. We saw last session a Bill introduced in this House under which this gentleman was to be allowed to import raw cane sugar and beet-root sugar into this country to help out his beet-root sugar factory. Is not that helping a political friend? What is the use——

Mr. FIELDING. Did my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) vote for that?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not think I had that pleasure.

Mr. FIELDING. Then, I suppose, that if it was wrong we shall find his name recorded against it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) continues to take that position, he will compel hon. members on this side to meet him. If on a measure before the House, or on a vote on concurrence in Supply a member on this side, though he may not agree refrains from calling for a vote in order to save the time of the House, but finds that he is told afterwards that, not having voted against it he is to be held as supporting it, that can have only one result; it will mean that we must vote against every thing, every vote in concurrence, with which we do not agree.

An hon. MEMBER. They will be the first to squeal.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes, they will squeal. They squealed last year when they were asked to vote on concurrence in certain items. I have a clear recollection of some of these hon. gentlemen bolting through the door rather than vote for the item of the Newmarket canal. They might find themselves at a great disadvantage if that policy were generally adopted.

Mr. NESBITT. I would again ask leave to ask the hon. gentleman a question Was the measure on the subject of sugar which he mentioned a measure in favour of Mr. Gordon and not in favour of any other beet-root sugar manufacturer?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There was only one manufacturer of beet-root sugar.

Mr. NESBITT. That does not matter. Any how, there are others.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. No, there are no other manufacturers.

Mr. NESBITT. There are.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt). I understand that, at the time referred to, there was no other manufacturer of beet-root sugar in this country. There were other factories, but the hon. gentleman's (Mr. D. A. Gordon's) was the only one running.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) has made a statement that is incorrect. I would ask him to withdraw it or prove it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have nothing to withdraw.

Mr. FIELDING. The question is, was it right or was it wrong?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have answered the question with which my address was interrupted. I have stated here that as I understand the matter, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. D. A. Gordon's) factory, at the time referred to was the only beet-root sugar factory running. It is a well known fact——

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie) cannot be interrupted except on a point of order or with his consent.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. member (Mr. D. A. Gordon) knows that the government brought down a Bill specifically to help him out in his beet-root sugar factory. As his factory was the only one running at that time.

An hon. MEMBER. There were others.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There had been others. But his was the only one that could keep going, and if he had had a Bill introduced for his own purposes it could not have applied more directly.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. The hon. member is in error.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman will have a chance to take the floor when I am through.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish——

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And so will the Finance Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not seeking to interrupt the hon. member. I did not dispute whether this hon. gentleman or any other member was concerned. What I wished to ask is this: Was the thing right or was it wrong?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why, it is right to protect any manufacturer. I say that plainly. But the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will not acknowledge that principle. He will not rise in his place now and repeat what I have said, that it is right to protect any manufacturer.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that it was right to pass the Bill referred to, and, having voted for it, I am ready to defend it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) voted for it and now finds fault with it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. He would not dare to get up in this House and say that he believed in the principle of protecting any natural industry of this country—he will not dare now to get up and announce that proposition. I await his reply.

Mr. FIELDING. I believe in protecting all the interests of this country, including the interests of the consumers.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the hon. gentleman then say it is not in the interests of this country that the woollen industry should be protected.

Mr. FIELDING. It is protected.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What part of it?

Mr. FIELDING. He knows very well it is protected.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If the hon. minister wants it I shall take up the woollen industry and explain distinctly where you are giving protection and where you are not. I have the goods right here and if I wanted to spend half an hour I could show the hon. gentleman how he has protected the industry as far as manufacturing foreign wools is concerned, but has taken good care not to protect it as far as the manufacturing of Canadian wools is concerned. There is a great difference.

Mr. PATERSON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I will not answer these double-barrelled questions of the Minister of Customs. The minister will have to split his question in two so that the answer to one part may be 'yes' and to the other 'no.'

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has insinuated, or more than insinuated, that in the administration of the customs law favour has been shown to a Liberal because he was a Liberal and justice withheld from a Conservative because he was a Conservative. I want to ask him if he can point to any single instance where that ever happened. I have a right to ask, and I have a right to an answer.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman wishes me to throw him some bouquets. He has heard the Minister of Finance get a little bit the worst of it and he is afraid the people will think he got the worst of it too. I am very glad the minister has brought this matter up. I will say for his especial benefit that as far as his department is concerned, as near as I can know and ascertain, having had dealings with that department, that that department is straight and honest in that respect. I do not wish to be partisan in any respect in anything I say in this House, and I am satisfied his department is correct and is absolutely straight in its dealings with the public. But just while I am on his department, I may speak of the cost of collection of revenue. We find from the statement of the Minister of Finance that the chief charges against the consolidated revenue fund of

this country in 1896 and 1908 were as follows:

	1896.	1908.
Charges on the public debt..	$10,745,245	$11,324,287
Provincial subsidies.. ..	4,250,674	9,032,775
Collection of revenue ..	9,129,416	20,727,329

This last item is the property of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, he will see how it has gone up. In order to collect something like $90,000,000, we have to pay to the collectors of revenue $20,000,000 a year, to those who have to collect these revenues. In other words—

Mr. PATERSON. What is that?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is what I say. I will give the figures again.

Mr. PATERSON. Say it again.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Minister of Customs in his department, the collection of the customs, because all collection of customs, collection of revenue of all kinds is included, has increased from $9,000,000 to $20,000,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Of the customs?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. No, not of the customs altogether. I will give the hon. gentleman the customs figures. Of course the hon. gentleman likes to put himself up on a pedestal and have me throw bouquets at him.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I will give the advance in the cost of collection of customs. In the Department of Customs the increase has been over $1,000,000 a year.

Mr. PATERSON. That is right.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am just going to puncture a little bubble right there. The total cost of the collection of revenue has increased from $9,000,000 to $20,000,000 and our total revenue is something like $90,000,000. That means, in plain words, that for every dollar this government collects in revenue it pays to the army of collectors and people who sit in these beautiful customs houses and post offices, 25 cents commission.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. There are too many feeding at the crib.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes, too many feeding at the crib. The Minister of Customs also knows that his army has increased and that his expenditure per annum on the collection of revenue has increased to double what it was in 1896. He cannot deny that.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot, I do not want to; but it is different from an increase of $10,000,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does he want to tell the House that he is the great practiser of economy in his department?

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If so, we will have a little investigation into the expenditures of his money and ascertain how many hundreds of preventive officers who do not prevent anything but Conservatives voting on election day, are on the pay-roll. I think I have satisfied the Minister of Customs. I believe that the time has come when the government of the day should seriously consider the fiscal policy of the country. I think the time has come when the people of this country have satisfied themselves that they do not desire the tariff that is in existence at present. I think that the people of this country are dissatisfied with the checkerboard tariff which contains parallel columns for every country and takes every other country into consideration but our own. I think the day has come when we should have a tariff that deals directly with us as far as we are concerned—and that brings me to the question of preference. I have pointed out that this country does not give a preference to England when you figure it out on the cold basis of dollars and cents. That being the case, what is the use of putting up a pretense? Why not adopt a single column tariff and be straight? Why not deal with every nation on one and the same ground? In that way we will be on the safe, sound ground that brought this country into the prosperity which it has, and we will be kept from foreign entanglements. We will not need to have secret trade agents in foreign countries to keep those customs questions straight. We will not have entanglements that will bring us into trouble with Great Britain and our interests will be much more advanced than by having such a complicated tariff as we have to-day. Let the government adopt consistent policies of its own, not sticking close to the tailboard of the old Conservative party and taking no step in advance. I think the time has arrived when this country should consider the question of the tariff and it should be made an issue. The hon. gentlemen opposite have made it an issue before, and they cannot quell the voice of conscience. I am also opposed to delegating the tariff to a commission. What right has this parliament to vote money and to delegate its collection to a commission? It is the same way in regard to the tariff, we have a right here to discuss it, and to adjust it ourselves. Our tariff should be open to the world and we should have one tariff for all people.

On motion of Mr. Schell, the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—Mr. Worthington.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Toronto Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

REPRESENTATION OF OTTAWA.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C., member for electoral districts of Quebec East and Ottawa, respectively, having declared in his place in the House that he elected to sit for the electoral district of Quebec East, thereby causing a vacancy in the electoral district of Ottawa, I have in accordance with chapter 11, section 5, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the electoral district of Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister if he is able to tell us when the election will take place in Ottawa?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid I am not able to tell him just now.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes the right hon. gentleman a long time to make up his mind.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 12, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Railway Statistics of Canada for the year 1909.—Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

Civil Service List of Canada for the year 1909.—Hon. Charles Murphy.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1909 (Vol. II).—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for the year 1909.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

THE ARCTIC COMMEMORATIVE TABLET.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to correct an answer which, as it is reported in 'Hansard,' was made to a question put by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) on or about the 15th of December last, relating to the tablet which has been erected in the vestibule of the library of parliament. The following is the question:

1. By what authority was the tablet commemorative of the Arctic expedition placed in the vestibule of the Library of Parliament?
2. Was a sketch of the tablet proposed to be erected submitted? If so, what officer of the government was charged with the duty of examining and reporting on said sketch?
3. What has been the cost of the tablet, and to whom was the money paid?

The answer should be as follows:

1. The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons.
2. This tablet is an exact copy of the tablet left on Parry Rock, Winter harbour, Melville island, lat. 74—47, N. long. 110—50 W., by the crew of the 'Arctic,' 1st July, 1909.
3. The tablet was made by the government employees on board the 'Arctic,' and there was therefore no charge made for this work.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT—THE SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. SPEAKER. On December 17 last the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) asked leave to introduce a Bill intituled 'An Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act.' An objection was raised, on a point of order, that the Bill should have been first considered by a Committee of the Whole before its introduction, on the ground that rule 77 applied to the case. Rule 77 provides that if any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned to a future day; and then should be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, before any vote do pass thereon. Not having had an opportunity of perusing the Bill at the time the objection was taken, the Bill was allowed to stand in order that this point might be considered. I have looked carefully through the Bill, which contains two clauses, the first of which provides that 'An entrant for

a purchased homestead may, within six months after the date of entry, abandon such homestead and make a second entry, and shall receive credit for the amount of principal paid on the first entry.' The second clause is substantially the same as far as the principle of rule 77 is concerned. I do not find here that any public aid or charge upon the people is provided for. The proposed Act simply provides that an entrant may abandon one lot of land to the government and take up another in lieu thereof, his cash payment to the government simply remaining to his credit on account of the second lot applied for. This is no charge upon the revenues of the country; nor can the substitution of one parcel of land for another be held to be equivalent to a charge or tax. Therefore, I think, the hon. member may introduce his Bill without reference to a Committee of the Whole House.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Central Ontario railway.—Mr. Stratton.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 92) respecting a patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—Mr. McGiverin.

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

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER—I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election to the House of Commons of John Best, Esq., for the electoral district of Dufferin, and John D. Sperry, Esq., for the electoral district of Lunenburg.

NEW MEMBER.

John Best, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of Dufferin, introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Sproule.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill which I explained briefly the day before the Christmas recess. The object I have in view is to provide relief in the case of a party who is entitled to a purchased homestead and who makes entry for a purchased homestead, but who, either through some fault of his own or from some misfortune, has entered for a piece of land that is absolutely worthless. In entering for a purchased homestead, for which the entrant has to pay $3 an acre, a payment of $1 per acre in addition to the entry fee of $10 has to be made when the entrant makes the entry. A number of instances have occurred in which the entrant has by some means or other got hold of a piece of land that is absolutely worthless. Under the present law it is impossible for that man to abandon that worthless land and get another quarter section without forfeiting not only his $10 entry fee, which would not be bad, but also the $160 which he has paid on account of principal. All I ask is that the man who has been so unfortunate as to get a quarter section that is absolutely worthless, shall, for the period of six months, have an opportunity of going to the land office, abandoning that particular quarter section, substituting another in its place and getting credit for the amount of money paid on account of principal on the first quarter section. It is very simple and very easy, it will not conflict with any interest or hurt any one, and it seems to me to be a desirable reform. No man in this country should be put in the position of forfeiting $160 of his hard earned money to the government and getting nothing in return. It is to enable the department to avoid such injustice that I am introducing this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) respecting the Naval Service of Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, it was understood when the House adjourned for the Christmas recess that, upon resuming our sittings, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) would introduce the Naval Bill which was foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne and expose the policy of the government in regard to it. Unfortunately, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to-day in such a condition of health that he cannot be present, but with a view of not disappointing the House and of expediting its business, my hon. friend has asked me to introduce the measure for him. He hopes, and still more I hope, that when the Bill is brought up for second reading early next week he will be able to be in his place to move the second reading and then go fully into the whole question and all the details of policy and administration connected with it. My object, therefore, to-day will be simply to introduce the Bill and give to the House its

salient features, reserving for the second reading the more general discussion of the measure.

The Bill which will be laid upon the table is entitled 'An Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada.' It provides for the creation of a naval force to be composed of a permanent corps, a reserve force, and a volunteer force on the same pattern absolutely as the present organization of the militia force. The Bill, I may say, follows the Militia Act in many respects, and does not materially depart from it except in one feature. Under the Militia Act it is provided that the whole male population of Canada, from the age of 18 to the age of 60, is liable to military service. Should an emergency arise the whole male population within these ages may be called upon for service. Some discretion is vested in the government under the law. The first class is composed of men from 18 to 30 years of age, the second class of men from 30 to 45, and the last class of men from 45 to 60 years of age, and should the volunteer force in its different classes not be sufficient there may be an enrolment and balloting under the law. Nothing of that kind is to take place under the present Bill, no man in this country, under the Naval Service Act or any other, will be liable to military service on the sea. In this matter the present Bill departs altogether from the Militia Act; every man who will be enrolled for naval service in Canada will be enrolled by voluntary engagement, there is no compulsion of any kind, no conscription, no enrolment and no balloting.

The Bill provides that the naval force shall be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

It further provides that there shall be a director of naval service who must be of the rank of rear admiral or at least of captain.

The department shall be assisted by a naval board who will advise the department.

The terms of engagement will be determined by the governor in council.

Commissions in the naval militia will issue in the name of His Majesty.

These are the general features so far as the organization of the force is concerned.

Coming now to the service which will be required from the force, 'active service,' as defined by the Act, means service or duty during an emergency, and 'emergency' means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.

The Act provides also, that, at any time, when the Governor in Council deems it advisable, in case of war, invasion or insurrection, the force may be called into active service. There is also an important provision to which I at once call the attention of the House, that while the naval force is to be under the control of the Canadian government, and more directly under the control of the Department of Marine, yet, in case of emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the royal navy the naval service or any part thereof and any ships or vessels of the naval service and any officers or men serving on these vessels or any officers or men of the naval service. There is a subsequent provision that, if such action is taken by the Governor in Council at a time when parliament is not sitting parliament shall immediately be called. This provision is taken from the Militia Act and reads as follows:

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

Provision is made for pensions of the officers of the naval service, these provisions being closely akin to, if not actually taken from, the Militia Act now in force. Another important feature of the Bill is that it provides for the establishment of a naval college on the pattern of the military college now in existence at Kingston. It also declares that the naval discipline shall be in the form of the King's regulations.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the leading features of the Bill. Of course, the matter can be very largely elaborated, but I do not think that any elaboration is necessary to an understanding of the matter. In resumé, it provides for the creation of a naval force; in this there are to be three classes as in the militia, the permanent force, the reserve and the volunteer force. The naval service may be placed at the disposal of His Majesty in case of war.

Mr. FOSTER. In that connection, would the right hon. gentleman give us the clause that defines 'emergency'?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is the clause taken from the Militia Act:

> Emergency means war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended.

And, as I have already stated, in case of emergency the Governor in Council may exercise the power of calling out the naval force to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty, the only restriction being that parliament is to be immediately summoned.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the 'war' referred to war in any part of the empire or in Canada only?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. War everywhere. When Britain is at war, Canada is at war; there is no distinction. If Great Britain, to which we are subject, is at war with any nation, Canada becomes liable to invasion, and so Canada is at war.

The question may be asked: What is to be the number of the permanent force? Under the Militia Act, the number of the permanent force is limited to 5,000 men. There is no limit specified in this Bill, for the very obvious reason that the number of men cannot exceed the number required to man the ships we may have.

These being the leading features of the Bill, I come now to the question of what armament it is contemplated to have at this juncture. If hon. members will look at the notes of the conference which took place in London, and which have been published, they will see that at that conference the idea was entertained that it would not be advisable for Canada to have a fleet unit on the Pacific ocean. I read from page 26 of the notes of the conference:

> The Canadian representatives explained in what respect they desired the advice of the admiralty in regard to the measures of naval defence, which might be considered consistent with the resolution adopted by the Canadian parliament on the 29th March, 1909.
>
> While, on naval strategical considerations, it was thought that a fleet unit on the Pacific, as outlined by the admiralty, might in future form an acceptable system of naval defence, it was recognized that Canada's double seaboard rendered the provisions of such a fleet unsuitable for the present.

And at page 22, in the summary of the proceedings given by Mr. Askwith after the conference had taken place, is the following:

> Separate meetings took place at the admiralty with the representatives of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and general statements were agreed to in each case for further consideration by their respective governments.
>
> As regards Australia, the suggested arrangement is that with some temporary assistance from the imperial funds, the commonwealth government should provide and maintain the Australian unit of the Pacific fleet.
>
> The contribution of the New Zealand government would be applied towards the maintenance of the China unit, of which some of the smaller vessels would have New Zealand waters as their headquarters. The New Zealand armoured cruiser would be stationed in China waters.
>
> As regards Canada, it was considered that her double seaboard rendered the provision of a fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present. It was proposed, according to the amount of money that might be available that Canada should make a start with cruisers of the Bristol class and destroyers of an improved river class—a part to be stationed on the Atlantic seaboard and a part on the Pacific.
>
> In accordance with an arrangement already made the Canadian government would undertake the maintenance of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and it was a part of the arrangement proposed with the Australian representatives that the commonwealth government should eventually undertake the maintenance of the dockyard at Sydney.

The representatives of the Canadian government at the conference took the ground that it would not be advisable for Canada to have all her fleet on the Pacific ocean. Evidently, as I understand the conference, the British government were anxious to have a strong force on the Pacific. There are considerations the discussion of which I may reserve for a future occasion; at present I am only outlining our policy. I think that every body will agree that it would be very inadvisable that the whole of our force should be located on the Pacific. Our representatives, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) thought we should have our force partly on the Atlantic and partly on the Pacific.

The question arose as to what should be the extent and character of the fleet to be created in the beginning. Two plans were proposed and discussed, one involving the expenditure of $2,000,000 a year and the other involving the expenditure of $3,000,000 a year. The first one would have consisted of 7 ships; the second one would have consisted of 11 ships, namely, 4 Bristols, 1 Boadicea and 6 destroyers. We have determined to accept the second proposition, that is to say, the larger one of 11 ships. That is the force which we pretend to create and to start with; 4 Bristols, 1 Boadicea and 6 destroyers. Perhaps it will be interesting to the House to understand what is meant by a fleet unit, what is understood by a Bristol, by a Boadicea and by a destroyer. The fleet unit which was suggested, and which has been accepted by Australia, and to which the home government contributes a certain sum per annum, is to be composed of one armoured cruiser of the type of the Indomitable, 3 protected cruisers, 6 destroyers and 3 submarines.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the definition of the unit given by the British government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the definition of the unit accepted by Australia; but there is more than one class of units. This, I understand, is the unit which has been accepted for the Pacific ocean, and which Australia has undertaken to maintain with the assistance of the home government, and this was the unit proposed by the British government at first. Now the fleet which we have agreed with the British government to accept is to be composed, as I said a moment ago, of four

'Bristols,' one 'Boadicea' and six destroyers. These terms are new to the House, as they were new to me, and perhaps it would be advisable to explain what is understood by these terms. A 'Bristol' is a protected cruiser, which means that it has a steel deck which protects all the vital parts of the ship. It is of 4,800 tonnage, with a speed of twenty-five knots. The number of guns has not yet been determined upon, but the largest 'Indomitable' carries eight guns. A 'Boadicea' carries six guns, though it is probable that the number of guns will be made eight. It has a total crew of 391 men, of which twenty are officers.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the capacity of the guns?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot speak as to that, because it has not yet been decided. The 'Boadicea' is an unarmed cruiser with a tonnage of 3,300, and carries six four-inch guns. It has a crew of 278 men, of whom seventeen are officers. We are to build six destroyers of what is known as the improved river class. I will state what is meant by this term. Until quite recently the class of torpedo boat destroyers were constructed for sea-keeping qualities, and were called after the rivers of India, and spoken of as the river class. The First Lord of the Admiralty suggested that we should build a later development of destroyer, which he spoke of as an improved river class, and he suggested this class on account of their sea-keeping qualities This is the class we have adopted.

The total cost of these eleven ships will be, according to the British figures, £2,338,000, or a little more than $11,000,000. According to Canadian prices, supposing the ships were to be built in Canada, we would have to add at least thirty-three per cent to the cost just given. I may say that it is our intention to start at the earliest possible moment with the construction of this fleet, and if possible, to have the construction done in Canada. These, Mr. Speaker, are the explanations I have to give upon this occasion, in introducing this Bill, of which I now beg to move the first reading.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask a question of the right hon. gentleman. When does he expect these ships will be ready to put in commission? Has he formed any estimate on that point?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have not formed any estimate yet.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister a question. Is the object of this legislation to carry out an agreement or understanding reached at the conference of delegates last year or is there anything in this legislation which in any way varies or tends to change the agreement arrived at there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was no agreement arrived at, but the policy laid down by the conference is the policy which it is intended to carry out now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, we all regret the indisposition of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and we trust, with the Prime Minister, that he will be speedily restored to health, and be able to give us upon the second reading of this Bill the fuller explanations which have been promised. It is very natural that so important a subject as this should have attracted a great deal of attention throughout the country, since the resolution which was passed unanimously by this House in the month of March last. That resolution was the outcome of a notice of motion placed upon the order paper by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the discussion which arose upon it different views were expressed. While it may not have been satisfactory to every member of the House, and indeed in all its terms it was not absolutely satisfactory to myself, nevertheless it seemed eminently desirable at the time that it should receive the unanimous support of this House. The participation of Canada in the naval defence of the empire has naturally aroused a great deal of interest. The resolution itself has not escaped comment and criticism, and I am very glad so far as I am concerned, that that comment and that criticism have not altogether been along party lines.

I do not think that any one in this country is prepared to deny the advantage of the present relations and the present connection of Canada with the British empire. The safety of our commerce, the security of our shores, the safeguarding of our citizens and their property upon every sea and under every sky, the powerful protection of the British flag, the advantages of the diplomatic and consular service of the British empire, with all the might and influence and prestige which that service embodies, the principles of right and justice which are inseparably connected with British institutions and traditions—all these constitute advantages so enormous as to awaken the liveliest appreciation in the mind of every thoughtful citizen of Canada. More than that, Mr. Speaker, the outlook which Canada enjoys as a part of the British empire means a great deal. It is something for us in this country to be able to say to-day that any Canadian has the like legitimate right to aspire to be Prime Minister of Great Britain as to be Prime Minister of Canada.

My right. hon friend the Prime Minister, in days gone by, has not perhaps

taken the same view with regard to our connection with the empire which I myself entertain; but I do not desire to awaken any controversial discussion of that kind to-day. I was a little surprised at a statement which the right hon. the Prime Minister made during the early part of the session—a statement in which he declared that if we did have a Canadian navy or a Canadian naval service that Canadian navy or Canadian naval service would take no part in any war in which Great Britain might be involved unless this parliament should first consent. I am glad that my right hon. friend has receded, if I understand him rightly, from that position. I do not see how he could avoid receding from it because a declaration of that kind would mean Canada's absolute and complete independence of the British empire. My right hon. friend has admitted it here to-day in the brief remarks which he made. He has said that when the British empire is at war Canada is at war—and he has said that correctly. He is absolutely right in that regard because it would be impossible for the British empire to be involved with a great naval power or with any power unless, as a necessary consequence of that war, any naval service, or any fleet, which we might possess would be subject to attack by the ships of the enemy. Our coasts and our cities would be exposed to attack; and the suggestion that we, while preserving our connection with the British empire, can be at peace with any other power then at war with Great Britain, is the idle dream of some man who has not thought upon this subject at all. Look at the situation for one moment and my right hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen in this House will realize that to the full. Suppose that a Canadian unit of the British navy is organized—and I prefer to speak of it in that way rather than as of a Canadian navy pure and simple—suppose that a Canadian unit of the British navy, or of the imperial navy is organized and suppose that a cruiser of some great naval power should commit a wanton act of aggression upon our coasts, or should attack one of our cruisers, does not every hon. gentleman in this House understand that the whole might and power of the British navy would be available to this country to avenge that insult and redress that wrong? How would it be possible for any man in this country to imagine that Canada could be at peace with any great naval power in the world if that naval power at that very moment was at war with Great Britain? The thing is absolutely inconceivable. The nations of the Brtish empire are separated by great stretches of ocean, the empire covers every continent in the world and these great nations are divided by vast distances, but upon the sea, any British navy, any imperial navy, must be one. The jurisdiction and power of our government and of this parliament over expenditure and over control in time of peace must be maintained. I frankly admit that we must maintain that principle in view of our autonomy, but in time of war the naval force of Canada, or the Canadian unit of the British navy, must be part of the British navy when engaged in the preservation and defence of this great empire.

I realize that there are a great many people in Canada who have made their views heard in recent months in opposition to what they call militarism. I am opposed to militarism and I believe that every hon. member of this House is opposed to militarism, regarded as militarism. There is no doubt about the evil of war. The fact that war exists to-day, the fact that preparation for war is maintained upon so gigantic a scale on the continent of Europe is the best possible evidence that what we call the civilization of the twentieth century is only a very thin veneer over a certain underlying barbarism which has always prevailed throughout the world. War is an economic waste. It is pitiful to think of the suffering and starvation that prevail throughout the world while nations are spending untold millions in preparation for subjugating each other or in contending for the mastery of the world. But, let us realize that war between nations is the court of final appeal and that at the present time there is no other. In every constituted state there are courts, there is the majesty of the law, and the final vindication of the law must depend on the power of the state in every organized community. But as between the nations of the world, as organized at the present time there is no court of appeal. A Canadian writer, Mr. Carman, in a very interesting book which he has writen upon the ethics of imperialism, uses these words:

> Of course, war is costly. The world loses immensely by permitting it. The time will come when it will not allow destructive fighting between nations over any question between them, any more than a community will let two farmers burn each other's barns because they do not agree where a fence ought to run. But the world can only stop war in the same way that a community does; that is by providing an impartial court which the nations will trust, and then supporting its rulings with overwhelming force. . . Peace is only to be defended by the weapons of war.

And His Majesty King Edward, the peacemaker, in July last went to the root of the whole matter when he declared at Liverpool that readiness for defence is the strongest of the safeguards for peace. If you unroll the pages of history you will

find that no nation has ever survived whose people were too selfish or too cowardly to fight for the defence of their territory and for the preservation of their national existence. It has been suggested that Canada can never have need of a navy whether she belongs to the British empire, or otherwise. Look at the capture not many years ago of a Canadian ship on the high seas by one of the South American powers. Look at the pressure of oriental nations upon our western coast and realize if you will that it would be the most utter folly for Canada to attempt to isolate herself from the activities of the world. Canada can not be a hermit nation. Canadian interests will exist and must be protected not only upon the high seas, but in every quarter of the globe. The great empire of China attempted to isolate herself from the rest of the world and did so with some measure of success, but the result was not encouraging. To conceive that Canada could play any such part in these days of steam and electricity, when the oceans of the world have ceased to be an impassable barrier and have become magnificient highways, is but an idle dream.

There is another point that I would like to make and it is that those who oppose what they call militarism in this country are apparently under the impression that our participation in the defence of this great empire will impose upon the people of Canada greater burdens than would have to be endured if we were an independent nation or if we were absorbed into the great republic to the south of us. Let me point out the absolute and utter fallacy of that. Put aside for the moment, if you wish, the ties of blood and allegiance and tradition. Consider, if you like, the purely economic aspect; estimate the fair reasonable share which we ought to undertake in organizing an effective defence of the empire; estimate on the other side the cost of our naval and military defence, if Canada were an independent nation prepared to defend its territories and make its flag respected. Consider on which side the balance lies and it is my profound conviction that even upon this purely business basis you will find it largely in favour of our participation in the defence of the empire. The great Conservative leaders of bygone days, Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier, fully realized the principle which I have just expressed.

The articles of war refer to the navy in these striking words:

The navy, under the good Providence of God, upon which the safety of the realm doth chiefly depend.

Gladstone used these words in 1878:

The strength of England is not to be found in alliances with great military powers, but is to be found henceforth in the efficiency and supremacy of her navy—a navy as powerful as the navies of all Europe.

That we enjoy British institutions, British liberty, British justice, that this wonderful majestic heritage of Canada is ours with all its infinity of promise for the future; all these blessings under Providence are ours because of the British navy. A well known American naval authority, Captain Mahan, has demonstrated in his well known work that in all the great naval wars recorded in history the issue depended upon the control of the sea. In one striking sentence he says:

At Trafalgar it was not Villeneuve that failed but Napoleon that was vanquished; not Nelson that won but England that was saved.

I might quote also the words of the present secretary for the colonies, Sir Edward Grey, who in June, 1909, giving his view as to the necessity of the navy for the permanency of the empire said:

The navy is the common security of the whole empire. If it ever fails to be that it will be of no use for us to discuss any other subjects, and the maintenance of the navy in that position must therefore be the care not only of us at home but of the self governing Dominions beyond the seas.

Now, Sir, I come to the resolution of March, 1909, and I desire to say that having heard all that has been said against that resolution, passed unanimously by the House of Commons; having given careful and deliberate attention to every criticism that has been urged against it, if I were speaking to-day under the same conditions that then existed I would support that resolution just as I did in March, 1909. I realize that the party system is not the best in international or defensive matters; I realize that it is desirable to keep these matters, whenever possible, above the controversy of party strife, and I realize fully that the statesmen of Great Britain, in respect to foreign affairs have endeavoured to act in the best interests of the empire for the time being and to put aside party considerations. I know that it has been urged, and with some force, that we in Canada cannot properly take a permanent part in the naval defence of the whole empire unless we are to have some voice as to the wars in which Great Britain may engage. Let me say in the first place, that I do not believe Great Britain will in the future engage in any great war—except indeed it may be a war forced upon her without a moment's notice—before consulting the great dominions of the empire. I have some warrant for that statement when I recollect that before Great Britain engaged in the South African war, which was in the end forced upon her, she came to the great dominions of the empire, she came to

Canada and she sought advice and counsel. And, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, standing in his place in this House moved a resolution in 1899 expressing the sympathy of this House with the efforts which Great Britain was then making to bring about better conditions for her subjects in the Transvaal republic. I remember on that occasion that one of the followers of the right hon. gentleman—a man not now in this House, but one of the ablest and most faithful of the right hon. gentleman's supporters—said to me when it was mooted that such a resolution would be proposed: I shall support and vote for that resolution but only on the condition that if war does come in South Africa, Canada shall back the mother country up with all her resources and to the utmost of her power. And, Sir, I venture to believe that in future the self governing nations of the empire will have something to say about the wars of the empire. It is not wise to prophesy what the future may bring forth, but I would venture to hope that a defence committee or an imperial conference having special jurisdiction over defence matters, composed of men from both parties in Great Britain itself as well as in the self governing nations of the empire, would have some control over the organization of imperial defence, and as an outcome of such a committee or such a conference I would expect that in future Great Britain would engage in no great war without knowing before hand that she would have the support and the sympathy of every one of the great self governing nations of the empire. This would give to these dominions a voice in the control of war, because I thoroughly agree that if we are to take part in the permanent defence of this great empire we must have some control and some voice in such matters.

The criticisms upon the resolution of March, 1909, have been many and to some of them I shall refer. The Prime Minister has told us that the proposal which he has placed before the House implements, according to his view, the resolution of 1909, but I fear I cannot concur in that view in all respects. One of the criticisms which have been made upon the resolution is this: That parliament did not then proffer to the empire in the hour of peril anything more than an expression of desire to co-operate and an intention to perform. Well, Sir, so far as we on this side of the House are concerned, that is not our fault. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said, in that debate, with my concurrence:

> To-day peril stands at the gateway. It is not for me to say how great it is, but I cannot brush it aside. To-day it impresses itself upon the greatest statesmen of the old country; to-day it appeals to Australia until public subscriptions are taken, and the government is being importuned to do even more than its settled policy to meet the emergency; to-day little New Zealand gives one Dreadnought and offers a second, and to-day Canada faces that position of peril and emergency. Let me say to my right hon. friend, that if after careful consideration he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, now and as it should be, whether it be by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money of this country, this side of the House will stand beside him, and stand for Canada in supporting that measure.

It may not be generally known throughout the country and it may be well for me to mention it now, that under our constitution it would not be possible for any member of the opposition or for any private member of the House to propose to parliament a concrete resolution for 'Dreadnoughts' or for a gift of money. That could not be done by a private member under the terms of the British North America Act, because such a resolution can only be proposed to the parliament of Canada by a minister of the Crown who must first announce that he has the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General to such a resolution.

Then, it has been argued that the creation of a so-called Canadian navy will have a tendency towards the separation of this great Dominion from the empire. I do not see that it has such a tendency more than the organization of a militia force; less, I say, because the resolution of this House of March, 1909, expressly declared that the organization of a Canadian navy should be 'along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference.' That resolution, as introduced by the Prime Minister, was slightly modified in the end, and, as finally passed, was as follows:

> This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.
>
> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.
>
> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

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

The chief amendments that were made in the resolution, as originally introduced by the Prime Minister, were the omission of one paragraph, to which I need not further allude, and the redrafting of the second paragraph. That paragraph, as originally proposed by the Prime Minister, read in this way:

The House reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The difference between the resolution as it was first proposed by the Prime Minister and the resolution as it eventually passed, was this, that the original resolution did not permit what I might call an emergency contribution when war might be impending or might be anticipated within a few years. The resolution as eventually passed, having been in that respect amended by the Prime Minister at my instance, does permit an emergency contribution to be made by Canada when the existence of the empire may be imperilled. You will observe that the organization of a Canadian naval service was to be in 'co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference.' What were the lines suggested by the admiralty at that conference in this respect? The Fist Lord of the Admiralty, at the conference of 1907, said this (page 129):

The only reservation that the admiralty desire to make is that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist attacks and to defend the empire at large whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas.

If my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is implementing the resolution of March, 1909, it goes without saying that the control and the command of the Canadian naval service in time of war must be vested in some central authority, in the admiralty, in order that the whole forces of the empire may be concentrated effectively for the purpose of meeting the issue, it may be in some great battle on our coasts or elsewhere. The control of our militia is vested very much in the same way. The statutes governing the militia of this country have been somewhat modified by the present government; but by the statutes of 1904, chapter 41, section 72, it is provided:

In time of war when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of His regular army.

Thus the control of the militia in war emergency is vested in His Majesty. So it is absolutely essential under the resolution of March last that the supreme control of the Canadian naval force shall be vested in one supreme authority in time of war, acting in the interests of the whole empire.

It has been urged also that the creation of a Canadian naval force will be attended with corruption, the exercise of patronage and all the dishonesty and extravagance which unfortunately have prevailed during recent years. Again, I say the remedy is in the hands of the people themselves, and unless we are prepared to abnegate the power of self government and to admit that we are unfit for the privileges we now enjoy, it is idle to put forward any such reason or excuse. The evil is serious, indeed, alarming, but is not to be met in that way. When the existence of this country and of the empire itself depends on honest and efficient administration, I believe the public conscience of this country will be more thoroughly awakened, and the creation of a Canadian naval force to co-operate with the other great naval forces of the empire may be the beginning of better days in that regard.

It has been suggested that instead of the organization of a Canadian naval force, there should be a system of annual contributions from this country to the mother country; and I am free to admit that, from the strategical point of view, I would be inclined to agree with the view of the admiralty that this would be the best way for the great self-governing dominions of the empire to make their contributions. But, Sir, from a constitutional and political standpoint, I am opposed to it, for many reasons. In the first place, I do not believe that it would endure. In the second place, it would be a source of friction. It would become a bone of partisan contention. It would be subject to criticism as to the character and the amount of the contribution in both parliaments. It would not be permanent or continuous. It would conduce, if anything could conduce, to severing the present connection between Canada and the empire. Let us remember that the British empire as it now exists is of recent constitution. We are apt to consider it as a very old empire. The present relations of the great self-governing dominions to the mother country are of recent

growth and have not yet received their full development. The British empire in some respects is a mere disorganization, and I for one believe that co-operation in trade and in defence are essential to its future development and even to its future existence. Permanent co-operation in defence, in my opinion, can only be accomplished by the use of our own material, the employment of our own people, the development and utilization of our own skill and resourcefulness, and above all by impressing upon the people a sense of responsibility for their share in international affairs.

I regard the resolution of March last as the most important step towards co-operation that has been taken in this country for 25 years. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has taken a certain stand in the past with regard to that great question which it would be invidious for me to enlarge upon to-day. I do not intent to enlarge upon it. I refer to the attitude which he took in regard to participation in the defence of the empire before 1896. He has since said that when the beacon fires are lighted on the hills, Canada will come to the succour of the empire; but he told the British government, he told the statesmen of the mother country in 1907, that so far as any such scheme as this is concerned, he would none of it. There is no doubt about that, and I shall refer to it for a moment because it is not old history, but is a matter of very recent occurrence in the life of this nation. Mr. Smart, who was the colleague of Dr. Jameson, moved the following resolution at the Imperial Conference of 1907:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contributions towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contributions to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with varying circumstances.

Sir, that was practically the resolution of March, 1909, but my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in 1907, would have none of it. He virtually declined to discuss it in the conference and he said in the end that those representing the other great self-governing dominions of the empire might vote for it if they choose but he would vote against it. So, I regarded it as a distinct advance on the part of the right hon. the first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he was willing to accept or indeed to move a resolution of that kind in March, 1909. In that resolution, he formally acknowledged, in the most express and distinct language, Canada's duty and responsibility for the defence of the empire and the maintenance of the supremacy of the navy. So I was very glad to join with my right hon. friend on that occasion declaring Canada's duty and responsibility, a duty and responsibility which will be accepted, I believe, by the people of Canada when the question comes to be placed before them for their verdict, because I feel sure that the men of this country, of whatever race and whatever province, will not shrink from what is, after all, due to their own self-respect, the taking of a proper share in the defence of this great empire. The defence of the empire is not a defence of the British islands alone, not a defence of Australia, or New Zealand alone, but a defence of every part of the empire, Canada included, and a defence of every citizen of the empire, whether he be a resident of Canada or the British Isles.

The resolution of March last, as I have already pointed out, provided for action in emergency or peril. Speaking upon it I used these words:

The day might come—I do not know that it will come—the day might come; it might come to-morrow, it might come next week, it might come next month, when the only thing we could do in the absence of preparation in this country would be to make some kind of contribution.

The resolution, as I have already pointed out, was amended in accordance with that suggestion. Therefore, so far as the resolution of March, 1909, is concerned, it not only is consistent with an emergency contribution, but, so far as I understand it, it even authorizes an emergency contribution in time of peril. In what way would our autonomy be affected by a contribution of that kind? Have we not given subsidies to cable companies, to railway companies and to steamship companies? Have we not sent contributions to San Francisco and to Italy in times of great disaster? There is no disturbance of our autonomy by what I would call an emergency contribution, and indeed, if we take the example of Great Britain herself, we find that more than 100 years ago, when she was engaged in a struggle for her very existence, she was in the habit of subsidizing great continental nations who were her allies.

Let us go to the proceedings of the recent conference. The admiralty experts recommended the establishment of a fleet unit by such of the great dominions as were able so to contribute. A fleet unit comprises one powerful armoured cruiser (Dreadnought type), three unarmoured cruisers (Bristol class), six destroyers and

three submarines with the necessary auxiliaries such as depots and storeships. The memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty declared that the armoured cruiser is the essential part of a fleet unit. Australia with two millions less population than Canada and presumably with resources in proportion to its population unhesitatingly accepted the recommendation of the admiralty. New Zealand undertakes to furnish one Dreadnought. The total cost of a fleet unit is £3,695,000. The cost of an armoured cruiser alone is £2,000,000. . The contribution of New Zealand to imperial defence in proportion to population and resources is at least seven times that which is proposed by this government.

The proposals of the government seem to me inadequate; they are either too much or too little. They are too much for carrying on experiments in the organization of a Canadian naval service, they are too little for immediate and effective aid. I am convinced that the policy of the government will be attended with a very great waste of money and with no immediate effective result. We understand now, perhaps a little better than we did in March last, what time it takes to create a navy. The military correspondent of the 'Times' uses this language:

> An army takes twenty years to create and a navy half a century.

The speediest organization would not make our Canadian naval service effective in less than ten years.

Probably 15 or 20 years would be required; and the crisis, if a crisis is to be apprehended, will come and probably within three years.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaks eloquently of the perfect security afforded to Canadians in foreign lands by the talisman of the British flag. What gives that flag in distant seas and under alien skies its talismanic powers? I saw a great British fleet last summer arrayed in the River Thames preparatory to its subsequent review by His Majesty the King. There were 24 great battleships, 16 powerful armoured cruisers, with other craft such as are the adjuncts of a powerful navy to the number of 150 in all. There was the power, there was the might which gave the British flag its talismanic virtue, and it was not a proud thought for a Canadian surveying that mighty fleet to remember that all the protecting power which it embodied was paid for without the contribution of a single dollar by the Canadian people, although Canada and every Canadian throughout the world had the right to invoke and the just expectation to receive the protection afforded by that great armament. Yes, the flag is the protecting talisman of every Canadian. That flag represents the power and the might—as yet we trust invincible—of that great fleet and the Prime Minister proposes to sustain and support its talismanic virtue by ineffective proposals for petty cruisers, which as he at first declared, would go to no war unless the parliament of Canada chose to send them. I am glad the Prime Minister receded from that view to-day. Surely this would not be a fair conception of (to use the words of the resolution) :

> The sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

Surely this is not the Prime Minister's idea of

> A Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy.

But my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has spoken on this subject during the recess and he has taken the view that the British naval supremacy which he regards and properly regards as essential to the integrity of the empire, has not been challenged and is not likely to be challenged. That is the great question to-day. The right hon. gentleman says the British navy is supreme to-day. I do not dispute it; there is not a man in the empire disputes it. But the question is not of to-day, but of to-morrow; the question is of next year and the year after that. Britain, through the mouths of her wisest, sanest and ablest sons has told us within a few months that her hour of peril is fast approaching. Take the facts and nothing but the facts as they are known to-day, and no one can dispute that the naval supremacy of Great Britain which, as we declared in March last, is absolutely essential to the integrity of the empire, is openly and avowedly challenged as it has not been challenged for more than a century. I trust that in any remarks I may make I shall not be understood to be an alarmist. I trust that in anything I may have to say with regard to the growing power of the navy of one of the great European powers I may not be misunderstood. I have the highest possible respect and admiration for the German people, their patriotism, their ability, their powers of organization. So far as we in Canada are concerned, we have absolutely no better citizens, no worthier settlers in this country than those of German descent. In what I have to say, I do not propose to speak with disrespect of Germany or any other nation but simply to assert what I believe to be our own duty for the purpose of maintaining the supremacy of the British fleet and in that way the integrity of the empire.

The consolidation and organization of the German empire, the dominancy of the German military power, the progress and development of German industry and commerce, have been among the most notable events of the past fifty years. And the most astonishing and important incident of the present century in international affairs has been the growth and development of German naval power. And let me here quote briefly the admirable summing up in an article by Mr. C. Frederick Hamilton in the 'University Magazine':

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier became Prime Minister of Canada, the German battle fleet consisted of four small, badly-constructed, thoroughly inferior ships; the British navy consisted of from twenty to twenty-five battleships, enormously superior ship for ship to those of the Germans. To-day Germany (1) has eighteen fairly good battleships of the pre-Dreadnought type (2) is building Dreadnoughts so rapidly as to make it a subject for controversy whether she or Great Britain will be in the lead in 1912 or thereabouts.

And it is only fair to realize that Germany, in that regard, is expressly directing her attention to the navy of Britain simply because the navy of Britain is the most powerful navy in the world. I am not suggesting that war is in the minds of the German people or the German government. It is not known to any man in this country, or to any man in the world, whether or not we may have war or whether there is danger of war. But we have to take into account the fact that Germany to-day is the greatest military power in the world. Her military strength is at least five times, and perhaps ten times, that of the British empire, taking into consideration numbers, training, material and organization. She is supreme on land as Great Britain has been on the ocean. This is abundantly apparent from the extent of her preparation, the language of her statutes and the declarations of her citizens. We have no right to resent the challenge. If the Germans prove themselves the greater race, if they have greater resourcefulness, higher skill, superior organizing ability and more sincere and self-sacrificing patriotism, they are entitled to be supreme on the sea, as they now are on the land. We have no right to resent the challenge, but unless the ancestral blood flows less red in our veins we shall meet it with a heart no less firm than that with which our forefathers encountered the shock of the 'Invincible Armada.'

Even before the Dreadnought period, the Germans began the construction of a great navy. The Dreadnought type renders previous types obsolete either in the immediate or early future. This gave Germany an opportunity of starting on even terms. In 1906 the Germans made preparation for a great increase in the capacity of their shipbuilding yards. They did this by enlarging the gun factories and the manufactories of armour and gun mounting, the three things that take time in building a battleship. The British government discovered last winter that the German preparations of 1906 had enabled the Germans in effect to build as rapidly as Great Britain. Great Britain has many building slips and could construct many battleship hulls and engines simultaneously, but in providing armour and gun mountings could not surpass the German output. Just in order to impress upon the House the marvellous growth of the German navy as compared with the British navy, let me read a very few figures showing the British and the German expenditures in the construction of armament in the last ten years:

Year.	Great Britain.	Germany.
	£	£
1900..	9,788,146	3,401,907
1901..	10,420,256	4,921,036
1902..	10,426,520	5,039,725
1903..	11,436,520	4,929,110
1904..	13,508,178	4,644,862
1905..	11,291,002	4,968,738
1906..	10,859,500	5,342,466
1907..	9,227,000	6,285,225
1908..	8,660,202	8,366,438
1909..	10,256,194	10,751,468
1910. Estimate of German expenditure..		12,100,000

Germany has a naval programme which involves the construction within a few years of the most powerful fleet the world has ever known. I propose to refer to some statements, official statements, of British statesmen on this point. I confine myself absolutely to official statements of those who must be presumed to be in a position to know whether or not Britain is involved in peril at the present time. I quote no statement or observation on this subject made by Mr. Balfour or any of his associates, because they have not at the present time the responsibility of office. I quote no statement made by any man in the election campaign which is now proceeding in Great Britain; I prefer to take the statements made at a time when the fires of political controversy had not been kindled. I take the statements of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Asquith; the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. McKenna, and I ask you to consider whether or not, having regard to the solemn, deliberate utterances of these men, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is correct in the expression of opinion to which he gave utterance at Toronto that the supremacy of the British navy and the integrity of the British empire are not likely to be imperilled.

On the 16th of March, 1909, the First Lord

of the Admiralty declared that if twelve more Dreadnoughts and Invincibles were to be in commission by 1812, then (for reasons stated) twelve of the larger ships which Great Britain has at present must have passed out of commission, and in making our comparisons for 1912, we must reckon only such ships as would then be on the active list. The reason he gave was that to keep up these twelve ships of the pre-Dreadnought type after they had been replaced by ships of the Dreadnought type would impose an intolerable burden of taxation on the British taxpayer, and the resources of Britain were not equal to it. At page 938 of the 'Hansard,' to which I have alluded, he continues as follows:

There will come a day when, by an almost automatic process, all ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnought will be relegated to the scrap heap. The maintenance of our superiority then will depend upon our superiority in Dreadnoughts alone. The German power of constructing this particular type of vessel is at this time almost if not fully equal to our own owing to their rapid development within the past eighteen months.

Then coming to the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, on pages 959 to 961 of the 'Hansard,' he estimated that by November 1911, Great Britain would have 16 and Germany 13 Dreadnoughts. And remember, if you please, that according to the official statement which I have read, Dreadnoughts and Dreadnoughts alone will count in the very near future. Mr. Balfour, on the other hand, estimated that Great Britain would have 16 and Germany 17. Mr. Asquith estimated that in March 1912, Great Britain would have 20 and Germany 17 Dreadnoughts. Later, on the 29th of March, Mr. Asquith somewhat modified his estimate by saying that in March 1912, Germany might have only 11 or 13 instead of 17. But the circumstance that the Prime Minister of Great Britain found it necessary, within a period of about one fortnight, to modify his estimate in that regard, is a striking illustration of the fact that Great Britain really knows very little about the rate at which German construction is proceeding. Indeed that is said in so many words, because at page 934 of the 'Hansard' Mr. McKenna declared that the government had no reliable information as to how fast German construction was proceeding. Now let us see as to the actual situation. What are the official statements of these great statesmen of the empire with respect to the imperilling of the necessary supremacy of the British navy: What says Mr. McKenna?

Two years ago there were in Germany, with the possible exception of one or two slips in private yards no slips capable of carrying a Dreadnought. To-day there are no fewer than 14 of such slips and 3 more are under construction. What is true of the slips is also true of the guns, armour and mountings.

On the 29th of March, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, spoke on this subject. Now all who have followed the career of Sir Edward Grey know that he is a man of calm and deliberate judgment, the last man who could be characterized as an alarmist. Yet in speaking upon a vote of censure moved by the opposition, he used the following significant language, to be found in volume 3 of the 'Hansard' for 1909, at page 54:

First of all the House and the country are perfectly right in the view that the situation is grave. A new situation in this country is created by the German programme. Whether that programme is carried out quickly or slowly the fact of its existence makes a new situation. When that programme is completed, Germany a great country close to our shore will have a fleet of 33 Dreadnoughts. That fleet would be the most powerful which the world has ever yet seen. It is true that there is not one of them in commission yet; but it is equally true that the whole programme comprises what I have said, and when completed the new fleet will be the most powerful fleet which the world has yet seen. That imposes upon us the necessity, of which we are now at the beginning—except so far as we have Dreadnoughts already—of rebuilding the whole of our fleet. That is what the situation is. What we do not know is the time in which we shall have to do it.

Now I venture to say, speaking not as an alarmist, but having a reasonable and necessary regard to these grave words of one of the ablest statesmen in Great Britain, one of the most reasonable and conservative as well, having regard, I say, to these words, is it open to us to-day to say that the integrity of the British empire is not threatened, and that the supremacy of the British navy is not imperilled? Sir Edward Gray emphasizes his statement a little further on:

No superiority of the British navy over the German navy could ever put us in a position to affect the independence or integrity of Germany, because our army is not maintained on a scale which unaided could do anything on German territory. But if the German navy were superior to ours, they maintaining the army which they do, for us it would not be a question of defeat. Our independence, our very existence would be at stake.

At page 70, he made the following reference to the overseas dominions:

We must be prepared to defend our national existence under the conditions which are imposed upon us in our own generation. I am glad that it is not to us alone that this feeling is confined. I am glad that the colonies, such as New Zealand recognized that their national existence is one with us in this matter.

I am very sure, Sir, that there are a great many people in Canada, the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day,

who devoutly wish that Sir Edward Grey, in making that statement, could have coupled the name of Canada with that of New Zealand and of the other overseas dominions.

On the 16th of March, 1909, Mr. Asquith, Prime Minister of Great Britain, the man who has more to do with the defence of the empire than any other man within the empire, the man who is more responsible for that defence than any other man within the empire, makes this declaration:

> There has been such an enormous development in Germany, not only in the provision of shipyards and slips on which the bulk or fabric of a ship can be built or repaired, but what is still more serious—in the provision for gun mountings and armaments of those great monsters those Dreadnoughts, which are now the dominanting type of ship—such an enormous development—and I will venture to say this without attempting to excite anything in the nature of unnecessary alarm in this country—such an enormous development as to be so serious a development from our national point of view that we could no longer take to ourselves as we could a year ago with reason the consoling and comforting reflection that we have the advantage in the speed and the rate at which ships can be constructed. This is a fatal and most serious fact. We have both these sets of considerations, both of them I agree invalidate the hypothesis which only a year ago I addressed to the House when speaking on this topic.

That statement of Mr. Asquith is significant in more ways than one. It is impossible for us to believe that such statements made by men holding the highest responsibilities of office, were not well considered. No Prime Minister of Great Britain, no Prime Minister of any one of the great dominions of the empire, could make such a statement as that if he did not believe that there was grave cause for concern. When we hear the Prime Minister of Great Britain declaring: 'This is a fatal and most serious fact, and when we hear him admitting that the considerations which apparently had only come to his notice a short time before, 'invalidate the hypothesis which only a year ago I addressed to the House,' surely there is no man in this country who will venture to say that there is not grave cause for concern, and that the supremacy of the empire is not threatened. On the 29th July, only six months ago, the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, made the following declaration:

> If we were permanently to lose the command of the sea, then whatever might be the strength and organization of our military forces, even allowing that you had an army like the army of Germany, whatever might be its strength and whatever might be its organization, it would not only be impossible that this country should escape invasion—invasion might not even be necessary—but the subjection of the country to the enemy would be inevitable. It followed from that proposition that it is the business of the admiralty to maintain our naval supremacy at such a point that we cannot lose the command of the sea and that against any reasonable possible combination that could be brought against us we must hold the sea and make invasion impracticable.

Now, let us look for a moment, at the provisions of the German Navy Bill and at the absolute declarations of prominent authorities in regard to the motives which have inspired Germany in entering upon its naval programme. Again I say that I do not pretend to argue that Germany has at this present moment any desire to make war upon Great Britain. But that is not the test because the disintegration, dismemberment and dissolution of the British empire will inevitably follow if British naval supremacy once passes away; it would follow without striking a blow and without the firing of a gun. The German Naval Bill of 1900 contains the following recital and preamble:

> Germany must possess a battle fleet so strong that a war with her would, even for the greatest naval power, be accompanied with such dangers as would render that power's position doubtful.

This seems to me to be an express declaration of intention, in case of conflict, to challenge the British navy for the mastery of the seas, because the words 'greatest naval power,' as contained in the recital of the German Naval Bill, can have reference to one power and one power alone and that is the British empire.

A prominent German authority and writer on naval and military affairs, Count Ernest Von Reventlow, in the last 'Navy League Annual' puts the case in a nutshell. This gentleman is a retired captain-lieutenant in the Germany navy, he is a writer on naval and military affairs, he is associated with the pan-Germanic party and I believe he is regarded as one of the leaders of that party. I do not believe he has any official position other than that which I have stated, but this is the way he expresses himself with regard to the matter to which I have been alluding:

> We do not doubt the pacific intentions of the British government, but we know that since the commencement of the new century a war between England and Germany has been more than once very imminent; and moreover there are in England quite a large number of people, who consider a preventive war very desirable. It is true that it is now too late for this, and that England has missed her opportunity.....The cordiality in the relations between any particular nation so frequently dwelt upon nowadays is nothing more than a phase, at times a very useful one; we decline to enter here into such trivialities..... Economically and politically every healthy

nation works only for its own advantage. This gives rise to competition, the earth unfortunately does not expand, and thus mutual strength is necessary in order to render equalization of power and consequently a pacific equilibrium possible.

In other words Germany, the dominant military power upon land beyond all challenge does not propose to rest satisfied until she can successfully challenge the control of the seas by Great Britain. That means either the dismemberment of the empire or its relegation to a condition of inferiority which would lead to its early dissolution. The highest authority in Great Britain has declared that ships of the 'Dreadnought' type will alone count at a very early date. No one pretends that the British navy is not supreme to-day, but the continuance of that supremacy will cease within the next two or three years at least, unless extraordinary efforts are made by the mother country and all the great dominions.

It may be said that upon the official figures and by the tonnage Great Britain has still a marked superiority to-day. My right hon. friend went into that in his speech in Toronto. No one doubts that for a moment, but it is not a question of to-day; it is a question of to-morrow. Does my right hon. friend realize that Great Britain, only two or three years ago, withdrew her fleets from all parts of the world to concentrate them in the North Sea? Does my right hon. friend realize for what reason that was done? Great Britain has to-day in the Mediterranean less than half the fleet she had there four years ago. She has withdrawn practically her entire fleet from the Pacific. She has concentrated the great majority of her vessels around the British islands, she has done that for some reason and that reason will be outlined by certain official utterances to which I shall direct the attention of the House later on. Further than that, speaking of pre-'Dreadnought' vessels, Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty, on the 16th March last, used the following language:

> What is the purpose of these vessels? To what extent could we concentrate them in the home waters? Clearly we cannot take out the number of ships in the navy, add them altogether and reckon the total tonnage without having some regard to the duties which the navy is called on to perform. We maintain squadrons in Chinese, Australian, South African and East Indian waters. There is another squadron, a cruiser squadron, always kept available for service in the Atlantic.

Does any hon. gentleman doubt that in the early future Great Britain will have to send at least four 'Dreadnoughts' to the Mediterranean and four to the Pacific?

A very great authority upon German military affairs, Professor Schiemann, whose weekly chronique of foreign affairs in the 'Kreutz-Zeitung' is said to be the most influential factor in moulding German opinion respecting foreign policy, has recently emphasized the necessity under which Great Britain labours of guarding not the North Sea or the British islands alone but the four quarters of the world. Here is his opinion which, according to some authorities at least, is German official opinion on this subject:

> We know quite well that the German navy will never be called upon to face the massed fleets of the greatest maritime power. At any moment disturbances may break out in distant parts of the earth and necessitate the urgent dispatch of powerful British squadrons for the protection of British interests. In point of fact we know very well that England will not be able to escape the necessity of sending a portion of her navy to the East Asiatic stations. Therefore we do not regard the vociferous demands of the British press for the maintenance of naval supremacy in too tragic a light.

I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether anything could be more definite or suggestive? Has he read the provisions of the German Navy Bill in regard to this matter? The provisions of the German Navy Bill I have alluded to in part. Let me quote another very significant passage which is to be found there:

> Germany must possess a battle fleet so strong that a war with her would, even for the greatest naval power, be accompanied with such dangers as would render that power's position doubtful. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest sea power because generally the greatest sea power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us.

That is not the utterance of any unofficial citizen in Germany. That is a direct and definite statement contained in the recital of the German Navy Bill of 1900, and it says as plainly as language can express it that in her attempt to challenge the British supremacy of the sea Germany relies upon the fact that the fleets of Great Britain must be scattered throughout the world. Germany needs to guard only her North Sea gate; Great Britain needs to guard all her dominions throughout the world.

There is another significant official utterance to which I would like to direct the attention of my right hon. friend before he finally concludes what shall be his naval programme proposed to this parliament. On the 5th of March, 1907, the parliamentary secretary of the admiralty, the right hon. Edmund Robertson, in explaining to the British parliament the distribution of the fleet and its concentration in the North Sea said:

> The chief feature is the concentration of strength in home waters, and its chief result

will be additional security to the people of these islands against what I believe is their only danger—a sudden raid—and that, I hope is not a serious one.

He takes into account the possibility of a sudden raid and expresses the hope that the danger may not be serious, and he explains to the parliament of Great Britain in the same breath that the possibility of this raid is sufficiently serious to justify England in recalling her warships from the Mediterranian and the Pacific and concentrating them in the North Sea. Could an official warning be couched in more significant language? The heart of the British empire is in the British isles and a fatal blow at the heart must result in the death of the entire organism. Thus, the existence of the British empire presently depends upon the safety of the British islands.

My right hon. friend may say: These statements were made eight or nine months ago, and although it may have seemed to the members of the British government, to the Prime Minister, to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and to the First Lord of the Admiralty that the crisis was imminent at that time, yet since then it has passed away and there is no need to take further care. These statements pointed to a crisis and an emergency and a peril which might face the British empire within two or three years at the outside. Has that peril passed? No, Sir, we are nearer to it by nearly a year. Has Germany's policy been modified in the meantime? No. On the contrary Germany has since put forward the greatest naval budget in her history: 443,000,000 marks ($105,434,000), $60,000,000 of which are to be devoted to construction and armament alone. My right hon. friend may dismiss all this with a wave of the hand and an eloquent phrase and he may say there is no danger and no peril. Sir, in Denmark, in 1864, in Austria in 1866, in France in 1870 a Prime Minister might have done the same, but that would not have altered the record of history. I do not say there will be war; I do not know nor does the Prime Minister know. I trust, I hope, I pray there will not be war. But, without war, without the firing of a shot or the striking of a blow, without invasion, German naval supremacy would bring the empire to an end. It is idle to assure us that there will be no war. The war has already begun, the war of construction, and victory will be as decisive there as in actual battle.

Does the dissolution of the empire signify nothing to Canada and her people? Laying aside other considerations, let us remember that we settled some matters to our satisfaction and to our advantage when the British North America Act was passed in 1867. Not only federal but provincial autonomy was secured and rights and privileges were recognized and are still maintained which are very dear to the hearts of all the Canadian people. But, Sir, when the British empire is dissolved the British North America Act goes also and with it there departs every constitutional guarantee which it contains. All beyond is chaos and darkness. What may be evolved out of that chaos and darkness, what constitutional status, what final relation, what ultimate balance of conflicting forces no one of us to-day is bold enough to prophesy or wise enough to foresee. This consideration ought to give food for thought to every one of us who has at heart the future interests of the people of this great country.

Said Lord Salisbury ten years ago:

> I do not believe in the perfection of the British constitution as an instrument of war. . . . It is evident that there is something in your machinery that is wrong.

He was comparing the party system of government in the British islands with the more strongly centralized systems which prevail in other countries. He concluded and doubtless rightly that the British system was not most effective for such purposes. If the organization of the British islands is thus unsuitable what can be said of the infinitely greater disorganization of the empire so far as concerns the concentration of its powers for defensive warfare. The mere circumstance that there are in Canada those who conscientiously object to co-operation in defence gives room for grave disquietude. I can understand the man who advocates independence. In that case with ten thousand miles of coast line and a great sea-borne commerce, we must of necessity become a naval power at enormously increased expense or else remain the plaything and laughing stock of the world. I can understand the man, if there be any such in Canada, who conscientiously advocates the union of this country with the great neighbouring republic, but let him remember that such a union would be followed by naval and military charges of from twenty to twenty-five millions per annum. I cannot, however, understand how any man receiving and accepting the protection of the British flag, the advantages of British citizenship, the safeguarding of our coasts, the security of our shores, the benefits and advantages of the diplomatic and consular service throughout the world, the talismanic protection of our flag, can reconcile it with our self-respect to have every dollar of the cost paid by the over-burdened taxpayers of the British islands. We have the power to adopt that position if we choose because our liberties which we hold as of right and of grace are in this regard absolute, but, with all respect for the conscientious opin-

ions of others, I cannot conceive it to be a worthy or honourable course. It is not so much a question of our duties or obligations to the mother country as of our own honour and self-respect. I am the descendant of those who have never lived under any other than the British flag since it first streamed to the free winds of heaven. I am as profoundly and unalterably attached to British institutions and connection, and as ready to work, and if necessary to fight for them as any man in Canada. But if my country, one of the richest in the world in proportion to its population, should accept the humiliating, the degrading, the pauperizing position of receiving future protection and safety at the hands and cost of the British taxpayer without contributing one dollar in aid or assistance, I would say that the sooner the empire was rid of her the better for all. When the battle of Armageddon comes, when the empire is fighting for its existence, when our kinsmen of the other great dominions are in the forefront of the battle, shall we sit silent and inactive while we contemplate with smug satisfaction our increasing crops and products, or shall we pauper-like seek fancied but delusive security in an appeal to the charity of some indefinite and high sounding political doctrine of a great neighbouring nation. No, a thousand times no. There will be no such outcome. It may be that the Canadian people absorbed in the development of their marvellous natural resources have paid little heed to the wideworld activities of the empire, and have realized but imperfectly the responsibilities and duties of their country as one of its greatest dominions. But they do not lack the intelligence, the vision, the courage, the patriotism necessary to realize those duties and accept those responsibilities. So, if Canada be true to herself she will not fail in the day of trial, but stand proud, powerful and resolute in the very forefront of the sister nations. But she must not stand unprepared. I say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, so far as my words have any weight with him: Go on with your naval service. Proceed slowly, cautiously and surely. Lay your proposals before the people and give them if necessary opportunity to be heard, but do not forget that we are confronted with an emergency which may rend this empire asunder before the proposed service is worthy of the name. In the face of such a situation immediate, vigorous, earnest action is necessary. We have no Dreadnought ready; we have no fleet unit at hand. But we have the resources and I trust the patriotism to provide a fleet unit or at least a Dreadnought without one moment's unnecessary delay. Or, and in my opinion this would be the better course, we can place the equivalent in cash at the disposal of the admiralty to be used for naval defence under such conditions as we may prescribe. In taking this course we shall fulfil not only in the letter, but in the spirit as well, the resolution of March last, and what is infinitely more important we shall discharge a great patriotic duty to our country and to the whole empire.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important measure that has ever been brought down to this House by any government since confederation. It involves a radical departure from the well defined policy of Canada. If carried out, its influence on the destiny of Canada, will, I believe, be more far reaching than any man can at the present time accurately forecast. I think it will be granted by all that it must tend either to draw closer the bonds which at present unite us with the empire or that it must lead in the opposite direction. Because of its vagueness and uncertainty, and because I do not think the naval policy as outlined by the government is in line with public opinion, the needs of Canada, or, if they have been considered at all, the requirements of the empire, I desire at the outset to submit that this question should be referred to the people for their verdict. In the first place, in my judgment, this House has no mandate from the people to bind them to this or any other permanent policy of naval service. The policy of a Canadian navy means—there is no use in attempting to disguise the fact—either a broadening of the community of interests which exist today between Canada and the other self-governing dominions and the centre of the empire, making them stand as against the world like Dumas' three guardsmen, 'each for all and all for each,' or it means a weakening of that natural and unfettered alliance. Which is it to be? It seems to me that it is for the people of Canada, and not this House, to decide. When the Canadian naval programme is framed, that question may as well be dealt with and settled once for all; and the people of Canada should and I believe eventually will settle it. The people have not an opportunity to express their will on the naval question. The press of the country is divided. Some of the most influential are diametrically opposed. The party press reflects what it considers to be the political expediency of the hour. The editorial columns of others contain the ideas of individuals, or at most of the little coterie that surrounds the directing mind. What is required, I believe, is an expression of the solid common sense of the people of Canada. I think the people of Canada should be consulted by means of a referendum or plebiscite. Will any hon. member

adventure his political existence by saying that the people should not be heard from before they are taxed for ships of war which they and their sons must pay for and man; and a permanent policy of this nature is grafted on to the political economy of this country and that grafting—who will doubt it? will prove an expensive process. Plebiscites are not new to this government. They found the need for one in 1898. At that time the government did not desire to deal energetically with the question of the liquor traffic, without, as they said, securing the endorsation of the people. To be sure they never did deal energetically in that regard. There seemed to be some misapprehension between the people and the government respecting it. The majority of the people who voted, said that they voted for prohibition, and the government in effect said that might be, but it was not the right people who had voted for it; that when those who were opposed to prohibition demanded it the government would grant it to the country. However, the point I wish to make is that the government then subscribed to the doctrine of consulting the people before declaring their intentions with regard to a matter of great public importance. Is not the present question of naval defence equally worthy of being submitted to the people for their consideration and verdict? When the right hon. Prime Minister discussed this question in March last he said:

> It behooves us as freemen to look at our position calmly and deliberately, to review the situation as it is, to ascertain where we are, and to determine whether we should alter or whether we should persist in the course we have adopted long ago.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that 'the time had now come when the parliament and the people of Canada should sit down together and take stock of the position and come to some conclusion.' What opportunity do the government intend to give to the people of Canada to 'sit down and take stock of the position and come to some conclusion'; and of what avail, if they do come to a conclusion, if they are not to be permitted to express themselves thereon before the government bind them to a line of policy that may be altogether foreign to their wishes?

I propose to consider this question in its relation to the empire purely from the business standpoint as it presents itself to me. The government proposal is not one to meet an emergency, but is the beginning of a permanent policy. If the measure were one to meet a present pressing emergency that would not wait, the case would be different, and parliament would, I believe, be not only justified in providing, but would be required to provide, against that emergency. If the government were proposing action under what may be termed the emergency clause of the resolution of the 29th of March last, which reads:

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

The case would be entirely different. But the fact is that the government have not recognized that an emergency exists. By their policy to-day, they declare in effect that no danger threatens Britain's supremacy on the sea. As matters stand, it seems to me that is the large question. Upon the sufficiency of that navy depends the safety of Canada. Under the operation of the government's proposed policy, no effective number or class of ships can be placed in commission within a long period of years. In view of this fact, to deny the people the right to express their opinion of the proposed policy in a constitutional manner seems to me to be not only undemocratic but a usurpation of their prerogative. Nor do the proposals of the government contemplate the construction of ships of the class declared by naval experts to be the first essential in the case of a self-governing colony desiring to create a navy. Two members of the government, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Militia and Defence, journeyed to England last year to consult the British naval authorities on this subject. The report of that conference which the government have given to the House and to the country is somewhat meagre. It will not be disputed in this House I think that British naval experts lead the world, always granting, of course, the qualification, in their own minds at least, of the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to review their opinions. In the report of the imperial conference of the representatives of the self-governing dominions on the naval and military defence of the empire, held in London in July and August last, at which the gentlemen I named were present, we find as paragraph 5 of the admiralty memorandum this statement:

> In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

And as paragraph 11 of that memorandum:

> As the armoured cruiser is the essential part of the fleet unit, it is important that an

'Indomitable' of the 'Dreadnought' type should be the first vessel to be built in commencing the formation of a unit fleet.

Here we find the large armoured parent ship spoken of as a necessity, the first essential in the creation of a fleet unit. Australia and New Zealand have adopted the plan of the naval experts, yet the government of Canada deliberately ignore it and propose placing in the water ships, which in the stern test of modern naval warfare, would be as helpless as a family of small children dumped down in a vacant tenement and told to shift for themselves. Again, the class of ships proposed to be built by the government would, in the event of war, compel Canada to take a position inferior to Australia and New Zealand, who are each preparing to provide ships capable of taking their place in the battle line. It was the boast of the people of Canada, irrespective of race or creed, that when the Canadian volunteers went to South Africa, they took their place on the firing line, they fought shoulder to shoulder with the best troops which Great Britain or any of the colonies sent to the front, they won honour for themselves and reflected honour on their country. To-day Australia and New Zealand are each preparing to provide cruisers of the Dreadnought type. These vessels will not only be a deterrent to our common enemy, but in time of war would take their place in the battlle line in defence as well of Canada as of every other part of the empire. Where would the proposed Canadian ships be if they are built, or obsolete craft such as the government are considering the purchase of? Too light to withstand the fire of a powerful enemy and only from such would an attack come; if they went to war at all they would be forced into a position inferior to that of the ships of the other self-governing dominions, and would actually have to accept the protection of the larger ships of the younger and smaller colonies. The self-respect of the people of Canada, including, I believe, the descendants of the veterans of Montcalm and Wolfe, would cry out against the indignity to which the government proposes to subject this country. And there is no man, in this government or out of it, who can tell where, this naval scheme once entered upon, the cost will end. Like the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, when the government brought it down, they do not know within $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 what it will cost. The preliminary figures are small, just to accustom the people to the title so that they may not shy at it when they see it in its immensity hereafter. But we know this is the growing time. The expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence, for instance, has increased from $1,574,013 in 1895 to $6,474,715 in 1908. This is getting close to a war tax in time of peace of $1 per head of the population of Canada. But the government have something to show for it. The Minister of Militia stated to the House a short time ago in reply to a question by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that the Kingston Battery of soldiers had recently performed a stunt for certain manufacturers of moving picture films. Thus, the people of Canada, on payment of the small additional sum of 5 cents a head, may be privileged to witness the daring military manoeuvres of the forces of the first war lord of Canada. The average cost per unmounted man in the force is $564 per year, and of a mounted man $674 per year, and since 1895 $10,818,180 have been charged to capital account and added to the public debt of the country for this service. Burdens of this character are not lightly to be taken on, and only in cases of emergency should they be heaped on the people with indecent haste.

The proposed naval programme is only calculated, in my judgment, to increase the burden of taxation in Canada without lessening the weight of taxation in Great Britain for the defence of the empire, Canada included. I am discussing only the business side of the question, the sentimental side has no part in it, at the moment. What useful purpose would be served by a navy of the proposed Canadian type aside from its use as training ships? It would not relieve the pressure on the British fleets on the Atlantic or the Pacific oceans for Great Britain has many ships of the variety proposed to be built or acquired, which naval experts declare will be comparatively useless in the prospective sea fights of the future unless they are supported by powerful armoured cruisers. It would not relieve the pressure on the British fleet in any other part of the globe; it would not, I venture to say, protect Canada; it would be too light to take its place in the firing line with the ships of other colonies. Against who then is it to be used? If we starved every public service in this country and utilized every available dollar for this purpose, it would take at least 25 years to create a navy which of itself would be effective. Meantime the decisive battles may be waged not by fleets of the sea but by fleets of the air. The British navy protects us to-day; on that navy Canada must depend for her protection for many years to come. If it were destroyed, no navy which Canada might possess would be capable of protecting us against a power capable of destroying the British fleet.

There are those who at times prate of the Monroe doctrine as being the bulwark of Canada. It may be beyond the question to say that the United States largely nullified the effect of the Monroe doctrine by

possessing themselves of territory in the far east. It may also be beyond the point to say that we might some day pray to be delivered from our friends. I have a high admiration for the people of the United States. They are a great and progressive people and their country reflects their greatness and progress; but the British navy is the bulwark of Canada. The people of the United States, with their great population bordering on 90,000,000, have serious problems of naval defence confronting themselves. In this connection I may be permitted to quote Congressman Richmond P. Hobson, the hero of Santiago, who in a speech at Washington on 'The Philosophy of Naval Policy for the United States,' is reported to have said:

As things are going the United States will probably be in for defeat in the first stages of the conflict.

And later on, speaking of the Japanese question on the Pacific coast:

Being defenceless in the Pacific ocean we cannot even discuss the question with Japan. Japan has practically compelled us to surrender the right of local self-government.

And the United States has been spending an average of almost one hundred million dollars yearly during the last ten years.

It is well known that had the suggestions of President Roosevelt been carried out the naval programme for the United States would have been a more energetic one than it has been in the past few years.

Let me state the cost of the navies of the great nations of the world during the past ten years as reported in 'Brassey's Naval Annual' for 1909, the figures being reduced to Canadian currency:

	Total naval expenditures. 10 years, 1900-1909.	Average yearly expenditure.
Great Britain.. ..	$1,640,293,035	$164,029,303
Germany..	604,246,755	60,424,675
United States.. ..	991,022,104	99,102,210
France..	636,659,160	63,665,916
Italy..	265,856,995	26,585,699
Russia (9 years)..	481,678,575	53,519,842
Japan (4 ")..	138,927,085	34,731,771

Does not this contain a lesson for Canada which it would be well for us to take to heart? This measure will furthermore give without warrant from the people additional tremendous spending powers to an administration proved beyond a shadow of a doubt by the report of the Civil Service Commission and the report of Mr. Justice Cassels' investigation to have absolutely run mad in extravagance, patronage and waste. The subject should only be dealt with from the broadest possible viewpoint and after most careful investigation and consideration. Yet, if appearances indicate anything, it is liable to be embarrassed with sectionalism from the outset. Certain sections will receive the shipbuilding plants, and others, no doubt, will demand and receive a sop as compensation. It will not be forgotten that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), last summer spent some time in the west, and during the course of his triumphal tour, he radiated promises of public works estimated to cost $25,000,000 to $30,000,000. The Secreary of State (Mr. Murphy) last year also went avisiting, and when, like young Lochinvar, he came out of the west from his courting of Miss Canada, the modern gallant warbled the lay 'box cars, not battleships.' This sounded like a bid for the vote of the new American settlers who are naturally not expected to bubble over with enthusiasm at the idea of assisting to provide a navy, whose guns will look into the muzzles of those of their quondam countrymen. And the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) contributed his share to this policy of placation, by telling where the necessary money was to come from. He stated to the House that on March 31 next the population of Canada was estimated to be 7,450,990. He also stated to the House the ease with which he contemplated, next year, effecting the painless extraction of $100,000,000 from the pockets of the Canadian taxpayer, with which to stock the government's cornucopia. This would make the average tax per head of the people of Canada $13.42 in 1910; whereas in 1895, it was $7.05 per head. The minister also stated to the House during the course of his budget speech, that the cost of the naval service would next year be defrayed out of consolidated revenue account and not charged to capital. Then he paused for the applause which he evidently expected from his supporters; but none came. Even that declaration failed at that time to arouse their enthusiasm on this subject. Like the cheers of the young gentlemen students at Dotheboys Hall, when Mr. Squeers made his famous speech, the response of the minister's supporters, was merely sighs of extra strength with the chill on. The extravagance and recklessness of this government knows no bounds. Their system of patronage, I believe, is costing the country millions of dollars yearly. I do not think that voting more money to the government will make them more prudent, more capable or less anxious to benefit their friends at the public expense. If the government had recognized the existence of an emergency and were asking parliament for power to meet it, I would support any reasonable measure to that end. But they have, in effect, declared that no emergency exists. By their policy of to-day they propose to bind the people of this country, without asking their leave or opinion. They propose to spend the money of men who must man

the ships and pay the bills without deigning to consult them. They are denying the people their right to speak as to the government's action in disregarding the advice of naval experts; they are refusing to let their voice be heard as to the old policy of one empire, one navy. I do not think the administration or this House possess that right, and I submit, with all due deference, that this question should be referred to the people of Canada by means of a plebiscite before the adoption of a permanent naval policy upon the lines proposed by the government.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Everything, Sir, connected with the discussion of this all-important matter seems to be a surprise. For my own part, I little anticipated the turn which the discussion has taken this afternoon, and reasonably so, I think. It seems to me that, having taken the opportunity of expressing my view about this matter upon another occasion, I was entitled, in the ordinary courtesy which exists within the working of a party, to some indication that, upon this occasion, at the first reading of this measure, the party itself, as I understand it, would express its policy. I say that has been a surprise to me which, I think, I have not deserved. But, Sir, even under these circumstances, I would have been prepared to await the moment usually chosen for the discussion of the principle of a Bill to defend before the House, as I have defended outside of it—and intend defending in the future—my opinion in this matter. Unfortunately, expressions have been used which make it necessary for me to at once challenge certain statements that have been made. And let me say this further, Mr. Speaker: Although I have the misfortune to differ from many on this side of the House—and apparently from all on the other side—on this question, I consider that advantage gained in this country, where we enjoy those free institutions which we have been so earnestly invited to maintain and defend, in speaking of people who do not hold our own views as people without sense of honour, without self respect. If that course is carried too far, those who have initiated such a mode of attack will be the first to suffer from it. I deem it now, at this stage of the discussion, necessary to point out how I and others like myself understood this resolution to which so much reference has been made and which was passed on the 29th of March last. The better to give the House my impression, I will relate the facts as I know them. At the opening of the session my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) gave notice of a motion, which is no doubt familiar to every member of this House, but the sense of which was, that it was time for Canada to have a navy of its own for the purpose of its own defence, of defending its own coasts and harbours. The moment I saw that motion upon the orders of the day, I said freely to those who sit on this side of the House, and to many of my friends on the other side, that I would not approve of that motion. I mentioned that to my hon. friend from Toronto, I think I spoke of it to the leader of the opposition; at least he was spoken to about it in that sense by others than myself. I said that I did not deem it opportune. Sir, one would suppose, from some of the arguments we have heard this afternoon, that we are a people prepared to lie down and allow ourselves to be killed. We are not that kind of people. We are discussing the assumption of serious, unusual and new responsibilities, and we pretend that we can discuss them freely. Well, what happened? It cannot have been my intimation surely which caused the delay of the presentation of that motion of my hon. friend from Toronto, for weeks. I have not the data here, I have not come here prepared to discuss this question fully, when I return I will have the data. I say the motion remained in abeyance. I say more than that, although my memory on that point is not fully clear, I think I was given to understand that the motion would not be pressed. If I were certain of that I would assert it here. But it remained in abeyance until nearly——

Mr. FOSTER. To make the question clear to my hon. friend, so far as I am concerned, no such promise was made by me.

Mr. MONK. No, it was not made by my hon. friend. But I did not say any promise was made. I said I had a distinct recollection of understanding that the motion would not be pressed, because many people in this country believed that the time was not ripe for Canada to build a navy. Some of those whom I have heard this afternoon are of that opinion still. I believe myself we are not fit at the present moment to build it. However, to return to the resolution of the 29th of March. On the 16th of March—I think that is the date—a very violent discussion took place in England upon the question of armaments. I have stated elsewhere, and I say it here, as my conviction that that discussion was brought on for political motives with which we have no concern, which we do not understand, to which we are strangers. But it seems to have fired people all over the empire. I have the testimony of people who were in England at the time. It created a panic which lasted nearly a month, and it blew over. Recent statements by responsible men from England lead us to believe that these violent and exaggerated statements are not borne out by the facts. But at the time, the discussion produced on the minds of people within the empire the impression

that the empire was in grave danger. On the 29th of March, strange to say, just about the time the news of that violent agitation reached here, we felt the effects of it, and that resolution of my hon. friend was presented to the House. Now, I appeal to my fellow members of this assembly as to what took place then. My hon. friend presented his resolution. Immediately the leader of the government presented an amendment, an amendment which entirely changed the sense of the original motion. Will anybody deny that? It gave the original motion an extension which nobody had dreamed of, which I had not dreamed of. What happened? Upon a question of such vital importance—which I trust before this discussion is ended we will be able to show has an immense influence upon the whole future destiny of this country—what took place? On that day several members of this House spoke on the amendment of my right hon. friend. There was, if I remember right, a speech from the hon. member from the Yukon (Mr. Congdon), and I think by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I may be mistaken, but I am speaking without preparation. I think there was a speech by a gentleman on this side of the House, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte) spoke in French, against what he called at the time imperialism. I think also my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Roy) spoke, but I cannot from memory recollect what he said. We were told then, being, as I said, under the impression that a war scare existed in England and throughout the empire, and feeling that a war by a powerful enemy was about to be waged against the United Kingdom and the Crown of England, that it was the duty of the dependencies of the empire to manifest their willingness in that emergency to stand by the empire. In the presence of an impending catastrophe of that kind, although it appeared to some of us, as it did to me, purely a matter of political partisanship, it was suggested, in face of this ado, through the whips to the leaders of both sides, to do—what? To frame such a resolution as I understood it, and as all understood it—let us be frank about it—such a resolution as would convey to the mother country, at the moment when she was threatened with an onslaught by a powerful enemy, an assurance that we were not going to choose that moment to desert her.

I wonder if there is any man in this House, whatever may be the blood that flows in his veins, who is a British subject, who, at that moment, would have felt himself called upon to get up and discuss fully this phase of the question, this system, the system which is going to be imposed upon us, and express his active dissent from that resolution? I would have been ashamed to do so; I never would have dreamed of doing so. The resolution was adopted. I believe I was not in the House when it was adopted. I believe, if my memory is right, that my hon. friend the whip of the Conservative party, reported to me the terms of this resolution tendered under these circumstances and which resolution was going to be cabled to England the next day and all over the world to show that at that moment, indeed as at every other moment, we were not going to back out. I went away and the resolution was adopted in my absence. Are we going to be told that under these circumstances to-day, after numberless discussions when this fever, this panic—I believe more designed than people generally knew—had been sprung upon us, when a conference had taken place and when, at that very conference, it was laid down expressly by the members of the British government themselves in so many words, because even in England they have other notions of freedom than what we apparently have here, that anything that had been settled there would not become effective until each of our parliaments had approved of it—are we going to be told here at the very outset of this discussion upon the presentation of the Bill that there is no discussion to be had, that the incident of the 29th March of last year, binds and fetters us, and that with the policy as laid before us in the Bill, the result of this discussion—we have nothing to do but that, as honourable men, we must subscribe to that policy? I deny that, Sir, and I say that there is going to be very full and ample discussion of this question, at any rate, as far as I am concerned. One would suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion of these new relations, because they are new to the whole empire, these formidable responsibilities which we are going to assume and which we may have to assume—I do not pretend like other people to be infallible—would be essential to their proper understanding. But, we are told that we are not to be allowed to discuss them freely. We will see about that. That is my interpretation of this resolution of the 29th March. Had I known that the use was going to be made of it that I have seen made of it in the newspapers and elsewhere, had I known that all future discussion of the conditions of this new system was going to be forbidden, I would then and there, not have discussed it, because no man in this House could have discussed that phase of the problem intelligently upon the spur of the moment, but I would have asked for its postponement to a later date. I think that at this stage it is essential that I should make this statement as far as that particular incident is concerned.

Now, Sir, I certainly do not wish to de-

tain the House at this time. I had no idea whatever when I learned of the illness of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that anything else would take place to-day than the introduction of the Bill by the Prime Minister; in fact this was announced by the newspapers. It was expected that the real discussion of this measure would be postponed.

It involves a great many questions, Mr. Speaker, that I will not trouble you or the House with this evening. Are we in a position to build a navy? Are we able to build something that will count, that will be worth anything at the present time? Have we the money for it? Can we, at present, with the immense works which we must necessarily execute undertake to build a navy? Have we more essential work at the present time even in the interests of the empire, not in our own interests alone? After all we belong to the empire, we are of the empire, but I suppose that many of us were born, bred and brought up here and that we have some special object and some special task here to perform. As between ourselves and the Fiji Islands, for instance. I suppose that a divine providence has placed me here with an object expecting me to exercise my activities here in a particular way, for a particular purpose and for this particular country. But, that is another question. I do not intend at the present moment to touch upon these questions, but they will be referred to later on if I have the advantage of being present when these matters are brought up. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has stated that the idea that in case of war we should summon parliament is an idea which does not commend itself to him or indeed to anybody. I think that is very true. There is no man who reflects for a moment who will advance the proposition that if war is waged against us, we must, before defending ourselves, summon parliament. But, he has emphasized in that respect a point which I wish to indicate for the consideration of the House, and that is the enormous consequences of the step we are taking to-day.

I will do that and make no further observation at this preliminary stage of the Bill. I say that if Great Britain is involved in war, whether it be to suppress an insurrection in India, or against any foreign country, or in virtue of her numerous alliances or treaties, the moment that war breaks out —if we carry out this plan and the scheme generally laid down by the Imperial Defence Conference—we are into that war. It is said that that is absolutely necessary any way. I deny that. I am now speaking of war only, and, I deny that. I am not alone in that opinion, because it will be established here that statesmen of no mean repute, patriotic men who knew something about this country, have maintained that under our system as it has existed in the past, we were not necessarily drawn into the foreign wars of England. I will read to the House when the time comes a most able memorandum sent by the Macdonald-Sicotte ministry to England in answer to a request of the Duke of Newcastle that we should raise 50,000 troops in this country, and in that document it is clearly demonstrated that the consequence of the adoption of the plan offered by the Duke of Newcastle was to make us in a sense responsible for every war into which the British Crown entered. But what I wish to point out is this: does it not strike the members of this House—indeed in this very discussion it has been alluded to—that if we are to carry out this policy we shall find ourselves in the position that we become responsible jointly and severally with the people of the British isles for the whole foreign policy of the empire, and mind you without having had a single voice in the formation of that policy. The very first words which the right hon. the Secretary of State addressed to the conference of 1907 were these:' —and every representative of the British government at this conference from the very beginning spoke in the same sense. He said: ' The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has spoken of our inviting you to our councils. We do. We cannot possibly ask you to take up with us the burden of defence; we cannot decently do so without inviting you to participate in the formation of our policy, in our diplomacy. Why is it that that most vital side of imperial defence schemes has been left out? What! Are we going to be in the position that the whole foreign policy of the empire is going to be framed, and formed, and carried out by a cabinet of men in Downing street, men absolutely controlled and elected by the electorate of the British isles; that we, British subjects like themselves, are going to be placed upon a different footing, that we will not have a voice in the conduct of that policy, that we are to be responsible for everything while having no voice in the conduct of anything? That was not what on more than one occasion— I have simply mentioned the principal one —was stated at the conference, and stated not by colonials but by men who knew that it would never work with Anglo-Saxon people to have in any sense taxation without representation. Sir, if there were no other, but there are many others, that alone is a vital defect in this policy. My right hon. friend has on more than one occasion spoken of Paul of Tarsus. Paul was a Roman citizen by special favour and in Paul's time that special favour was not by any means extended to everybody. But, Rome, falling as she was beginning to fall recruited her strength and her legions from

the outlying provinces where there was no Roman citizenship. Rome went to these provinces for her soldiers and her gladiators and her armies to resist the invasions of the barbarians. And these men who held back the rising tide of invasion had no Roman citizenship; they were not consulted in the policy of Rome, and it was only two or three centuries after Paul of Tarsus that Caraculla, seeing that the Roman empire was going, constituted that general citizenship of Rome which brought every man who was of the empire into the full enjoyment of the rights of Roman citizenship. What is proposed to-day here is to invite us to assume responsibilities which I will claim we are not bound to assume. What is proposed to-day is to invite us to become responsible for the policy, for the diplomacy, for the treaties, for the alliances of which we know nothing, over which we have no control, made by men, excellent men no doubt, but men who are not responsible to us. And, the proposal is to ask us to assume all these responsibilities without our enjoying the privileges of representation. I do not speak for the province of Quebec; I say you will never find Anglo-Saxons who will willingly accept that responsibility, who will willingly bend their heads to what I consider to be an infraction of the ancient rights of British subjects established centuries ago in England. That is my view of it whatever it may be worth. Can we not more properly be likened to those who, from Gaul and Germania and Dacia, were brought down to Rome to enter the Roman armies and the Roman arena and who had no representation in the councils of the Roman republic? That is the condition which, I submit, this plan is imposing upon us, and it reminds me of the man in the gladiatorial arena dying:

> He heard it, but he heeded not—his eyes
> Were with his heart, and that was far away;
> He recked not of the life he lost nor prize,
> But where his rude hut by the Danube lay,
> There were his young barbarians all at play,
> There was their Dacian mother—he, their sire,
> Butchered to make a Roman holiday—
> All this rush'd with his blood—shall he expire
> And unavenged? Arise! ye Goths, and glut your ire!

That, much truer than the story of Paul of Tarsus, is the spectacle which is presented to me under the terms of this scheme. Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House, but it is free to every member of this parliament to express his opinions and it seemed to me that to be silent under what has been said this afternoon would not be proper because silence would amount in a sense to acquiescence. Although I may be in a very small minority, and although it is a matter of very great regret to me to have to differ from friends of mine on this side of the House, and indeed from any member of the House, upon a question of this magnitude, I claim the right to my conviction, and I intend expressing it most freely during the progress of this discussion.

Mr. FOSTER—Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is introduced, I would like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I think I have seen reports in the newspapers of sundry negotiations amounting to purchases of war vessels and the like of that. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether and to what extent there is truth in that statement; and if it is so, on what parliamentary authority the government has acted. We have had the promise of a policy to be submitted. Surely it cannot be that the government has forestalled parliament and has already made its purchases and entered into contracts?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—The government has made no purchase whatever. The government has entered into negotiations with the imperial authorities for the passing over of a ship. The whole matter is subject to parliamentary approval, and nothing can be done until it is considered by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. gentleman have these papers brought down so that we can have them in this discussion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As soon as the negotiations are completed, certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DISMISSALS.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE:

How many men were dismissed from service on the Intercolonial railway each month from October 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY. Number of men dismissed from Intercolonial railway: October, 8; November, 11; December, 20; January, 10; February, 5; March, 11; total, 65.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE:

How many men discharged from the Intercolonial railway from October 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909, would come within the provisions of and would be entitled to, the benefits conferred by Bill (No. 19), providing paragraph 2 was eliminated?

Mr. MURPHY. No men affected within period named.

MILITIA MATTERS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Are facilities for rifle practice available at the Royal School of Instruction, St. John, Quebec? If so, to what extent?

2. What was the total cost of the Brandon drill hall, including site?

3. Have the buildings for guard-room and married quarters at the Winnipeg barracks been yet completed? If so, when?

4. What was the total cost for each of these buildings, and when were they occupied?

5. Are there any members of the permanent force at Winnipeg still drawing allowances in lieu of quarters? If so, how many, and at what rates?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

2. Site, $3,100; building, $63,759.14; total, $66,859.14.

4. Guard-room, $28,993.02; quarters for N. C. officers, $48,880.32.

The first, third and fifth questions were answered by the Minister of Militia. He stated that a site had been given free to the government. As to that he was misinformed. The cost of the building as given by him was $52,954. That was the contract price. There were some additional expenditures for fittings and other work in connection with the building, which made the total what I have stated.

THE HERRING FISHERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Are the fresh herring which are carried from Passamaquoddy bay and adjacent waters to the United States carried in Canadian or American bottoms?

2. Do such boats, when so employed, regularly comply with the Canadian customs laws respecting entry and clearance?

3. Are the Canadian customs laws enforced in respect to said boats? If so, since when have they been so enforced?

4. If not, in what respect are they not so enforced, and why?

Hon. WM. PATERSON:

1. Principally in American bottoms.

2. Vessels carrying fresh fish from points in Passamaquoddy bay have not all entered and cleared regularly at the Canadian Custom House in the past.

3. The Canadian customs laws are being enforced in respect of these vessels more effectively since January 1, 1910, at which date a new custom house was opened at Indian island, in the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, to facilitate entry and clearance of vessels.

THE RIVIERE DU LIEVRE.

Mr. MAJOR:

1. Have the inhabitants of the valley of the Rivière du Lièvre, in the county of Labelle, made known to the government the position in which they find themselves, from the fact that the McLaren Company claim to be the proprietors of the booms and slides of that river?

2. Have they sent to the government one or more deputations or petitions for the purpose of making known their complaints?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

THE KINGSTON 'WHIG.'

Mr. EDWARDS:

How much money has been paid by the Dominion Government to the 'Whig' Publishing Company of Kingston, for printing and advertising in each year from 1896 to the present time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Statement of expenditure showing amount paid by Department of Militia and Defence to the 'Whig' Publishing Company of Kingston, Ontario, since 1896:

	Advertising.	Printing.
1896-7	$ 33.50	
1897-8	46.75	$ 18.75
1898-9	80.95	
1899-1900	21.00	52.00
1900-1	30.00	
1901-2		1.25
1902-3	14.00	
1903-4	26.20	4.75
1904-5	37.10	
1905-6		
1906-7	48.40	
1907-8	75.16	
1908-9	79.44	
1909-10	35.03	
	$527.53	$76.75

Advertising	$527.53
Printing	76.75
Total	$604.28

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By the Department of Marine and Fisheries:

1905	$ 49 16
1906	92 92
1907	111 33
1908	215 18
1909	48 85
	$517 44

RIVIERE DU LOUP RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

Is it within the knowledge of the Department of Railways and Canals that the railway crossing at the station of Rivière du Loup is said to be very dangerous, without gates and guards, and a source of very grievous accidents? If so, is it intended to grant a tunnel at this place for the safety of the public travellers and the passers by of that locality?

Mr. MURPHY. There is no public crossing at Riviere du Loup, as referred to, and it is not the intention to construct a subway or to facilitate in any way the passing of foot passengers at the point in question as ample and safe access is now provided, by the existing subway and roads.

MILITIA EXPENDITURE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

In the matter of expenditures by the government upon fortifications, reserve stores, mobilization, equipment, etc., upon particulars of which it is said to be in the public interest that there should be no discussion,

and for which no items appear in the estimates under specific descriptive headings, is the government prepared to adopt the policy of submitting the same, confidentially, to the leader of the opposition, previous to the House being asked to pass upon the estimates submitted for the ensuing financial year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The government has expressed its willingness on all occasions when such information has been requested to give the same to the leader of the opposition, and sees no objection to following the same course in the future.

SUB-TARGET RIFLE MACHINES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. How many sub-target rifle machines have been purchased by the government to date?
2. How many such machines are at present on issue to corps of active militia, military schools of instruction, cadet corps and rifle clubs, respectively?
3. What is the total cost of such machines to date?
4. Are such machines regularly employed at all military schools in imparting instruction to attending officers and men?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 552.

2. The issue of sub-target machines from District Ordnance Depots to units, rifle associations and cadet corps is authorized by the District Officer Commanding, and machines are withdrawn and re-issued in the district as may be considered necessary by that officer. The following is the distribution of these machines:

	No.
In Military District No. 1	53
" " 2	105
" " 3	48
" " 4	52
" " 5-6. . . .	110
" " 7	40
" " 8	33
" " 9	40
" " 10	35
" " 11	15
" " 12	5
" " 13	14
Total	550

The remaining two guns are retained as sealed patterns to govern manufacture and inspection.

3. $137,850.

4. Musketry forms part of the syllabus for attached officers and non-commissioned officers at Schools of Instruction, and sub-target gun machines are used for imparting instruction.

TENTS FOR MILITIA DEPARTMENT.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What number and description of tents have been manufactured for the Militia Department during the five years ended 31st March, 1909?
2. What was the average cost of each pattern of tent?
3. By whom were the same manufactured?
4. Were tenders called for in all cases? If so, how?
5. If by public advertisement, in what places and in what newspapers were such advertisements published?
6. From whom were tenders received, and what were the amounts thereof?
7. (a) Do any contracts at present exist for the supply of tents? (b) If so, when do such contracts terminate?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. See Auditor General's Report for 1904-05, Part Q, pages 79, 97, 98; 1905-06, Part Q, pages 71, 117; 1906-07, Part Q, pages 67, 68, 101; 1907-08, Part Q, pages 80, 119; 1908-09. The honourable gentleman will be able to obtain the information required for the year 1908-9 so soon as that portion of the Auditor General's Report for the year dealing with the Department of Militia and Defence has been laid on the table of the House. This, no doubt, will shortly be done.

2. See above references.

3. Woods, Ltd., Ottawa; Merchants Awning Co., Montreal; The War Office.

4, 5 and 6. This information can be supplied on a motion for return of papers.

7. (a) Yes; (b) March 31, 1912.

SADDLERY FOR THE MILITIA DEPARTMENT.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What quantities and descriptions of harness and saddlery have been manufactured for the Militia Department during the five years ended 1st March, 1909?
2. What was the average cost of each set?
3. By whom were the same manufactured?
4. Were tenders called for? If so, how?
5. If by public advertisement, in what places and in what newspapers were such advertisements published?
6. From whom were tenders received and what were the amounts thereof?
7. Do any contracts at present exist for the supply of harness and saddlery? If so when do such contracts terminate?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. See Auditor General's Report for 1904-05, Vol. 2, Part Q, pages 60, 67, 69, 77, 78, 95, 96; 1905-06, Vol. 2, Part Q, pages 69, 70, 72, 117; 1906-07, Vol. 2, Part Q, pages 66, 67; 1907-08, Vol. 2, Part P, pages 75, 77, 87, 119; 1908-09. The honourable gentleman will be able to obtain the information required for the year 1908-09 so soon as that portion of the Auditor General's Report for the year dealing with the Department of Militia and Defence has been laid on the table of the House. This, no doubt, will shortly be done.

2. See references already given.

3. By Adams Bros., Toronto; S. & H. Borbridge, Ottawa; Billington Bros., Winnipeg; Hugh Carson, Ltd., Ottawa; Craig Harness Co., Ltd., Ottawa; Kellys, Ltd., Halifax; Lamontagne, Ltd., Montreal; H. Lamontagne & Co., Montreal; A. Strachan, Kingston; M. J. Wilson & Sons, Ottawa.

Stores of this description were also obtained from the War Office.

4, 5 and 6. A motion should be made for the return of papers.

7. Yes. March 31, 1910.

COST OF UPKEEP, PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. (a) What was the total cost of the upkeep of the permanent army service corps for the financial year ended 31st March, 1909, and (b) what is its numerical strength?

2. (a) What was the total cost of the upkeep of the permanent army pay corps for the financial year ended 31st March, 1909, and (b)) what is its numerical strength?

3. (a) What was the total cost of the upkeep of the permanent army medical corps for the financial year ended 31st March, 1909, and (b) what is its numerical strength?

4. (a) What was the total cost of the upkeep of the Canadian ordnance corps for the financial year ended 31st March, 1909, and (b) what is its numerical strength?

5. (a) What was the cost of administration of the militia stores branch of the Department of Militia and Defence, outside service, for the financial year ended 30th June, 1903, and (b) what was its numerical strength?

6. (a) What was the total cost of the upkeep of the corps of military staff clerks for the financial year ended 31st March, 1909, and (b) what is its numerical strength?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) $77,212.

(b) 10 officers, 3 warrant officers, 105 non-commissioned officers and men. In addition, 31 civilians are employed on water transport and barrack services at Halifax and Esquimalt in lieu of enlisted men at an expenditure of $18,528 for the year ended 31st March, 1909.

2. (a) $38,683.

(b) 10 officers, 6 warrant officers, 20 non-commissioned officers and men.

3. (a) $86,357.

(b) 22 officers, 1 warrant officer, 70 non-commissioned officers and men.

4. (a) $172,781.

(b) 28 officers, 24 warrant officers, 134 non-commissioned officers and men. In addition, 35 civilians are employed, in lieu of enlisted men, at an expenditure of $21,-185 for the year ended 31st March, 1909.

5. (a) $53,346.70.

(b) 90 permanent employees and 8 temporary labourers, &c.

6. (a) $26,823.

(b) 5 warrant officers and 25 non-commissioned officers.

HERRING FISHERY IN CHARLOTTE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many barrels of herring were packed in the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, during the years 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908, and what was the respective annual value thereof?

2. How many barrels of britt or sardine herring were caught in waters contiguous to the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, during the years 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908?

3. To whom were they sold, and at what price per barrel, each year, respectively?

4. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries satisfied with the condition of this fishery?

5. If not, have any means been taken to improve it? If so, what means and when were same taken?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

	Year.	Barrels.	Value.
1.	1905	7,965	$35,842 50
	1906	7,384	29,536 00
	1907	2,210	8,840 00
	1908	2,420	10,890 00
2.	1905	332,496	
	1906	218,150	
	1907	246,644	
	1908	271,254	

3. Mainly to United States and Canadian sardine canners, but to some extent to Canadian fishermen for bait.

In 1905 at $2 00 per barrel.
1906 " 1 50 "
1907 " 1 50 "
1908 " 1 50

4. The conditions are peculiar to the particular locality and have obtained for the past thirty years, and it is for the people to deal with it.

5. Answered by No. 4.

DEEP WATER WEIRS IN CHARLOTTE COUNTY.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many licenses were annually issued for deep water weirs in the conuty of Charlotte during the years 1900 to 1909 inclusive, and what license fee was respectively charged during said years?

2. Were licenses issued to other than British subjects? If so, in what years and to whom?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 1900 record not extant.
1901 469
1902 473
1903 453
1904 463
1905 443
1906 432
1907 433
1908 538
1909 557

$5 per weir.

2. No.

RURAL FREE MAIL DELIVERY BOXES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many different kinds of rural free mail delivery boxes are offered by the Post Office Department?
2. Has the government changed the design of the rural free mail delivery boxes? If so, why?
3. If any change has been made, what is the difference in the cost to the government in making the change, and can the new design, if any, that has been decided on, be locked?
4. Has the government received a petition asking for a mail route to be established between Dresden and Garville, in the county of Kent, Bentpath, Dawn Valley and Beaver Meadow, in the county of Lambton? If so, has the petition been granted? If not, why not?
5. Have locks to boxes been sent to those applying for same? If not, why not?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. One.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. There has been a mail route between Bentpath and Dresden since 1st April, 1887.
5. The department has decided that for the present locks are not to be supplied.

KENSINGTON WHARF.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Does the government own, or is it interested in, Kensington wharf, on the St. Mary's river, in West Algoma? If so, when was the wharf purchased, at what price, and subject to what conditions?
2. If the government does not own this wharf, are there any negotiations on foot for the purchase of it? If so, at what price, and upon what terms has the wharf been offered, by whom, through whom, and at what date, and has the government accepted the offer?
3. Has the government made an investigation as to the value of this wharf? If so, who made the investigation, and when was it made?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. No.
2. No.
3. In 1908, representations were made to the department that the Kensington wharf was in a very bad state of repair; a report was secured from Mr. J. G. Sing, district engineer, who estimated at $3,300 the cost of rebuilding and repairing the present structure which belongs to the Hiawatha Land Company.

COST OF PRAIRIE SECTION, G. T. P.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. What was the return made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to the government as to the cost of construction of the line per mile across the prairie section in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?
2. Is such a return sworn to, verified or otherwise?
3. How much of such cost is to be charged, respectively, to surveying and locating the line, clearing right of way, grading, ties and laying same, steel and laying same, station houses, telegraph lines, fences, locomotives and cars, if any such are included in cost?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Up to the 31st October, 1909, the average expenditure per mile of the 'prairie section' as returned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is $35,360.64. The average cost as certified to by the auditor of the Railway Department and the government engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental railway, as being the amount for which the government is liable under the guarantee agreements with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is $33,718.62. Unable to give information by provinces, as it is not kept in that manner.
2. The return is certified to by the president, third vice-president, and assistant chief engineer of the company, and after audit by Mr. G. A. Bell, departmental auditor of the Department of Railways and Canals, a similar certificate of cost on which is based the government's liability under the guarantee agreement is certified to by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, C.M.G., government chief engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental railway.
3. See statement attached.

MANITOBA—HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. How many homesteads have been entered for during the years 1908 and 1909 in Manitoba in township 19, range 15, west 1st meridian; township 20, range 15, west 1st meridian; township 21, range 16, west 1st meridian; township 22, ranges 16 and 17, west 1st meridian; and township 23, ranges 17, 18, 19 and 20, west 1st meridian?
2. Who were the original entrants, and the date of entry in each case?
3. How many have been cancelled or abandoned?
4. In the cases of abandonment or cancellation, who are the present entrants?
5. What lands are still open for homesteading in those townships?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 98.
2.

ORIGINAL ENTRANT AND DATE OF ENTRY.

Section. Part.	Section. No.	Township.	Range.	Meridian.	How Disposed.
S.E. ¼	4	19	15	W. 1	Hom. Dec. 9, '89, W. A. McConnell—Cancelled.
S.E. ¼	4	19	15	W. 1	" Nov. 28, '08, A. G. Brown, jr.
N.E. ¼	5	19	15	W. 1	" Sept. 10, '08, John Van Male.
S.E. ¼	5	19	15	W. 1	" April 7, '08, G. A. McClay.
S.W. ¼	5	19	15	W. 1	" Sept. 10, '08, Hugh Stevenson.
N.W. ¼	6	19	15	W. 1	" " 1, '08, T. G. Maberley.
S.E. ¼	6	19	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, James Jauncey.
S.W. ¼	6	19	15	W. 1	" Nov. 12, '08, Louis Curtis.
N.E. ¼	18	19	15	W. 1	" Sept. 3, '08, T. A. Worssy.
S.W. ¼	18	19	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, Andrew Anderson.
S.E. ¼	31	19	15	W. 1	" Jan. 13, '08, Bert Cook—Cance ed.
S.E. ¼	31	19	15	W. 1	" Dec. 11, '08, W. W. Hawkins.
S.W. ¼	31	19	15	W. 1	" Sept. 2, '08, J. A. Maberly—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	6	20	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, Hugh McLaughlin.
S.W. ¼	6	20	15	W. 1	" " 15, '08, C. J. Kavanagh.
N.E. ¼	7	20	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, W. Empey.
N.W. ¼	7	20	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, W. E. Empey.
S.E. ¼	7	20	15	W. 1	" " 2, '08, A. Kavanagh.
S.W. ¼	7	20	15	W. 1	" " 1, '08, J. W. Neill.
N.E. ¼	17	20	15	W. 1	" Oct. 20, '08, D. Rintone.
N.W. ¼	17	20	15	W. 1	" " 20, '08, W. Gunson.
S.E ¼	17	20	15	W. 1	" " 20, '08, J. McPhail.
S.W. ¼	17	20	15	W. 1	" " 20, '08, C. Buchanan.
S.W. ¼	18	20	15	W. 1	" Dec. 22, '08, Bert Allen—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1	" " 1, '08, C. Hosler.
N.W. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1	" Sept. 3, '08, Wm. McIntyre—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1	" July 27, '09, W, I. McLeod.
S.E. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1	" Sept. 2, '08, Geo. Cavanagh.
S.W. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1	" Sept. 3, '08, Nelson McIntyre.
N.E. ¼	31	20	15	W. 1	" Jan, 13, '08, J. T. Blackford—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	31	20	15	W. 1	" April 25, '08, John Floyd.
N.E. ¼	31	20	15	W. 1	" July 18, '08, R. Smith.
N.W. ¼	31	20	15	W. 1	" April 21, '08, J. N. Hill.
N.W. ¼	1	21	16	W. 1	" Sept. 1, '08, James Burns.
S.W. ¼	1	21	16	W. 1	" " 1, '08, Geo. Jackson.
N.E. ¼	23	21	16	W. 1	Hom. Nov. 6, 1908, James Busby.
N.W. ¼	23	21	16	W. 1	" July 20, 1909, Albert Dewick.
S.E. ¼	23	21	16	W. 1	" Sept. 2, 1908, Wm. Scott.
S.W. ¼	23	21	16	W. 1	" Oct. 24, 1908, J. H. Doucette.
N.E. ¼	27	21	16	W. 1	" Sept. 25, 1908, Emile Terrillon.
S.E. ¼	27	21	16	W. 1	" Oct. 2, 1908, Felix Terrillon.
N.W. ¼	33	21	16	W. 1	" Nov. 7, 1908, M. J. Jansen.
N.E. ¼	16	22	16	W. 1	" April 29, 1902, J. H. Doucette—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	16	22	16	W. 1	" Oct. 21, 1903, F. Coulombe—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	16	22	16	W. 1	" Jan. 24, 1905, Eulalie Veringge—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	16	22	16	W. 1	" July 26, 1909, Aug. Saquet.
N.E. ¼	18	22	16	W. 1	" June 7, 1898, W. W. Reed—Cancelled
N.E. ¼	18	22	16	W. 1	" July 23, 1906, A. C. Bloxham—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	18	22	16	W. 1	" June 24, 1908, Nikolo Kizchach.
N.W. ¼	20	22	16	W. 1	" May 25,1898, A. Howson—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	20	22	16	W. 1	" Oct. 13, 1905, W. H. Down—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	20	22	16	W. 1	" May 14, 1906, Thos. Herbert—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	20	22	16	W. 1	" May 30, 1908, G. W. Lowther.
N.W. ¼	31	22	16	W. 1	" Sept. 15, 1908, Jos. Roussin.
N.E. ¼	19	22	17	W. 1	" Oct. 15, 1908, D. McLoy.
N.W. ¼	19	22	17	W. 1	" " 9, 1908, P. M. Warner.
S.E. ¼	19	22	17	W. 1	" April 2, 1909, W. J. Elder.
S.W. ¼	19	22	17	W. 1	" Oct. 9, 1909, Wm. Patterson.
N.E. ¼	21	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 11, 1908, J. J. Buckingham—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	21	22	17	W. 1	" Dec. 23, 1909, John Burgera.
N.W. ¼	21	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 15, 1908, A. B. Roberts.
N.E. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" June 9, 1898, R. G. Hill—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" April 28, 1908, John Suannell.
N.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" Nov. 2, 1905, S. T. McCollam—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" " 9, 1909, J. E. Armstrong.
S.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" June 9, 1898, F. G. Hill—Cancelled.

ORIGINAL ENTRANT AND DATE OF ENTRY.

Section. Part.	Section. No.	Township.	Range.	Meridian.	How Disposed.
S.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	Hom. Nov. 1, 1905, R S. McCallum—Cancelled.
S.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1	" July 27, 1908, Henry Hall.
N.W. ¼	23	22	17	W. 1	" May 1, 1908, J. H. Peters—Cancelled.
S.E. ¼	23	22	17	W. 1	" Oct. 29, 1908, F. M. Andre—Cancelled.
S.W ¼	23	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 16, 1908, Wm. Jeffery.
N.E. ¼	25	22	17	W. 1	" " 30, 1908, G. P. Abriam.
N.W. ¼	25	22	17	W. 1	" " 3, 1908, A. Goulsbra.
S.W. ¼	25	22	17	W. 1	" " 3, 1908, C. Recknell.
N.E. ¼	26	22	17	W. 1	" Dec. 29, 1905, J. A. Humm—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	26	22	17	W. 1	" July 23, 1908, Harry Down.
N.E. ¼	27	22	17	W. 1	" " 7, 1909, F. E. Simpson—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	27	22	17	W. 1	" Dec. 5, 1908, A. J. Pitre.
S.E. ¼	27	22	17	W. 1	" April 28, 1909, J. W. Scott.
S.W. ¼	27	22	17	W. 1	" " 5, 1909, C. H. Holloway.
S.W. ¼	28	22	17	W. 1	" May 10, 1902, C. A. E. Blackman—Cancelled.
S.W. ¼	28	22	17	W. 1	" July, 13, 1906, J. F. Anderson—Cancelled.
S.W. ¼	28	22	17	W. 1	" Aug. 18, 1908, Stanislas Pitre.
N.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 10, 1908, H. E. S. Sale—Cancelled.
N.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" May 22, 1909, Francis Shapf.
N.W. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" Mar. 11, 1909, Geo. Shapf.
S.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 10, 1908, R. S. Wilson—Cancelled.
S.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" Nov. 2, 1909, Alex. Carr.
S.W. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1	" " 14, 1908, O. Carter, jr.
N.E. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 10, 1908, W. H. Johnson.
N.W. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" " 10, 1908, John Geisel—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" Oct 23, 1909, Archie Thompson.
S.E. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 10, 1908, M. Hamilton.
S.W. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" " 10, 1908, A. Hamilton.
S.E. ¼	34	22	17	W. 1	" Dec. 12, 1901, E. Desrosiers—Cancelled.
S.E. ¼	34	22	17	W. 1	" Mar. 11, 1908, H. Vier.
S.W. ¼	34	22	17	W. 1	" July 24, 1906, L. Butcher—Cancelled.
S.W. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1	" Oct. 28, 1909, Jas. Pollard.
N.E. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1	" July 7, 1909, Geo. Sloane.
N.W. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1	" " 6, 1909, Thos. Grag.
S.E. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1	" July 7, 1909, W. H. Cernett.
S.W. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1	" Sept. 10, 1908, H. F. Bickle.—Cancelled.
S.W. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1	" July 6, 1909, J. J. Buckingham.
S.E. ¼	3	23	17	W. 1	" Jan. 20, 1909, John Lithell.
N.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1	" Aug. 28, 1899, C. J. Collingburn.—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1	" May 18, 1901, W. Sildon—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1	" July 4, 1904, J. Johnson—Cancelled.
N.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1	" April 9, 1908, Gordon McLean.
S.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1	" Sept. 21, 1906, Duncan Kennedy.
S.W. ¼	31	23	19	W. 1	" Feb. 12, 1908, N. McArthur.
N.E. ¼	34	23	19	W. 1	" Mar. 19, 1908, P. Morley.
N.W. ¼	34	23	19	W. 1	" June 23, 1908, H. Arkinson.
S.E. ¼	34	23	19	W. 1	" Feb. 29, 1908, A. Pallen.
S.W. ¼	34	23	19	W. 1	" Mar. 14, 1908, H. Davis.
N.W. ¼	15	23	20	W. 1	" July 14, 1908, H. Kasztra.
N.E. ¼	17	23	20	W. 1	" Mar. 18, 1908, P. Duda.
N.E. ¼	35	23	20	W. 1	" Aug. 19, 1908, J. Urbanovich.
S.E. ¼	35	23	20	W. 1	" " 17, 1908, J. Sklehoneick.
N.E. ¼	36	23	20	W. 1	" Sept. 24, 1908, J. Symcycz.

3. 14.

CASES OF ABANDONMENT OR CANCELLATION AND NAME OF PRESENT ENTRANT.

Section.		Township.	Range.	Meridian.	How Disposed.
Part.	No.				
S.E. ¼	4	19	15	W. 1.	A. G. Brown, jr.
S.E. ¼	31	19	15	W. 1.	W. W. Hawkins.
N.W. ¼	19	20	15	W. 1.	W. J. McLeod.
N.E. ¼	31	20	15	W. 1.	R. Smith.
N.E. ¼	16	22	16	W. 1.	Aug. Sagnet.
N.E. ¼	18	22	16	W. 1.	Nikolo Kizchach.
N.W. ¼	20	22	16	W. 1.	G. W. Lowther.
N.E. ¼	21	22	17	W. 1.	John Burgera.
N.E. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1.	John Suannell.
N.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1.	J. E. Armstrong.
S.W. ¼	22	22	17	W. 1.	Henry Hall.
N.E. ¼	26	22	17	W. 1.	Harry Down.
S.W. ¼	28	22	17	W. 1.	Stanislas Pitre.
N.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1.	Francis Shapf.
S.E. ¼	31	22	17	W. 1.	Alex. Carr.
N.W. ¼	33	22	17	W. 1.	Archie Thompson.
S.E. ¼	34	22	17	W. 1.	H. Vier.
S.W. ¼	34	22	17	W. 1.	Jas. Polland.
S.W. ¼	35	22	17	W. 1.	J. J. Buckingham.
N.W. ¼	36	23	18	W. 1.	Gordon McLean.

4.

5. S. W. ¼ sec. 31, tp. 19, range 15, west 1st meridian.

S. W. ¼ sec. 18, tp. 20, range 15, west 1st meridian.

W. ½ sec. 27, tp. 21, range 16, west 1st meridian.

N. ½ and S. E. ¼ sec. 23, tp. 22, range 17, west 1st meridian.

S. ½ sec. 21, tp. 22, range 17, west 1st meridian.

N. E. ¼ sec. 27, tp. 22, range 17, west 1st meridian.

N. W. ¼ sec. 36, tp. 23, range 17, west 1st meridian.

N. W. ¼ sec. 24, tp. 23, range 18, west 1st meridian.

E. ½ sec. 36, tp. 23, range 18, west 1st meridian.

Several other quarters are now in process of being made available.

QUEBEC COMMAND—MEDICAL OFFICER.

Mr. ALLEN:

1. Is there a principal medical officer for Quebec command? If so, what is his name and how long has he held the appointment?

2. Does he receive pay for the appointment? If so, how much has he received?

3. What are the duties of his position, and has he performed them satisfactorily?

4. When did he last attend annual training?

5. Is it the intention of the government to retain him in this position for any length of time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes; Lt.-Colonel A. N. Worthington. 1st May, 1905.

2. Yes; $1 per diem. Since May 1, 1905 to November 30, 1909, latest payment, he has received $1,663 as principal medical officer, Quebec command, and in addition he received $204 for attending annual training at Laprairie camp, 1905, and Sherbrooke camp, 1906.

3. (a) He is responsible to the officer commanding, Quebec command, for the medical administration, medical arrangements and sanitary duties within the command. (b) The manner in which an officer performs the duties of the position he holds is the subject of a confidential report every year. These reports are made confidentially, for the information of his superior officers and the Minister of Militia only, and it is, therefore, not considered desirable to answer this question.

Refusal to give such information is not to be understood to imply, in any way, that the confidential report on the officer in question has not been satisfactory.

4. 1906.

5. The period during which he will continue to hold his present position will be in accordance with the regulations governing the tenure of all such appointments.

GARRISON ARTILLERY.

On the question, Mr. BARNARD:

1. In how many instances have 12 pr. B. L. guns been supplied to regiments or units of

garrison artillery?

2. What regiments of garrison artillery is it the intention of the department to supply with these guns?

3. Are 12 pr. B. L. guns known as field artillery guns, and are they used for purposes of field artillery regiments?

4. Is it the policy of the department to require regiments or units of garrison artillery to train on 12 pr. B. L. guns?

5. Is it the policy of the department to arm for training or other purposes regiments of garrison artillery with field artillery guns?

6. Is any useful purpose to be served by requiring No. 1 company of the 5th regiment of Canadian artillery to train upon 12 pr. B. L. guns?

7. Why was this company selected out of said regiment to train upon these guns?

8. Is it the intention of the department to supply the 5th regiment of Canadian artillery with horses in order to enable them to train as a cavalry regiment?

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like very much, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question if some hon. member will put it.

Mr. TALBOT. I ask to be allowed to ask this question.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) had the consent of the hon. member (Mr. Barnard) who gave notice of the question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, that is not necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. But a member's question should not be taken from him by another member without his consent.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may state that there has been some misunderstanding as to this particular matter as the result of a question and answer given some days ago. I have had a statement prepared by the Inspector General, General Lake, who, in fact, thinking there was misapprehension regarding the matter, volunteered the information and desired me to place it before the House. It will reflect on nobody and I think it will be a decided advantage that it should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not raising the question whether it would be advantageous or not, but I am discussing the principle. It does not seem to me the best course to follow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could read the information some other time.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister is not debarred from bringing it down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point being raised whether a question should be put in the absence of the member who gave notice of it, it had better stand.

Mr. BARNARD.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARTY PATRONAGE.

On the notice of motion:

That in the opinion of this House the prevailing system of party patronage constitutes a menace to honest and efficient government, incites to great waste of resources and extravagance of expenditures, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals, and should forthwith be eliminated from our federal administration.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to give notice to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that next Wednesday, if this resolution is reached, I intend to move it.

JUDICIAL BUSINESS, DISTRICT OF MONTREAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a return showing the number of cases, en délibéré, or in which judgment has been reserved, before the Superior Court of Lower Canada or the judges thereof sitting in and for the district of Montreal, said return to be confined to the cases of said court heard in the city of Montreal, and to such as were en delibèré, or reserved, on the first day of December instant.

He said: This is rather a pressing matter, yet I do not intend to speak at any length upon it. I merely wish to call the attention of the government to a state of affairs which has now existed too long in the city of Montreal. There is, as the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows, a demand for additional judges in Montreal, by the bar, by the public, and, if they could take any action, I think, by the judges themselves. The judges have power, under our law, to call to their assistance the judges from other districts, and they do so, otherwise they could not get along at all. These judges come as much as they can and render as efficient service as possible, but what I wish to insist upon is that the insufficiency of judges of the Superior Court in that particular district is now apparent. As my right hon. friend knows, the provincial legislature has altered the law and has provided for two additional judges for the city of Montreal. The legislation by the province that is required was passed two years ago. As the House is aware, the organization of the tribunal is in the hands of the province, but the nomination and payment of the judges is with the federal power. The government here made representations, or I believe they did—certainly the Prime Minister expressed the opinion on one occasion—that it was not necessary to have new judges in Montreal but that there were judges in the outlying districts sufficiently unoccupied to be able to attend to the business of the district of Montreal and that a judicial re-

organization was necessary. There is no doubt that a judicial reorganization is necessary. There are districts in the neighbourhood of Montreal whose judges have very little to do—almost nothing to do. But to change the organization of the district and put more judges in the district of the city of Montreal would involve a complete change in our system of judicature in the province of Quebec. It has been spoken of for years, and a Bill has been introduced to that effect in the legislature of the province of Quebec, but for some reason or another the government of the province hesitate to change the system and change the districts, which change, if properly carried out, would give to Montreal sufficient judges without the nomination of additional members of the bench. The position of the provincial government, I understand, is this: Whatever may be said as to judges in certain districts not being busy, and as to the utility of changing the system, the people of the province of Quebec at present are not ready for that change. That I understand is the argument. Now the consequence of that is that we ought to have at present 16 judges in the city of Montreal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You have 14 now.

Mr. MONK. Well, there is another point to which I wish to call the attention of my right hon. friend. There was a long delay in replacing Judge Curran, I understand he has been replaced to-day. But the seat was long unfilled. There was also a long delay in replacing Judge Loranger, or Judge Mathieu. Anyway, for the past year, in the city of Montreal, we have only had 12 judges. When the House considers the extent of legal business in Montreal, it must conclude that those judges are overworked. They all do their very best, but they cannot get rid of the accumulating business. Let me give the House a few figures. Here is the certificate of the deputy prothonotary for the Superior Court in Montreal:

I do hereby certify that the number of cases inscribed for trial (enquete and merits) during the three last years was as follows: 1907, 1,817; 1908, 2,249; 1909, 2,758. On the 31st December last there were 1,545 cases left unheard.

I do further certify that the writs issued during the same period were: 1907, 5,884; 1908, 6,701; 1909, 7,000.

JOS. LOZEAU,
Deputy Prothonotary.

Montreal, January 3, 1910.

You can see how rapidly the business of the court has increased during the past few years. I have also another certificate from the Deputy Prothonotary in charge of the Court of Review, which is the Superior Court of three judges sitting in review on appeals from the judgment of the court below:

I hereby certify that the number of cases subscribed for hearing in review for 1907, was 225; in 1908, 244; in 1909, 278; and that on the 31st day of December, 1909, there were 128 cases left in hand unheard.

G. H. PLOURDE,
Deputy Prothonotary.

Montreal, 31st December, 1909.

I have stated that during the last year we have had practically only 12 judges. Let me point out how their work is distributed. The Superior Court has jurisdiction over cases involving from $100 upwards. There is an appeal from the judgment of the Superior Court judges to the Court of Review, which is composed of three other judges of the Superior Court, and from their jurisdiction you can appeal to the Court of Appeals, to the Supreme Court, and to the Privy Council, under certain conditions. We have four judges in the city of Montreal who are required for the Court of Review, three judges sitting in the court itself, and another judge in case one of the judges is disqualified to sit in a case of his own from which there is an appeal, or for other reasons. At the beginning of the month, four judges must be set aside for the purposes of the Court of Review, one for a jury trial, of which this month there are seven inscribed in the Superior Court, and two for the practice division. This leaves five judges of the twelve for the general business of the court. Of course if we get fourteen in working order, it will leave seven judges for the ordinary routine business of the court. But from the volume of litigation which I have just mentioned, it is evident that even seven judges must be extremely hard worked, and the cases must be easily disposed of, if they are to get rid of such an immense number as I have mentioned. As a matter of fact, they are not able to do so. The Chief Justice has to summon judges from the country districts in order to get through the business, which comes before the court as well as they can. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the province, having seen fit to alter the constitution of the tribunal and to provide two additional judges in Montreal, it is incumbent on the federal power to name those judges. This is the way the question presents itself to me: Under the British North America Act you can constitute your tribunals as you like, but we will not name the judges. It seems to me that position is untenable. We are obliged to provide the judges after the provincial power has organized the tribunal. Of course, if it was a case of vexation, supposing a provincial government, without any valid motive, should change the tribunal so as to force the federal power to provide the judges, I suppose we might refuse the necessary supply. But outside

cases of vexation, or conspiracy, or an organization for putting the dominion power unnecessarily to expense, and for the sole purpose of providing places, I do not think we have a right to refuse to name the judges they require.

Now this provision was made nearly two years ago, and unless the government takes the ground I have suggested, I do not think it can delay any longer to provide additional judges. What, then, is the reason of the delay? It is whispered that my hon. friend is delaying for political reasons. I hope he will contradict that. It seems there is no difficulty in finding nominees for the positions. There are a great many gentlemen qualified and willing to serve. But the government, for reasons of its own, those nominees, as we are informed, being members sitting in this House, have seen fit to delay the supplying of a legitimate want. I do not think that is fair. The province has done its share and the duty of the government, without any other consideration of the question at all, is to make the appointment. If there has been any correspondence between the government of the Dominion and the provincial authorities in regard to this matter which would justify the government's delay, I think the government should lay it on the table. I moved for the number of cases en delibèré, but it seems to me that the data which I have given to the House are much surer indications of the volume and pressure of business. There are undoubtedly a large number of cases en delibèré, or under advisement, but no blame for that is attached to the judges. In fact, there is no complaint about the judges; they are overworked and what is required is that they should be given the necessary assistance and it is for this government to do so. I therefore will not press the motion in so far as requiring the statement of the cases en delibèré is concerned. It would be an unnecessary and invidious statement. But I suggest to the government that if there is any correspondence with the provincial government upon this subject it should be laid upon the table of the House. While I am referring to the administration of justice—this is a corollary subject—I would like to say one word with reference to the judges of the circuit court sitting in the city of Montreal. They have an immense volume of work and they are very much underpaid. I merely wish to read what I find in the 'Gazette' of the 15th of December last in reference to the state of administration of justice in the city of Montreal. These judges are also paid by the federal authorities. I quote:

The Circuit Court for the district of Montreal, composed of the city of Montreal and the counties of Laval, Chambly and Verchères, Laprairie and Napierville, Jacques Cartier Soulanges and Vaudreuil, was established in the year 1893, for the purpose of taking the smaller cases from the then, as now, overcharged docket of the Superior Court, yet today the accumulation of business before the Circuit Court is so great owing to the rapid growth of the city that there are no less than 3,100 cases now inscribed to be heard as soon as Judges Lebeuf, Dorion and Purcel can find time to hear them. This, in a word, is the extent of arrears for the last eleven months, and by the first of January, 1910, there will be at least 3,500 cases behind. There were on the first of February, 1908, 2,500 cases in arrears, so it will be seen that the work of this important court is going behindhand at the rate of one thousand cases per annum, and this with the three present judges working from 10 o'clock in the morning to 5 and 6 o'clock at night.

As a matter of fact, the amount of litigation before the Circuit Court of this district is so great that there have been no less than 12,729 judgments rendered during the eleven months of the present year. As for the work done by the three judges who at present constitute the Circuit Court there is not a lawyer or litigant who has a word of complaint as to the manner in which the business of the court is carried on, for it was only the other day that the members of the junior bar of this district congratulated Judge Lebeuf because of the improvements he had made, and of the efficient manner in which the court expedites the work on hand.

Twenty cases are disposed of every day by the two judges on the bench, as it is absolutely necessary that there shall be one of the three constantly sitting in chambers, and even then he finds time to sit twice a week.

Speaking for his colleagues yesterday, Judge Lebeuf declared that it would be quite impossible for them to work any harder than they do now, and he, furthermore, expressed the opinion that there was quite enough work for at least nine judges in the Circuit Court of the district. Without one new case being inscribed it would take the present judges a whole year to come up with the work in arrears.

As to the question of salary the $3,000 per annum received by these judges is regarded as a grave injustice when it is considered that the judges of the Superior Court receive $7,000, and the recorders and police magistrates receive from $4,000 to $5,000 yearly. Judges Lebeuf, Dorion and Purcel are called upon to follow the same procedure and apply the same civil law as the justices of the Superior Court.

I have quoted this as an act of justice to these three judges who are much overworked and underpaid. It would seem to me that the government, under these circumstances, might take up in a special manner this question of the administration of justice as far as it comes under its own control in the city of Montreal. We now have a city of over 500,000 people. There is an immense commercial business. It is the commercial centre of the Dominion, there is an enormous amount of litigation

and the cases are of the utmost importance. From the data which I have given to the House I think we, in the city of Montreal, who contribute very largely to the taxation, ought to be better provided in regard to the administration of justice. I hope that the government will take the matter up because it affects the interests of the bar and of the public in the highest degree.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the hon. member (Mr. Monk) has moved is for a return giving certain information as to the number of cases standing for judgment before the Superior Court in Montreal. There would be no objection to the laying of any such information in the possession of the government before the House, but the hon. gentleman must be perfectly aware that no information of this nature is possessed by the government. No returns are made by any of the provincial courts to the Department of Justice or to any other department of the Dominion government in regard to the position of the business that may be standing for consideration.

Mr. MONK. I was told by the officials there that information of that kind had already been given here, but inasmuch as more instructive data have been cited by me to the House I do not insist upon that part of the motion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can assure my hon. friend that there are no returns made by any of the judges, or by any of the officials of the courts to the Department of Justice, or to any other department of the Dominion government, except certain very general information for statistical purposes which comes, I understand, ordinarily, and regularly, to the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, if this motion were adopted by the House it would be quite impossible to afford, by way of a return or answer, any such information as is asked in any other way than by making a special application to the judges themselves for the information that is desired. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend will see his way to withdrawing the resolution after it has been discussed, because I have no doubt that discussion and to call public attention to the situation was that which my hon. friend especially desired. Now, the hon. gentleman has addressed himself not only to the position of the judicial business in the superior courts in the city of Montreal but he has also spoken in regard to the circuit court and as the two stand in an entirely different position let me first say what I wish to say with regard to the circuit court. The circuit court is a small debtors' court, a court which corresponds, in a general way, with what in Ontario we call a division court. I have not the slightest doubt that the number of cases entered from month to month and from year to year in the debtors' court is exceedingly large. It could not fail to be so, but that there is in that court any such congestion of work at the present time as calls for additional judicial help, I must be given leave very strongly to doubt because the attorney general of the province, who is charged with full responsibility for the administration of justice within the province, and the provincial government have not proposed to add another to the number of circuit judges in the city of Montreal. Until that step is taken by the province; until the provincial legislature has provided for an additional judge to the Montreal circuit court, there is absolutely nothing that this parliament can do. No matter how much we might wish that there should be extra judicial assistance provided for the circuit court in Montreal we have no power to appoint an additional judge until the provincial legislature has acted, and the circumstance that the provincial legislature has taken no action is I think the best proof that there is no need of action in that regard. Increasing the salaries of the three judges who now constitute that court in Montreal manifestly would not lessen the amount of work these gentlemen have to do, and the only way in which congestion of work, if it exists in that court, is to be relieved is by a further judicial appointment. But, the Superior Court of Montreal or of the province of Quebec stands of course in a different position. The legislature of the province has provided for the appointment of an additional number of judges to that court. As yet this parliament has taken no action in that regard and for the propriety of the course which we have adopted in that respect there is the very best of reason. I think I could convince my hon. friend himself that that reason exists, but as it is six o'clock it would be impossible to finish the discussion and I shall have to reserve what I wish to say until it can be resumed.

On the motion of Mr. Aylesworth the debate was adjourned.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We intend to take up some of the Bills and go on with the budget debate.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 13, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PROCEDURE—WITHDRAWING OF QUESTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to Question No. 4 (which appeared in the orders of the day yesterday as Question No. 24), in the name of Mr. Barnard, I desire to make the following observations:

In my opinion, there are only two ways in which a question can be properly withdrawn when once it has been presented for answer in the House, that is, first by written notice by the member, putting the question, to the Clerk of the House stating that the question is withdrawn, or by the member, in his place in the House, informing the Speaker that he desired the question to be dropped or withdrawn.

In the British House of Commons the practice is that no member can ask a question in the name of another member unless upon the request of the member in whose name the question stands. (May 11th edit. p. 251.) The practice, however, in this House has hitherto not been so rigid as this, inasmuch as members have asked questions for other members under the assumption of an implied request, at least, and, in my opinion, it is not desirable that this practice should be changed.

On the subject of answers to questions the following is the practice of the British House. (See May, 251):

> A minister may, if he thinks fit, on the ground of public interest, answer a question appearing on the notice paper, although it is not asked. A minister may also, on the ground of public interest, or some other ground, decline to answer a question.

Having this practice in view, I think the hon. minister would be at liberty to answer the question of the hon. member even although the member did not call the same.

GARRISON ARTILLERY.

Mr. BARNARD. It was my intention to reframe this question, but if the hon. minister wishes to answer, I have no particular objection.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I thought it would be in the public interest to read a statement prepared for me by Sir Percy Lake, chief military adviser of the government, and inspector general, as there seems to be some misapprehension in the mind of the hon. gentleman and that of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), the latter of whom put the same question the other day. Therefore, on the ruling of Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed to read the statement prepared in answer to this question:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

1. In how many instances have 12 pr. B. L. guns been supplied to regiments or units of garrison artillery?
2. What regiments of garrison artillery is it the intention of the department to supply with these guns?
3. Are 12 pr. B. L. guns known as field artillery guns, and are they used for purposes of field artillery regiments?
4. Is it the policy of the department to require regiments or units of garrison artillery to train on 12 pr. B. L. guns?
5. Is it the policy of the department to arm for training or other purposes regiments of garrison artillery with field artillery guns?
6. Is any useful purpose to be served by requiring No. 1 company of the 5th regiment of Canadian artillery to train upon 12 pr. B. L. guns?
7. Why was this company selected out of said regiment to train upon these guns?
8. Is it the intention of the department to supply the 5th regiment of Canadian artillery with horses in order to enable them to train as a cavalry regiment?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

Instead of answering the question categorically I beg to read a statement on the subject prepared for me by Major-General Sir Percy Lake, chief military adviser of the government and inspector general:

In every fortress guns of various natures and power are permanently mounted in the batteries designed to protect the place, from guns of the largest calibre down to 12 pr. and 6 pr. quick-firing guns, and even machine guns. These are called its 'fixed armament,' and are mainly for use against ships and smaller vessels. Again, a certain number of guns are allotted to every fortress, as what is called 'movable armament,' i.e., mobile light guns capable of being moved about from place to place to meet attack in localities upon which the fixed armament of the fortress could not be brought to bear. The guns to which, it is presumed, the questions refer, belong to this latter description of armament.

When Esquimalt was taken over from the British government, the 'movable armament' which had been allotted to it was found to be one battery (6 guns) of 13-pr. muzzle loading guns. In other words, 13-pr. M. L. guns were included in its armament for use in repelling either a landing attack made outside the range of the fixed guns, or an attack from the land side of the fortress, upon which the guns of the 'fixed' armament could not be brought to bear. For a few years after the departure of the British troops, these 13-pr. guns were retained as part of the movable armament of the fortress, but, in view of the difficulties experienced in maintaining their ammunition (which was rapidly becoming obsolete) in an efficient condition, and the drawback that this gun used ordinary gunpowder, and not smokeless, it was always intended to replace them by 12-pr. B. L. guns firing smokeless powder, as soon as these latter should become available in consequence of the rearmament of the field artillery generally with the new 18-pr. guns.

The 12-pr. B. L. guns to which the question refers are assumed to be the battery of 12-pr. B. L. guns which has recently been sent to Victoria for this purpose.

Again, it is not correct to say that these 12-pr. guns, or indeed any guns of any nature, are 'supplied to regiments or units of garrison artillery.' All guns are supplied and belong to the fortress only, and the corps or men told off to work or drill with any particular gun may, at any time, be changed, and indeed often are changed as circumstances require. For the working of the particular guns in question, a company or part of a company of the 5th regiment, C. A., will now be detailed, probably the same company which, in previous years, has been detailed to train, and has trained, with the old 13-pr. muzzle loading guns, which have now been taken away. The selection of the particular company or part of a company of the 5th regiment to be trained in the use of these guns will be made by the officer commanding the regiment, in communication with the officer commanding the Esquimalt defences.

It may be noted that, in the case of Halifax, the movable armament includes, and has, for many years past, included, among others, 15-pr. B. L. field guns, while this gun and the 12-pr. B. L. gun are in use for the same purpose in many of the fortified ports of Great Britain and the empire generally. It is considered that, for the special conditions of Esquimalt, 12-pr. B. L. guns are well suited, probably better suited than would be the 15-pr., inasmuch as they are lighter and more easily handled on bad roads.

Note.—The new 18-pr. field guns are nowhere allotted for this purpose.

MANITOBA AND NORTHWEST TERRITORY FISHERIES.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask a question of the hon. the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A report was made five or six years ago by the commission which lately sat in Manitoba and the Northwest territory inquiring into matters pertaining to the fisheries there. The hon. minister promised that the report would be printed as soon as possible and laid on the table. When will it be laid on the table? I regret that the hon. minister is not here to reply and regret still more the reason why.

The Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I will have the matter inquired into at once and report as soon as I have an answer.

INDIAN LANDS IN ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON. I asked for a return about the middle of November regarding a sale of Indian lands of the Peigan Indians in Alberta. I am very anxious to have the return and would like to know when we may expect it.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. I laid it on the table a few minutes ago.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the return furnished this House on the 11th of March is incomplete. There was a letter written by one Rainway, at Selkirk, regarding the expenditure of $500 and there are no details. There is a letter from the Indian Department calling attention to the omission. Could the minister furnish details of that expenditure?

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether or not any further progress has been made with regard to the Waterways Treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, there are some subsidiary negotiations going on now with the view of forming our own judgment with regard to one of the points at issue.

FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is rumored that some difficulty has occurred in connection with the ratification of the French Treaty. Is there any ground for that rumour?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We are not aware of any difficulty, and presume that in due course it will be ratified. We have no official intimation to the contrary.

HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT NAVY YARD.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have the government had their attention drawn to some observations of Sir Wm. White, which are to be found in the London 'Times' of Nov. 19, regarding the conditions of the navy yards at Halifax and Esquimalt?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not answer that off hand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am aware that some correspondence has taken place and will be able to give an answer tomorrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can read the observations, if the minister would like to hear them. They are these :

During the past summer he had visited the naval yards at Esquimalt and obtained first knowledge of its condition. Considerable extensions had been made in comparatively recent times to its workshops, store houses and plants; fortification designed to protect the harbour had been modernized but the work was incomplete. He found the fort unarmed, the guns lying on the ground at the foot of the hill in the open. The navy yard was

without a staff capable of maintaining in good condition the expensive machinery left in the work shops and in the buildings. The stores had been disposed of locally at ridiculously low prices and the naval base had been virtually abandoned and was rapidly deteriorating. From information received he had reason to believe that the naval base at Halifax was in a similar condition. Facts of this nature made clear the importance attaching to the new agreement under which these naval bases were to be maintained by the Dominion government. It was to be hoped that before long all foreign naval stations would be restored to a condition of efficiency.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I misunderstood my hon. friend regarding the question. I have no information on that matter, but will make inquiries and be able to give a report if there is anything in the department.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 17) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire, by lease, lines of railways connected with the government railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question?

Carried.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) desires to speak. Stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have declared the motion carried, and I am now putting the question, shall the Bill be now passed. I suppose this latter motion might stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When any motion is passed under some misapprehension on the part of members, it has always been usual to regard it as not passed for the time being.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend can speak on another like motion which will come up.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that the Bill be now passed.

Mr. EMMERSON. By arrangement with the Minister of Railways, I was to have an opportunity to make a few observations with respect to the Bill. Unfortunately I was not here at the second reading, it was not possible for me to be here, and I have just now arrived. I would like the matter to stand until to-mororw.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter stands until to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding;

'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.'

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). In resuming the debate on the budget, I desire to join the felicitations of those who have already addressed the House on the character of the budget, and to extend to the hon. the Finance Minister my congratulations on the splendid statement which he has again presented to this House and to the country. The position which he occupies is certainly unique and unparalleled in the history of this country, and I think in the history of any country. Occupying, as he has, for the long period of thirteen years, uninterruptedly, the position of Finance Minister, he has been able to present to this House a succession of budgets that have at once given an indication of a growth, a prosperity and a development on national lines that has perhaps been unequalled in the history of any country. It is all the more gratifying to us to listen to such a statement in view of the recent world-wide depression that prevailed throughout the United States as well as European countries, and which was in a measure reflected in our own country, and which resulted in a certain recession of our trade, so that our revenue was somewhat less than it had been the year before. Last year the revenue was in the neighbourhood of $11,000,000 less than in the previous year. But we all rejoice that now there is every evidence of an increased revenue, and of a return of prosperity that will even surpass that of the record year of 1907-8. I have here a return for the month of December, from which I find that the optimistic forecast of which the Finance Minister gave on the introduction of his budget, is more than likely to be fulfilled. For instance, we see that the total revenue for the month of December was $8,733,571, an increase of $1,550,216 or over 20 per cent compared with December of 1908. For the nine months, the revenue has been $73,390,008, an increase of $11,091,497. The increase in the customs revenue has been $9,361,421. If this increase for the month of December continues during the next three months of this fiscal year, there is no doubt that our revenue will exceed the $97,500,000 which the Minister of Finance estimated, and may possibly touch the $100,000,000 mark at the end of this current year. But there is also another pleasing fact about the returns. The expenditure, on the other hand, shows a decrease for the nine months of $3,034,492 on consolidated fund account, and of $2,290,206 on capital account. The total expenditure on consolidated fund account was $47,-

398,129, and on capital $24,026,137, of which about $17,000,000 was on the National Transcontinental railway. We rejoice in the return of prosperity that has come to us, and we believe that we are on the eve of a growth and a development that has not heretofore been reached in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to answer at any great length the speech that was delivered by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) prior to the adjournment of the debate. But there are one or two statements he made which I wish to correct, and to give some information that will show that he was labouring under a misapprehension in some of the figures that he gave to the House. I would not for a moment hint that he was endeavouring to create a wrong impression, or that he wished to prejudice the country against the methods of book-keeping that prevail the government offices; but certainly he used some very strong language for one who apparently was not able to harmonize the records as they appear in the Statistical Year-book and the Trade and Navigation returns. For instance he says that the Statistical Year-book gives, for the exports in 1896, $117,684,799, while in the Trade and Navigation returns they are given as $121,013,852.

There is that difference, I presume. I have not looked up the Year-book but have simply taken the trade and navigation returns, from which it is easy to see how that difference occurs. For instance, the hon. gentleman has quoted the two years 1896 and 1900 in making these comparisons of exports. For 1896 there was an estimated amount short reported, as it appears in the Trade and Navigation report, of $3,329,053, which, if added to the figure given in the Statistical Year-book would correspond exactly with the total amount that is given in the trade and navigation returns. It will be observed that these two figures are given on the same page of our trade and navigation returns, no attempt is made to mislead or to falsify the accounts. The Statistical Year-book does not profess to give as complete a record as the returns published in the Trade and Navigation report. In the year 1900 there is an item ' estimated short reported $5,461,411.' That added to what appears in the Year-book would make exactly the amount which he has quoted as appearing in the trade and navigation returns. The circumstances in the other two years he has quoted are exactly the same, his figures are the same simply because there were no figures in that column ' estimated short reported.' Take the columns for imports. He says that the Statistical Year-book for 1896 gives $110,587,480, and that in the trade and navigation return the figure is $118,011,508. If he had given as much attention to the task of ascertaining the exact facts as he appeared desirous of prejudicing the House, he would have had no difficulty in seeing that these reports are exactly correct. On pages 2 and 3 of the Trade and Navigation report he will find both the amounts to which he has referred. The figures in the Statistical Year-book are taken from the imports that come into the country for consumption only, and he quotes from the trade and navigation returns the total imports. Both are given in the Trade and Navigation report and both are correct, but, as I said, the Statistical Year-book does not profess to go into these figures as elaborately and as fully. If he wished to have the facts they are there before his eyes. I shall not refer further to the different figures which he quoted, but an hon. member is not justified in using such language as this:

> But when we find a discrepancy of millions of dollars in corresponding statements given in these blue-books what must we expect to find in the other accounts? Is it a fact that we are standing on a volcano and that the statement given every year by the Finance Minister is a cooked statement?

Very strong language indeed, I think rather unbecoming language to be employed by a member without having made a very careful study of the accounts he proposes to criticise. I have been in the House five years and I do not think I have heard a single member question the correctness of the statements in the blue-books. The hon. member is apparently trying to create an impression in this country that there is at least carelessness in the manner of computing the statistics published in our blue-books.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What authority is there for these estimated shortages, except a fancied authority in the mind of some official?

Mr. SCHELL. I presume it was impossible to get the exact returns when the statements were published, but I would call attention to the fact that from 1868 to 1900 that column appears in the trade and navigation returns. Since 1900 it has been dispensed with.

The hon. member has taken exception to the methods that have been adopted in regard to the expenditure of the public funds of the country and he objects to the maintenance of the two funds, the consolidated fund account and the capital expenditure account. If he had his way he would unite these two accounts and have but one account in which all the moneys would be written up so that if there was any surplus whatever it would appear in excess over the total expenditure of the year. Personally, I prefer to take the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as a better critic in the matter of book-keeping. The system that has been followed by the present govern-

ment is exactly the same as that followed by the government prior to 1896 with one exception, and that is with regard to the bounties that have been paid by this government, which have been charged to capital expenditure. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has clearly explained the reasons for that change, and I think the reasons he has advanced are very good reasons. An expenditure made for the building up one of the great basic industries of this country is practically on a par with an expenditure in the way of a railway subsidy in helping a great public work.

However, I do not wish to quarrel with my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie). He says that the former government had a surplus in only one year during the whole eighteen years they were in power, namely 1882, but he says the present government has had surpluses in four years. If the hon. member is willing to concede that this government has done four times as well in the matter of surpluses as the former government, I suppose we need not complain. Following the system that has been adopted by the present government, as well as the preceding government, I wish to consider briefly the matter of surpluses as they appear in the records. You will find that under the former government they had a number of surpluses. There were surpluses during the financial years 1886-7, 1888-9, 1889-90, 1890-91, 1891-92, 1892-93, or in six years in a period of twelve years, they had small surpluses amounting in all to over $9,000,000. But during that same period, from 1884 to 1896, they had deficits larger than their surpluses. These deficits were as follows:

1884-5..	$2,240,000
1885-6..	5,834,571
1887-8..	810,031
1893-4..	1,210,332
1894-5..	4,153,800
1895-6..	330,500

Or a total of deficits during that period of over $14,000,000. With the exception of the year 1896-7, I am glad to say that the present government have always had a surplus. In the first year after the Liberals assumed the reins of power there was a deficit of $519,981.44, but the following year and from that to the present time they have had each year a substantial surplus amounting to as high as $16,000,000 in one year, and giving in all a total of surpluses amounting to $114,558,259, from which deducting the deficit of the first year you have a total of surpluses during the Liberal regime amounting to $114,068,277.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the hon. gentleman permit a question here?

Mr. SCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would he be kind enough to tell us what has become of all these surpluses?

Mr. SCHELL. With very much pleasure. The surpluses that have accrued to the credit of the government have been expended on capital account, and I should suppose that my hon. friend who has been in the House for a great many years would know that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then they were not surpluses.

Mr. SCHELL. They were surpluses over and above the ordinary or current expenditure. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) is too old a parliamentarian, I should judge, not to be better posted than he appears to be. He has been in the House long enough to be very well versed in the system of keeping the governmental accounts not only by this government but by the preceding Conservative government. However, he wants to know what has become of these surpluses and I have great pleasure in telling him that they have been expended on public works which stand as assets to the credit of the Dominion of Canada; not liquid assets in a sense, not interest bearing assets, but assets that indirectly contribute to the wealth and the growth and the prosperity of the country. For instance, I could give a statement of some of the expenditures that have been made from this source. Take the betterment of our canals. Does my hon. friend not consider that to be a wise expenditure on capital account; and on canals during the years of office of the present government there has been an expenditure of $28,385,227. Take again the Montreal harbour and the St. Lawrence ship channel. Who would say that is not a great national work in the interests of Canada and one which contributes immensely to the prosperity and the general welfare of our country? On improving the Montreal harbour and St. Lawrence ship channel there has been expended by this government $7,663,062. Then, in bonuses or subsidies to railways throughout the Dominion there have been expended $24,679,973; for harbours at Fort William, Port Arthur and Port Colborne there have been expended $2,276,303, and on the Quebec harbour $765,225. These are a few of the expenditures that have been made out of the surpluses to which I have already called the attention of the House. Now, I said that there had been surpluses to the amount of $114,000,000. Expenditures on capital account have been made to the amount of $212,000,000 during the twelve and three quarter years of Liberal government. It is true that our debt has increased somewhat, and of necessity it would have to increase when we have surpluses of $114,000,000 and capital expenditure of $212,000,000, and so we have had to borrow some money to meet these extra expenditures on capital account. But,

if you deduct the expenditure on the National Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge amounting to $58,500,000, you will see that all the government has had to borrow during the whole twelve and three-quarter years have been about $7,000,000. As I say, this has come from the wise management by this government of the finances of the country, so that they had a sufficiency to meet the demands of government, apart from the National Transcontinental railway, with the exception of some $7,000,000. On the other hand, how does that compare with the record of the former government? During the whole eighteen years of their term the total expenditure of the Conservative government on capital account was $167,162,252. Did they have nearly enough money to meet that capital expenditure? No. We find that they had to borrow money, that the revenue was not sufficient to meet the current expenditure and leave any considerable amount to apply on capital account, and out of that $167,000,000 during their whole eighteen years of office they only had $49,000,000 to apply on capital account. In other words, they had to go to the English market and borrow to the extent of $118,000,000 as against the $7,000,000 that this government has had to borrow during their twelve and three-quarter years. It will of course be said that the Conservative government built the Canadian Pacific railway. Well, eliminating the Transcontinental railway and eliminating the Canadian Pacific railway if you will, you will then see that the Conservative government had to borrow at least five times as much as the present government has had to borrow for the carrying on of the affairs of the country.

The hon. member for North Simcoe, as do many others on that side of the House, seems to think that because there is an adverse balance of trade against us it is an indication that the country is not prospering as it should. I am not very much surprised that our friends opposite sometimes think there is danger when they see an adverse balance of trade, because during their regime they had a very sad experience in that respect and perhaps it has made a very deep impression on their minds. In looking briefly into this question I find that from 1878 to 1896 the total imports were $2,044,807,768 and the total exports $1,682,592,467. There was an excess of imports over exports of $362,215,301, or an average of $20,123,000 per year for the whole 18 year period. If there had been compensating assets or sources of revenue or something to compensate for this adverse balance of trade it would not have seemed so bad, but we find that during their regime there was no material increase in population, there was no great inflow of immigrants to the country, no great public works, apart from the C.P.R., were constructed, to stand as great assets to the country. So, I say that this adverse balance of trade was a menace, and I am not surprised that they are so much concerned when they see a small adverse balance of trade accruing under the present government. The hon. member says that there is an adverse balance of trade during the twelve years up to the present time of $202,604,892. I do not know whether his figures are correct, but I have taken his own figures. With less than half the volume of trade, according to his figures, we have only about half the amount of an adverse balance. He says that when there is an adverse balance of trade, or even when trade is buoyant, times in the country are not so good. I take issue with him. In the first place, when trade is buoyant and is increasing rapidly, it is the best possible evidence of good times and prosperity as a whole in the country. I also take issue with him when he says that an adverse balance of trade is always a bad sign. Of course, there is a limit to which we can go with an adverse balance of trade without evil effects accruing to the finances of our country, but a small adverse balance of trade under certain conditions, is almost, I was going to say, a matter of necessity. I think I might use that expression in connection with the affairs of the country as we have seen them during the past twelve and three-quarter years. When the country is growing rapidly, when the population is increasing, when capital is coming to our shores for investment these things contribute to the increase of trade and especially do they contribute to the increase of imports. We will take, for instance, the money that has flowed into the Dominion of Canada for various purposes and see what we have as a compensating asset against this small amount of $202,000,000 which our friend says stands as an adverse balance of trade. For railway construction and for other public works it is estimated that at least $300,000,000 have come into the Dominion of Canada during the last twelve or fifteen years. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke), from a source that I suppose is fairly reliable, stated that at least $220,000,000 have come from the United States for investment in industrial enterprises during the last twelve years. We have had about 500,000 immigrants during the last nine years from the United States and it is estimated that last year alone the 90,148 immigrants who came into Canada from the United States brought with them, on the average, $1,000 apiece. That would amount to $90,000,000. Those that came in during preceding years, numbering, as I have said, some 500,000, less those who came

in last year, have brought in at least from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000. Some may say that this is an exaggerated estimate. It may be somewhat large but for those who have seen the class of immigrants who are coming in from the United States, farmers who have sold their farms at good prices and many of whom have brought in from $5,000 to $20,000, it is not unreasonable to suppose that this estimate is fairly correct. So that, from this source we have had brought into the Dominion money to the extent of about $250,000,000. I am leaving out entirely the money that has been brought by immigrants from Great Britain and other European countries. During the last twelve years immigration from Europe has totalled about 700,000 people. Possibly they have brought in $50,000,000, perhaps more; certainly they have brought in a considerable amount of money. Added to all that, political economists tell us that every able-bodied citizen who comes into the country becomes an asset worth, at least, $1,000. If we add that to the amount I have already named, you will see that we have a compensating asset to stand against any adverse balance of trade amounting to nearly $2,000,000,000. The figures are large but still they are figures that cannot be gainsaid. It is a fact that stands there and it, in a very large measure, answers the question: Why is it that our banks are receiving such an immense amount in deposits? Why is it that the general prosperity of the country is so evident? It is because of this large capital which has gone into circulation, and hence I say that this money which has come in and in some cases part of it going out for the purpose of buying imports, has materially contributed to what appears to be an adverse balance of trade. We know, however, that an adverse balance of trade is the usual experience of nearly all of the great countries of the world. Great Britain, Germany, France, Holland, Italy for the last thirty years have nearly always had an adverse balance of trade. The United States is frequently referred to as a country that has an excess of exports over imports, but if you go back and look at the history of the United States you will see that from 1855 to 1873 they had an excess of imports over exports amounting to $70,000,000 annually. So, I say there is no ground for alarm; in fact, there is no reason whatever for us feeling that there is any danger from the small balance of trade that has been referred to. I wish to call your attention to a statement that was made by the Vice President of the Montreal Bank in his annual report. He says:

> The adverse balance of trade has thus again begun to grow, but while men and money pour into Canada from abroad the disparity need not cause uneasiness. Domestic industries are, speaking generally, working well up to the limit of capacity. Labour is fully employed; the lumber trade has improved. The export of dairy produce has been larger than last year, with high prices ruling throughout the season, all farm products, indeed, are exceptionally dear.

That is the view that is entertained by this high authority that I have quoted.

Now, in the matter of loans, our friends opposite seem to think that the government are not effecting loans as cheaply as they were effected under their regime. Well, possibly some of the loans are not effected as cheaply. We know that money fluctuates in the money markets of the world like any other commodity. After the Boer war, money became much dearer, and in consequence of the increase in the rates of interest, it was not practicable, in the last few years, to renew loans on as favourable terms as in previous periods. Therefore our government as we have heard from the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on more than one occasion, found it more difficult to replace loans as cheaply as they could a few years ago, and our Finance Minister only made loans at short terms so that he might be able to take advantage of the market when, in the natural order of things, money became more plentiful. Let me read a statement which appeared in the Toronto 'Saturday Night,' written by its financial editor, and which I think bears directly on the subject :

> OUR DEBT.
>
> It may be interesting to know that while the public debt of Canada is strictly increasing, the rate of interest is decreasing. At confederation, forty-two years ago, the dominion paid an average rate of 5·55 per cent on $67,069,115 which London had advanced. The interest on this which had to be remitted, either in the sale of produce or in gold, amounted to $3,700,000 yearly. After the lapse of ten years, or in 1877, the debt of the country to London had increased to $122,477,629, but the average interest rate had been scaled down to 4·74 per cent. In the next ten years the federal debt of Canada had reached $171,075,735, while the average rate of interest had fallen to 3·99 per cent. This entailed the sending abroad of $7,000,000 for the payment of interest on the debt. In the next decade, ending in 1897, Canada's obligations to London had increased to $218,225,503, necessitating an annual interest of $8,125,664, but the average rate of interest had fallen to 3·72 per cent. According to the return for the past fiscal year, our debt to London had swollen to $262,000,000, on which the interest charge will be about $9,300,000, which is at the rate of 3½ per cent. In the forty-two years, therefore, of the life of the Dominion of Canada, her obligations to London in borrowings had grown from $67,000,000 to $262,000,000, an increase of $195,000,000, and while the total annual cost to the government had expanded from $3,700,000 to $9,300,000 annually, the aver-

age rate at which the borrowings had been made were reduced from 5·55 per cent. to 3·56 per cent.

There, I think is a complete answer to the contention of our hon. friends opposite that the government is not effecting loans on as good terms as they should be able to do. Let me quote also from the remarks of Mr. Byron Walker, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, made on his return from England this last summer:

> There never was a time when the English investor was so ready to consider favourably Canadian investments. Mr. Walker said, 'As a matter of fact there never was a time when Canadian credit was so good. It is so good that we Canadians must be careful. I think I can truthfully say that we have never sold the English investor bad securities. We have given him good value for his money, and we must continue to do so.'

The London 'Standard' remarks:

> Having regard to the present monetary conditions we think the Canadian government is to be congratulated, first upon the policy of raising money at the present moment in short term maturities rather than on stock, and second upon the terms on which the bills were sold.

It was only a few days ago that our Finance Minister cabled to his financial agent in London that he wished to avail himself of the privilege stipulated in a loan, made in 1885, of £4,000,000, for fifty years at four per cent. That privilege allowed the government to replace that loan at the end of twenty-five years on giving six months' notice, and on the 31st of December, the hon. the Finance Minister cabled to London that he proposed taking advantage of that option. No doubt he believes that the present is an opportune time for the government to replace its four per cent loan effected in 1885 by the former government, and I have no doubt he will be able to do so on more favourable terms.

My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) seemed very much concerned about the claims that are urged by our western friends, who claim to have a record wheat crop of 100,000,000 bushels, and he went on to say:

> If they look into the trade returns, they will find that 44,000,000 bushels of wheat is the largest amount exported from this country in any one year.

If my hon. friend had taken any pains, if he had looked up the trade and navigation returns he would have found that that is not a correct statement. For instance, we find that in 1898 the exports of wheat amounted to $44,000,000, which would represent a good deal more than 44,000,000 bushels, because wheat was not worth $1 a bushel in that year. That was of the crop of 1907 and previous years, not the crop of 1908. I do not see where the hon. member found his figures, for, in these returns, right in the adjoining column he would find the returns for 1909 showing an export of $57,891,304 worth of wheat—and this would be of the wheat crop of 1908 and not of 1909, and, in addition, $7,991,517 worth of flour, making a total value of $65,882,821 worth of wheat and flour exported of the crop of 1908 and preceding years.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. For the information of the hon. member I may state that the quotation was for 1908 and was taken from the Statistical Year-book and not from the trade and navigation returns. The trade and navigation returns from which the hon. member is quoting are the unrevised returns for last year. I took the latest actual figures that I could get, which are to be found in the Canadian Statistical Year-book.

Mr. SCHELL. I am quoting from the revised figures. These trade and navigation returns are revised and absolute. The hon. member (Mr. Currie) went back to 1908, as I have stated, instead of 1909. The hon. member referred to the crop of 1909, but based his figures on the crop of 1907. Besides, he gave the figures for wheat alone, he quoted bushels instead of dollars and he left out flour entirely. These errors made a difference of fifty per cent in the statement he presented to the House.

A good deal of attention has been given to the average rate of duty on imports into Canada. Almost the only criticism of the present tariff by our opponents is levelled at the rate of duty on dutiable imports. In all their statements they totally ignore the free imports. Now, that is wholly unfair. The present government, when it came into power, declared that certain commodities should be put upon the free list. Surely, that is to be regarded as a reduction—it is a reduction to the limit. We must consider the free imports, then, if we seek to arrive at a fair idea of the tariff imposed on goods imported into Canada. We find that the total free imports from 1884 to 1896 were $457,739,263. The total free imports from 1897 to 1909, a period of equal length, were $1,108,199,713, or $650,459,950 more of free imports during the latter period than during the former. If these goods, instead of being admitted free, had been charged the average rate of duty which is now charged on dutiable goods, the Canadian people would have had to pay higher customs duties to the amount of $107,586,075.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What has that to do with it?

Mr. SCHELL. That shows that the government has been carrying on a policy that makes for free trade to the extent of allowing this amount of goods to come in free of tariff charge. Or, if you wish to look at

it another way: The total free and dutiable goods imported since 1896 amounted to $2,822,097,615, had these imports been charged at the difference between the rate of duty that obtained in 1896 and the present rate, the Canadian people would have had to pay into the Dominion treasury $71,681,279 more than they actually did pay. Some may doubt these figures, but I challenge any one to disprove them. The average rate of duty is shown here in the blue-book, and I have never heard the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is the best authority on that side of the House, dispute the correctness of these figures. And I notice that in his reference to this matter he was very guarded and was careful always to state 'dutiable imports', thus leaving out the free imports in his comparison between the charges that were made by the former government and those made by the present government. If you take the dutiable and free imports, which is the only fair basis, you find that the average rate of duty in 1896 was 19·129 per cent, while in 1909 the average rate was 16·586 per cent, or a difference of $2.54 on every $100 worth of goods imported into Canada. At this rate, as I have stated, the people of Canada would have paid over $7,000,000 more than they actually have paid on the imports since 1896.

Great stress has been laid on the fact that our revenue has increased very materially, and so it is said our rate of taxation per capita is correspondingly increased. That is not a fair statement by any means. The rate of revenue has increased, it is true—it has increased per capita of the people of the Dominion from about $7 to $11. But the rate of taxation has not increased per capita, if it is properly and fairly analysed and put in its proper light. For instance, I want to mention as an illustration a simple fact which clearly explains this point. In the town of Tilsonburg, a small town of about 3,000 population in my constituency, an American firm has established a milk condensing factory, and they have brought into that town about $50,000 worth of machinery, upon which they have paid a duty, in round figures, of $9,500, and that has gone into the revenue of the country. You may say that the people of this country have been taxed to that extent, according to the argument that is made by our friends opposite. Now I take exception to that argument; it is not fair, it is not putting the matter in a fair light. If you apply that revenue to the people of that town of 3,000, there is an addition to the revenue of this country of over $3 for every man, woman and child in the town of Tilsonburg, on that one item alone. Consequently if the revenue has increased from $8 per head to $11 per head, here is $3 of it accounted for in that one item. Is it fair to say to the people of Tilsonburg, you are taxed $11 per head now, whereas you were only taxed $8 in 1896? But that is not all. This firm has also brought in capital to the extent of some $70,000, in addition to the $50,000 for machinery, which they have expended in that town for labour and material, and this also has gone to contribute, somewhat indirectly I admit, but has contributed somewhat to the revenue of the country. I mention this fact to make clear the point I am trying to put before the House. And this is an instance that might be multiplied a hundred-fold, perhaps a thousand-fold throughout the Dominion of Canada, if the subject were fully and thoroughly investigated. As I said a few minutes ago, it is believed that at least $220,000,000 of American capital has come into Canada for investment in our industrial enterprises. That capital has gone to pay revenue, directly and indirectly. Two to three hundred million dollars of capital have come in for the purpose of building our railways, and that has gone to a large extent into the Dominion treasury to pay for duties imposed on material used in the construction of these railways.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I would like to know if there is a duty, or a protective tariff, on the product of the factory which he speaks of?

Mr. SCHELL. I understand there is.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Then, according to the principles of the hon. gentleman, it would be advisable to take that duty off. Would he, as a free trader, be in favour of taking that duty off?

Mr. SCHELL. I do not see that that has anything to do with my argument at all, I think it is entirely foreign to the argument I have been making.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would also ask him if the machinery is made in Canada of the same kind that was imported?

Mr. SCHELL. No, I understand not.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Then would the hon. gentleman consider it fair——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCHELL. I do not object to any questions the hon. gentleman may wish to ask me. I wish briefly to call the attention of the House to the very large increase in agricultural exports, and when we remember that the population of the country has increased about 30 per cent, these figures will be all the more striking, as they show that the products of our farms especially have increased at a much greater rate than has the population. We find that in 1896

our agricultural exports amounted to $14,083,361; in 1909 they had increased to $71,997,207, an increase of over 400 per cent. Taking animals and their products, we find that in 1896 we exported $36,507,641, while in 1909 we exported $51,349,646. Or if you take the total of agricultural products and of animals and their products, we find that we exported in 1896, $50,091,000, while in 1909 we exported $123,346,853.

Mr. THORNTON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Where does he get these figures?

Mr. SCHELL. They are in the trade and navigation returns.

Mr. THORNTON. Where does he get his figures for 1909?

Mr. SCHELL. My hon. friend apparently does not know, but I will tell him, that the trade and navigation returns, while nominally for 1909, mean for 1908-9 ending the 31st of March last. So when I say 1909, I mean the figures that were given and verified up to the 31st of March last.

Mr. THORNTON. For 1908?

Mr. SCHELL. For 1909 up to the 31st of March last, and they are here for any one to see. They are verified and correct.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? Has he the figures of the imports of animals and their products placed alongside the exports in those lines?

Mr. SCHELL. I have not.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the hon. gentleman the figures for the imports of grain and farm products, so that he can place them alongside the exports?

Mr. SCHELL. No, I have not, I have the total exports. But I have not the imports for the different articles that are referred to.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it not a fact that the imports——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE The hon. gentleman has given me permission. Will he be kind enough to state if it is not a fact that the percentage of increase in imports of farm products has been equally great with that of exports? If he reads the blue-book he will find that to be so.

Mr. SCHELL. I am not able to say positively on that point, but I think he is mistaken. However, I do not think it makes any difference, because the price of our farm products is regulated by the English market almost entirely; and any imports that have come into Canada have come to certain sections of the Dominion that could not get them quite as easily elsewhere in Canada as they could perhaps from the United States bordering on that particular portion of our country. The price of those products has been affected insignificantly by any imports coming from other countries; I claim that the amount is so small that it does not make much difference to the price that has been paid to the farmers of this country for the products they have sent to the English market.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many millions?

Mr. SCHELL. Less than a million.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the hon member mean to say that the imports of farm products into this country do not amount to $1,000,000?

Mr. SCHELL. No, I said the difference in the price that might obtain would total less than $1,000,000.

The exports of Canadian manufactured goods have been as follows:

1896..	$ 9,365,384
1909..	28,957,050

This is an increase in our export of manufactured goods of nearly 200 per cent.

The exports of the products of our forests have also increased very materially, from $26,000,000 to $39,000,000. The exports of the products of our fisheries have increased from $11,000,000 to $13,000,000 and the exports of the products of our mines have increased from $8,059,650 in 1896 to $37,257,699 in 1909. Our total exports in 1896 were valued at $121,013.852 while in 1909 they amounted to $261,512,159.

Some may ask what has contributed to this very large increase? I do not think we will have far to seek or that it will be difficult to find why we have been enabled to increase our exports in every line to which I have referred. In regard to agriculture, I think we can see the cause directly in the very progressive policy that has been inaugurated by this government and the very excellent work that has been done by our Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher) and his able staff of officers. I do not suppose that our friends opposite will agree with me when I say that I think we have the best Minister of Agriculture that the Dominion of Canada has ever had. He is a man superior in every way to any other man who has occupied the position which he now occupies. From the day that he assumed the position of Minister of Agriculture he has pursued a progressive policy. Our friends opposite sometimes say that the Dominion of Canada has not spent enough money on agriculture, and on the other hand they sometimes object because certain amounts are expended—I suppose that no matter which

policy is pursued they will find some grievance. May I call attention to one or two facts in connection with the Department of Agriculture? At confederation the staff employed under the department consisted of 23 permanent employees. To-day we have a staff of 516 of whom 246 are at Ottawa, and as the department is now organized it consists of 12 branches whose work is of the utmost importance. Among these branches we have experimental farms, the dairy and cold storage division, the live stock division, the health of animals division, census and statistics, seeds branch and other branches whose work may not come so prominently before the people. Shortly after this government assumed office, they decided to grant to Great Britain a preference in our markets. Following the introduction of that preference as a part of the fiscal policy of the Dominion of Canada, we find that our exports increased very rapidly. I suppose that some will ask how the granting of that preference could affect the exports from Canada? In this way, that the attention of the consumers of England was called to our products in a new way. Up to that time our food products had not attained the position in the English market to which they were entitled. When the English people saw what Canada had done in the matter of preference, coupled with the work that the Minister of Agriculture was doing in placing before the English consumers our products in the very best possible condition, the people of England saw that our goods were better than they had supposed and they paid a higher price for them, so that our exports to England increased in a very rapid manner. Since 1898 when the preference was granted, they have almost doubled. In 1896 we were exporting some $66,000,000 of agricultural products to England. In each of the years 1907-8-9, our exports of agricultural products to England were in round figures $133,000,000. That has come about, as I have stated, largely by the placing of those goods upon the English market in the best possible condition. Prior to that time our system of cold storage was not what it should be, in fact we had practically no installation of cold storage on our steamships. The government, as you know, took that matter in hand, they granted a subsidy to one or two of the steamship lines, cold storage systems were installed on two or three boats, and after that system had been in operation for two or three years it was found that all the other companies, if they wished to secure a fair share of the trade of Canada in the products of the soil, had to provide a similar service. The result has been that there is not a steamship sailing from Montreal, Quebec or St. John to English ports that has not a system of cold storage installed, so that ample space is offered to any exporter who may have perishable products to export to the European markets. Cool storage has also been introduced by this government and ample cool storage space is offered to the exporter. In 1900 Professor Robertson, before the Agriculture Committee of the House made the following statement:

Last season our cheese trade got the worst setback from poor boxes and heated quality it ever got. It is now in a precarious condition. I do not know of a time when it was in a more doubtful position than it is at present. We got good prices in the summer, but hot weather in August and September caused the cheese to be heated, and much of it was landed in England in poor condition. It looks as if we might receive this summer of 1901 to the extent of $2,000,000 less for our export of cheese trade, because of the bad impression made in England last season by the poor condition in which much of it was landed.

Mr. EDWARDS. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if this government has taken any steps since 1896 to see that our cheese and butter are properly handled in the old country?

Mr. SCHELL. I am pleased to be able to answer the question by stating that the Canadian government has an inspector at London, at Liverpool, at Manchester, at Bristol and at Glasgow, five of the leading ports of Great Britain.

Mr. EDWARDS. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the report of the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner for 1907, page 97, where it is stated that Canadian cheese is roughly handled in the English market, and that Canadian butter is left on the docks at Liverpool for two and three days at a time.

Mr. SCHELL. There may have been some difficulty in 1907, and the inspectors of the Canadian government are there just for the purpose of seeing that Canadian products are properly handled by the steamship companies. The good work they are doing is probably best testified to by extracts from letters written by English importers which I shall read to the House. I have here a letter written by Messrs. Frank Hamilton and Company, of Liverpool, dated January 19, 1909. This firm is one of the largest apple importers in Great Britain, and as I am personally acquainted with Mr. Hamilton, I feel the more confidence in quoting his statement. Mr. Hamilton has been in Montreal for many years during the apple season attending to the Canadian end of the business, and this is what he writes:

Taking transportation first, there can be no question whatever but that improvements in this direction have been greatly to the ad-

vantage of all shippers of perishable goods.

As you are no doubt aware, our firm has been for over twenty years personally represented in the port of Montreal during the shipping season, and we are therefore in a position to appreciate to the full the efforts your government have made to minimize the losses to shippers caused by neglect and delay at the ports of shipment. It is not so many years ago that a walk along the docks of Montreal would disclose thousands of barrels of apples piled in the open and exposed to the effects of the weather, both hot and cold, and with only the protection of a tarpaulin, if that, and the bottom tiers often covered with mud or coal dust.

The steamers in those days only carried some 5,000 to 10,000 barrels of apples apiece, and the shutting out of goods was the rule rather than the exception. It was no uncommon thing to have a through bill of lading in our Liverpool office a month before the goods put in an appearance. Such a state of things is now impossible, Montreal being equipped with some splendid cargo sheds which will compare favourably with those of any other port in the world, and as the railway tracks run alongside, the handling of goods has been reduced to a minimum. In conjunction with these improvements, the class of steamer using the port is also improved and it is seldom that perishable goods are shut out.

The recent concession of your government to fruit shippers of free icing of cars during transit has had a beneficial effect on the condition of the fruit arriving at port of export.

On the whole, the transportation conditions to-day are tremendously ahead of what they were some years ago, and in consequence better results are obtained when the goods are sold on the British markets.

In reference to cheese, Messrs. Lovell and Christmas, Limited, of London, write under date January 4, 1909:

In reply to yours of the 2nd inst., speaking from our personal experience, the percentage, of heated cheese throughout the past season has been practically nil. During the warm weather we brought all our cheese in cool storage, at a small additional freight, and found this precaution was of great advantage because the cheese arrived here in perfect condition, and the saving in the weight (shrinkage) almost, if not quite, covered the extra expense incurred by having the cheese in cool, instead of ordinary stowage.

In our opinion, there has been a vast improvement in the carrying of cheese during the last 10 years, and as far as the past season is concerned we do not think it could well have been improved on. We believe this is the general feeling of the trade here, especially on the part of those who have taken advantage of the cool storage on the vessels.

Messrs. Rowson, Hodgson and Company, Limited. of London, write under date January 7, 1909:

Heated cheese.—Our experience is that only a limited quantity of the imports from Canada this season have shown any external or internal signs of heat—we should not think 5 per cent of the entire quantity received into the country, whereas ten years ago probably fully 25 per cent of the goods arriving suffered from the defect referred to.

Regarding the ocean carriage and landing of butter and cheese, so far as London is concerned, there has been a gradual improvement during the last 15 years, and more especially since the time that the 'cool air' stowage has been adopted on two lines of steamers viz. the Thompson and the Allan lines.

Messrs. Herbertson and Hamilton, of Glasgow, under date of January 15, 1909, write:

We have pleasure in reporting that our shipments of Canadian cheese received the past season show a distinct improvement both in condition and quality compared with previous years, and are a great advance in all respects with that we were receiving, say ten years ago.

Messrs. Andrew Clement & Sons, Limited, Glasgow, write under date of January 19, 1909:

In 1908 heated cheese were too few to do any harm worth mentioning, and the present carrying arrangements are about as near perfect as we can reasonably expect.

Messrs. H. H. and S. Budgett & Company, Limited, of Bristol, write:

As regards condition, we are pleased to be able to report favourably taking the season as a whole, no cases of heated or badly carried cheese having come under our notice.

I might quote at considerable length from a number of others who are receivers of our Canadian products and who are just as emphatic in stating that the transportation of our products now is practically perfect, and that there is practically nothing to be desired.

Mr. THORNTON. Would the hon. gentleman tell me why Canadian bacon is sometimes sold as American bacon in the English market? Why is not some effort made to prevent that being done?

Mr. SCHELL. I think my hon. friend is entirely wrong. This is the first time I have ever heard that Canadian bacon was sold as American bacon, because Canadian bacon is infinitely better, and the English purchaser knows it is better and it would be to his interest to advertise it as Canadian.

Mr. FISHER. They try to sell American bacon as Canadian.

Mr. SCHELL. Yes, sometimes they try to do that, so that I think my hon. friend (Mr. Thornton) is entirely misinformed. I wish to read an extract from a report of the United States Consul, Charles N. Daniels, at Sheffield, England, published in the 'Daily Consular and Trade Reports,' dated Washington, December 17, 1909, a report

that I think is rather important and which, coming from a person representing another government, I think, is of some considerable value.

From a personal interview with a dozen or more of these firms (fruit dealers) selected at random, it is safe to say that this English city consumes $15,000 to $20,000 worth of apples weekly during the season from October 1 to the middle of March or April 1. Of this amount, about three-fifths are Canadian, the remaining American. Practically all of these apples are bought of or from commission men on the wharfs at Liverpool. The tendency of the trade here is to favour the Canadian grower and packer, the reason for this being that Canada exercises supervision over the grading, packing and branding of its fruit that is entirely lacking in the American product.

A testimony of that kind, I think, would convince any one that there has been some very good work done by this government in the matter of the inspection and the handling of apples. That is a very important branch. It is one of the new branches of work that this government has taken up. We know that the way that many of our packers were packing their apples had become a scandal. There was a tendency to dishonesty and we were shipping many apples that were injuring our trade in Great Britain and in other markets in which they were sold. This government took the matter in hand and passed the Fruit Marks Act, which has been in operation now for some four or five years and any one who knows anything about the fruit trade will at once admit that the enforcement of that Act has resulted in very great benefit to the apple trade of this country. We have, under the Fruit Marks Act, at the present time, about twenty-six inspectors whose duty it is to inspect fruit not only at shipping points but also throughout the country. We have also inspectors in the markets of Europe watching these goods as they are being disposed of there. The results that have accrued to the trade generally have, I think, meant a great deal to this great industry. This is becoming an industry of very great importance, although it has not yet attained to nearly the importance it deserves. There is, perhaps, a wider and better field for the extension and development of the fruit industry of Ontario and several other provinces of the Dominion, especially Nova Scotia and British Columbia, and if such a development takes place, instead of exporting perhaps, $4,000,000, or $5,000,000 annually to the European markets, we may expect to export three, four, five or ten times that quantity. I do not think there is any branch of agriculture that would give a better return than the proper growing, caring for, and handling of that premier fruit, the apple. I know from practical knowledge of this subject that it is not at all difficult to get a return of at least $100 a year an acre clear of all expenses, clear of the cost, if the care of the orchard, the treatment, cultivation and pruning of the trees, and the picking and sale of the apples. But some may say that you have to wait for ten or fifteen years for the trees to come into bearing. That is quite true, but during these years the soil can be cultivated and almost a full return can be got from it while the trees are becoming of an age sufficient to produce fruit. But, when they do come into bearing, say at fifteen years old, until these trees are sixty or seventy years old, they may be made to produce a return that will average a profit of $100 an acre clear to the grower. I know an orchard in the county of Norfolk to which I referred in this House a year or two ago. There are some forty acres in all, probably there are about thirty-five acres under apple culture. That farm changed hands a few years ago at some $2,000 or $3,000. Again it changed hands after it had been put into a little better shape at $4,000. Within the last few weeks it has changed hands at $17,000. Having been pruned, cultivated and sprayed, the return from that orchard this year, as I am told, is $4,000 for the fruit upon the trees. Two years ago the return was $5,500. I could give many instances that have come under my own observation of orchards that have produced a return over all expenses, of from $100 to $150 to $200 per acre. So that the work which the government have done in connection with this industry show their progressive spirit and methods. There is an item in this connection that I wish to give the government some credit for and I would like them to do a good deal more in this direction than they have yet done. They conducted some experimental work in the county of Oxford in the matter of spraying. Some six years ago they spent $200 in one locality in that county. For the last three or four years, following the work that was done in that neighbourhood, proving to the farmers the benefits of spraying, we have found that the orchards that had been taken care of by the farmers who saw the benefit of spraying, all resulting from the experiments carried on by this government have given a return of from $2.000 to $3.000 more annually than has been received from adjoining orchards where they have not introduced the methods of spraying that were then demonstrated. That work could and, I think, should be carried out to a larger extent. In every county in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where this work can be done similarly, it should be done. Any money that this government might expend to advance the interests of agriculture in this way I believe could be returned a hundredfold, or a thousandfold, in a very few years. We had a very interesting debate on technical education in this

House a few weeks ago. I do not think there is any vocation or calling in life where there is a better field for the introduction of technical knowledge than in the carrying out of our farming operations, not but what many of our farmers who have no technical knowledge are successful. Keen, close observation, practical knowledge, experience, bright, clear, intellects and enterprise have combined to make many of our farmers successful, but if technical knowledge were given to our boys, if they knew the reason why certain results follow certain treatments of soils, if they knew the compositions of soils, the chemical properties of soils, the chemical properties of plants, the relation of plant life to soil, the action of air, of frost, of sun, of rain, on soils, if they had the technical knowledge that could be given to them it would be of immense importance to the agricultural industry. I do not know what is the best method. I believe that the government propose doing something in this matter, and I may say that there is no field which offers greater opportunity for the application of more advanced ideas and scientific principles than agriculture. I hope, therefore, that the government will lose no time in dealing with this subject as was proposed in the resolution discussed in this House some two or three weeks ago.

I do not wish to delay the House longer, but there is one other matter to which I wish briefly to refer, and that is the dairy industry, as it exists in the province of Ontario particularly. Our exports in that line have not increased as I would like to see them increase during the last few years. They are somewhat less than 1903 and 1904. That may be due to the seasons not being quite so favourable and the pastures not being quite so good, but it is perhaps due more to the fact that our home consumption has largely increased. Our towns and cities have been growing rapidly. As our people have increased in wealth, they are using more butter and cheese, and the increase in population has likewise called for a greater consumption of these products. I have no doubt that not less than $12,000,000 more is used at home now than five or six years ago. But I would also like to see our exports increasing. There has, however, been some development in the output. Our government has not been slow to recognize the possibility in this direction, and have introduced what are termed cow testing associations. A number of farmers in a neighbourhood associate together and agree to have their milk weighed and tested. Samples are taken regularly to the cheese factory and a record kept so that the farmers may know whether their cows are giving a good quality and quantity of milk or not. As the result of these associations, we find some very astonishing records. We have altogether seventy-two regular associations and fifteen smaller groups in eight provinces, with seven hundred and fifty-one members and 5,743 cows under test. I believe that the work is increasing. Certainly it is one which should be pushed, and everything which has been done so far only goes to prove what a vast field there is for further work in the same direction. Take the county of Oxford and let me draw attention to some herds in my own neighbourhood. There is one of eleven cows which, before the testing, produced 4,850 pounds of milk per year each. In 1908, after that operation was started, it produced 6,380 pounds. Another herd, which formerly produced 5,374 pounds each cow, increased its production to 7,243 pounds. Still another which had produced 4,360 pounds in 1903, is now producing 7,006 pounds per cow. I could give an individual instance of a special cow which has produced as much as 20,000 pounds in the one year, but that is a very rare occurrence. There is a record of a two-year-old cow at Innerkip in the county of Oxford which gave a production of 12,227 pounds, and the weight of the butter was 452 pounds. But of course these are record figures. I have a record of a herd of 65 cows which produced an average of 6,210 of milk each and the milk sold for practically $76 per cow. I have another herd in my mind which, I understand, has produced over 9,000 of milk per cow, and the number of cows is twenty. The milk brought in a return of nearly $100 per cow. Of course, the farmers adopted perhaps a little better method in the feeding and gave more intelligent attention to the care of their stock, and the result proves that this industry might easily be doubled without very materially increasing the number of cows kept. In the Dominion we have a little over 2,000,000 cows producing on an average about 3,500 pounds of milk, some make the average less, but I think if we had a correct record it would be found to be from 3,000 to 3,500 pounds a piece. If that can be increased to 5,000 or 6,000 pounds, and I believe it can, you can readily see that the dairy industry might be developed to such an extent that after supplying the whole market, which requires about $75,000,000 worth of butter, cheese and milk annually, we could export double the quantity we do now. Instead of exporting only $25,000,000 worth, we could easily double that quantity. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) deserves considerable credit for having taken this matter in hand, and I believe his officers are going to urge on the work along the lines I have indicated, and I hope for better results from year to year.

The wealth of Canada has been increas-

ing at an enormous rate through the wise policy of this government. I read a statement by Mr. George Parish, editor of the London 'Statist,' at a lecture given in New York recently, in which he said that the wealth of England had increased from $20,000,000,000 in 1850 to $80,000,000,000 at present. He also said that the wealth of the United States had increased from some $10,000,000,000 in 1850 to $107,000,000,000 at present; that the United States had been borrowers in the world's markets to the extent of some $6,000,000,000, and that England had been lenders to the extent of $15,000,000,000 in the last sixty years.

These figures, to my mind, were very suggestive, and I wondered where Canada would come in. Of course, we are a younger country; but when we look at the accumulating wealth in our banking institutions we cannot but realize that the wealth of Canada is becoming very considerable. Hon. members who have given any attention to the statistics of banking in Canada will appreciate that statement. In 1896 the deposits in our chartered banks and savings banks were $245,000,000. The Finance Minister told us the other day that these deposits were now $731,000,000. We find the assets of these banking institutions have increased in a similar ratio—from $350,000,000 in 1896 to considerably over $1,000,000,000 to-day. This money must certainly come from the people of this Dominion, and if they have enough money to be able to deposit $731,000,000, it will be seen that we have enough there alone to pay the national debt, to build the National Transcontinental railway and still leave $40 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion. According to the statistics that have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture, we have $2,800,000,000 invested in farm lands in Canada. We have 26,000 miles of railway which, at an estimated cost of $30,000 a mile, would represent an investment of about $780,000,000. And we know the growth that has taken place in our manufacturing industries, from an investment of $250,000,000 in 1896 to an investment to-day of nearly $1,000,000,000. If you look at the assessment of our towns and cities and consider the growth of wealth reflected in these figures for Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and other great cities, we begin to form some appreciative idea of the growing wealth of this Dominion. This has resulted in a very large degree—not wholly, of course—from the wise and progressive policy which this government inaugurated in 1896 and has been following ever since. I realize that every honest worker in the Dominion of Canada contributes to a certain extent to this wealth and prosperity. But the government of the day, working in unison with the people of the country, are helping the development of our resources and helping to build up our Canadian nationality. I hope that from the foundations which this government has laid will rise a superstructure that will ever stand as a monument to their wise and progressive policy.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the government of late years have made the debate on the budget an occasion for a grand eulogium of the government and all its works, and the hon. member (Mr. Schell) who has just preceded me for the space of about two hours devoted his attention almost wholly to the same purpose. It may be a very good thing as campaign literature, it may possibly be in the interests of the Liberal party in the riding of South Oxford, but I fail to see that it can be of very much service to the people of this country. In my opinion, the proper usage of parliament is that this occasion should be considered an occasion upon which members who have any criticism to offer in regard to the action of the government should offer that criticism and should make any suggestions which they believe might be in the interest of the country. And I believe that if the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) had devoted a very few moments of the time he has taken up this afternoon to some little criticism—and he knows as well as any member of this House that there are many points on which the action of the government has been open to criticism—or had made any suggestion of action that they might take in the interest of the country, he might have done at least some small good by the remarks he offered to this House. It is in accordance with the view I have just expressed that I have for several years past offered a few mild criticisms of the action of the government and a few suggestions where I thought they might take action in the interest of the country. In some cases, government action has followed the suggestions I made. I do not feel inclined to take all the credit, in fact, I do not care who gets the credit so long as the country gets the benefit of the action taken. In the same spirit, I propose to offer a few criticisms this afternoon and make a few suggestions, and I intend to be as brief as I possibly can.

In the first place, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the naval programme. And at the beginning I may say that I do not intend to trespass upon the debate that is to take place on the Bill now before the House. But this is the first time the government has given us even a vague idea—and it is even yet but a vague idea—of the action which they propose to take in the expenditure for the naval defence of the country. It has been

a great disappointment to me, after the great promises which were made during the debate last March, that the government have finally come down to such a miserable proposition in regard to providing for the naval defence of Canada. What they have proposed to do is to expend some $2,719,000 a year for the protection of our commerce, our coast line, and, indeed, of our very existence as a self-governing community. When I compare with this the estimates for this purpose which have been passed in the great dependencies of Australia and New Zealand, I must say that I feel simply ashamed to call myself a Canadian. I am thankful, however, that it is generally known throughout the world that there are two parties in this country and that it is only one party that, while acknowledging that an obligation is placed upon us to take our proper, legitimate share in the defence of the country, estimate that share at a sum of something less than $3,000,000 per year. I have some respect for those who are prepared to stand up here and declare that they recognize no obligation at all, and consequently desire to see nothing done. But I have nothing but disapprobation of the conduct of those who acknowledge the obligation, and yet make up their minds that they will simply sponge upon the taxpayers of the mother country for as many years longer as the mother country will allow them to do so.

I may also be permitted to express my amazement that, after having six months to work out the plans which the government told us they had adopted for naval defence, they come down now with a statement that they are unable to give us the slightest idea as to when they expect to be able to put a single one of their new ships into commission, or to have one of them ready built, manned, armed and equipped so as to be of some use as a fighting factor. The Prime Minister stated yesterday they had made no estimate whatever with regard to this particular matter. We must remember that if the government finally decides that these ships are to be built in Canada, it will be eighteen months or two years before they can begin even to lay the keel of the first of the small ships they speak of building, and many years after that, no doubt, before these ships will be ready to be put in commission. During the whole of that time we are still to remain in the position we are now in, of practically doing nothing whatever that will be of any effectual use in the defence of the country. Is the country willing that that shall be the case? I, Sir, believe that the great mass of the people of Canada desire to see Canada doing her duty, and doing it at once, by giving the fleet unit which the imperial authorities have asked for, and giving it immediately.

Now, turning to other points in the policy of the government as they appear in the estimates, I desire to say a few words in regard to the Hudson Bay railway. All that appears in the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1911, is a small sum for a further survey of that route. I desire to voice my strong protest against delay in the construction of that railway. The House will remember that nearly three years ago, on the 22nd of February, 1907, the Prime Minister made a declaration that 'the time has come'—those were his words—the time has come for the construction of this railway. In June of the following year, 1908, the Minister of the Interior submitted to the House, in the Dominion Lands Act, certain provisions to create a new source of revenue adequate to build that railway—that is the language he used in explaining the provisions. The House adopted those provisions, and the funds to build the railway are now in process of being made up, and a large amount of money has already been collected in that connection. A general election was pending shortly after that time, and in opening the campaign the Prime Minister said, in September, 1908:

'The time is now—not to-morrow but now' that this railway should be constructed. He made a most definite promise that the construction of the Hudson Bay railway should be proceeded with, and the Liberal party waged the greater part of the election campaign in the Northwest upon that declaration. It was quoted from one end of the country to the other as a specific promise, that if the country returned the Prime Minister to finish his work, he intended to include in that work the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Yet we find that no provision whatever has been made in the estimates for the turning of a single sod on that railway, at least up to the 31st of March, 1911. I would urge upon the Minister of Finance that he should bring down supplementary estimates to provide for this necessary work. It is an absolutely necessary work if the produce of the Northwest is to find an outlet. During the past summer a large number of resolutions in favour of the building of this railway have been passed by various public bodies throughout the Northwest; they have doubtless all been placed in the hands of the Minister, and as some of them have been forwarded to me for my information, I propose to read one out of a great number, all couched in about the same terms. To show the feeling of the people of the Northwest in regard to this matter, I will read a copy of a resolution passed by one of the town councils in the district I have the honour to represent:

Whereas, the development and commercial prosperity of eastern Canada are largely dependent upon the grain production and pur-

chasing power of the prairie provinces of the west, and,

Whereas, the grain and cattle carrying capacity east of the head of Lake Superior is not keeping pace with the rapidly increasing production of wheat and other exports of the west, and,

Whereas, an amount equal to the entire cost of the Hudson Bay railway is annually expended by the west on unnecessary freight charges consequent upon the present long haul to Atlantic tide water, thus reducing the purchasing power of the west and the corresponding prosperity of the east, and,

Whereas, explorers, navigators, engineers, contractors, and others familiar with the Hudson bay route, are practically unanimous as to the practicability of the route, the easy and rapid construction of the railway, and the natural harbour facilities at Churchill.

Therefore be it resolved:

That the government of Canada be requested to get busy and build 165 miles of the Hudson Bay railway in 1910, and the remainder of the road, 160 miles from each end of the line, in 1911; and during 1910 and 1911 install the necessary terminal facilities, elevators, harbour improvements, etc., to be ready for the adequate handling of traffic not later than July 1, 1912.

The House will see how very little prospect there is of the wishes of the people of the Northwest being carried into effect, when we realize that no provision whatever is being made which will enable the construction of that railway to be commenced for the next fifteen months. Not only have towns, villages, boards of trade, and other public bodies in the Northwest passed resolutions on this subject, but the legislature of Saskatchewan has passed a resolution only the other day unanimously calling upon the Prime Minister to implement the promise he made to build this railway. I spoke just now of some provision being made already for the cost which this railway is likely to involve. In reply to a question I asked the other day, the Minister of the Interior stated that there had been a sale of pre-emption and purchased homesteads to the extent of 4,130,400 acres of land. That answer was given last month, and covered a period up to the 31st of October last. The total sum receivable on account of these purchased homesteads and pre-emptions amounted to $12,391,200, nearly the whole amount of the money which the Minister of the Interior calculated that this railway is likely to cost. Now, I spoke on this subject last year, and again I desire to call upon the Prime Minister to implement the promise which he made. The promise was made under peculiar circumstances, but circumstances which, to my mind, involved all the greater obligation, because they gave it much more weight than the people are accustomed to attach to most promises of the ministers of the Crown. The money has been provided. The House has been led to believe that this

construction would be gone on with as soon as that money was provided, and no criticism was offered on this side of the House with regard to the provision which it was proposed to make at that time.

I mentioned the subject of pre-emptions and I desire to urge upon the Minister of the Interior that he should not insist to the letter upon one of the provisions in regard to payment for pre-emptions and purchased homesteads. There is a provision in the law that interest should be payable yearly upon the whole amount of the obligation assumed, beginning at the end of the first twelve months. If the people when making entries for these pre-emptions and purchased homesteads had understood this provision, I should not be so much inclined to press it on the Minister of the Interior, but I believe that very few of those applying understood that there was any such provision. I looked through the advertisements which were inserted in the newspapers announcing the sale of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, and while all other duties were insisted upon and set out at full length, nothing whatever was said about the annual interest, which amounts to $24 per annum, further than that a gentleman who had had a demand from the department to pay this interest came to me with a couple of circulars which he had received from the department, one dated in May last. That circular called attention to the duties he would have to perform in order to earn his pre-emption. It set out all the duties of residence and cultivation but said not one word in regard to the payment of annual interest, and it was only several months later, when the first payment of interest became due, that he received a notification that there was any payment of interest to be made. I think it would be found that a large number of people who in good faith made entry for these pre-emptions believed that no such payment would be demanded from them and a great number of them are not in a position to make such payments. A great deal of hardship will be caused if this is insisted upon. The Minister of the Interior told us the other day that those who did not pay would render their entries liable to cancellation. He said:

> His failure to do so renders his entry liable to cancellation.

It is a terrible position in which to place the enormous number of new settlers in that country who simply have not got this money to put up the payment of the annual interest, and I earnestly trust that the Minister of the Interior will take up this matter and will find some way out of the difficulty and not have all these homesteads liable to cancellation. I do not intend to discuss the policy by which the lands of the provinces in the Northwest are

being still retained in the hands of the Dominion government. To my mind this great hardship must sooner or later be redressed and the provinces of the Northwest must be placed on an equality with the other provinces of the Dominion in this respect. At the same time I think it right to call the attention of the House to a development that has recently taken place and which shows the difficulties which the retention of these lands by the Dominion government is creating. I may say that I do not consider that these questions of land in the Northwest ought to come before this House. They do not come before it in connection with the lands of any other province in Canada and yet every one of these matters has to be brought before this House and the time of this House occupied in discussing it. The lands of the different provinces, under the constitution of Canada, of right belong to the people of those provinces and they are the ones who should have the sole right to deal with them. A short time ago the statement appeared in the newspapers that the premiers of the three provinces of the Northwest, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, had asked that the administration of the school lands and the funds arising from their sale should be handed over to the provinces. I need not mention that this was a policy which was advocated by the Conservatives time and again and opposed by the Liberals, even by those who represented constituencies in the Northwest. It was put into definite shape in the year 1908 when a resolution was moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) from this side of the House providing:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by providing that, pending the transfer to the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, of the Dominion lands within their respective boundaries, the school lands and all funds arising from the sale thereof, shall be handed over to the control and administration of the said respective provinces, according to their interests therein and according as the said respective provinces shall be ready to accept the same.

This resolution was voted down in this House and I regret to say with the assistance of members representing parts of the Northwestern provinces. I sincerely trust that the government will see the error of their way and will now reverse their policy in this respect, especially as the prime ministers of the two new provinces, in whose elevation to that position the government exercises such a very strong influence, are themselves now asking that this measure should be taken. I would again remind the Minister of the Interior of the necessity of providing for higher education in the new provinces, by means of grants of land as an endowment for their provincial universities. In 1885, the Conservative administration of the day set aside 150,000 acres of land as an endowment for the university of the province of Manitoba, and I think that in consideraion of the further advance that we have made in the knowledge of the great benefit that education is to everybody, we should not be behind hand in following such a good example and should not delay any longer in making a considerable grant of land to the two new western universities, especially as land is being taken up so rapidly now that the time is very limited within which there is likely to be good land still available for that purpose. In the year 1908 this matter was also brought very definitely before this House in the form of a resolution moved by myself:

That the Governor in Council shall forthwith institute such proper inquiries as may be necessary for the purpose of ascertaining what quantity of Dominion lands in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan should be set aside and appropriated for the purposes of higher education, and that thereupon, after obtaining the consent and approval of the governments of the said respective provinces the Governor in Council shall set aside, appropriate and transfer, to the said respective provinces the quantities of said lands so ascertained for the purposes aforesaid.

That resolution also was voted down by gentlemen on the other side of the House, including members from the new provinces concerned. I again express the hope that the government will reverse their policy in this respect, and that they will, even at this eleventh hour make some provision for the universities of those two provinces.

Nothing whatever has been done to remove what my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) called the villainous exemption from taxation which is enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific railway throughout Saskatchewan and Alberta. Rightly or wrongly the exemption was given; it was part of the bargain made by the Dominion government for the construction of a great federal undertaking the Canadian Pacific railway and it is not right I say that all that burden should be placed upon the shoulders of the prairie provinces. In 1905, Mr. Walter Scott the present premier of Saskatchewan made the statement in this House that the Prime Minister had promised him that measures would be taken to remove this unjust exemption from taxation, and although the Prime Minister stated that no such promise had been given he certainly led the House to understand that the government would take some steps to remove this injustice. I hope that the Prime Minister will now conclude that the time has come for him to take up the matter and give immediate relief.

The reports in connection with the distribution of seed grain in 1908 have now been brought down. It will be remembered that in the early spring of 1908 the government decided to make a distribution of seed grain to the settlers of Alberta and Saskatchewan who were suffering from the want of seed grain because of a frost which had visited certain sections. The government delayed action most unduly in my opinion, and great expense was caused by this delay as a considerable quantity of the seed had been sent out of the country and had to be brought back again at excessive cost. The price was so high and the conditions so onerous that a number of the settlers, although they were absolutely without seed, decided they would not accept it, and so a considerable quantity remained in the hands of the government and had in be disposed of at a loss of over $100,000, although at the same time certain settlers who wanted seed grain had to go without it. The opposition at the time called the attention of the government to the onerous nature of the conditions which they proposed and moved that the payment for the seed grain should not be insisted upon within one year as the government had proposed. Every Conservative member voted that at least two years should be given to the settlers to make payment, but I regret to say that every Liberal member voted against that proposal. The result was that although the value of the grain supplied by the government amounted to $401,027 within the one year specified by the government, only $28,118 had been paid back by the settlers. This shows how absurd the provision insisted upon by the government was, and it also shows what a lever was placed in the hands of the supporters of the government during the election which took place shortly afterwards who told the settlers that if they voted for Liberal candidates they would take care the government would not insist on payment for the grain within one year.

For the last two years the members on this side of the House have been urging upon the government a measure which the grain growers of the Northwest consider to be of vital importance to their industry. We have asked that the government should operate the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. In this connection my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) moved last year:

> That it is the opinion of this House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producer, and that the government should take immediate steps to operate the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur and the transfer elevators between these terminals and the Atlantic sea-board.

That resolution was opposed by the members on the other side of the House and was not carried. Since then new conditions have arisen: The government of Manitoba has agreed to introduce a Bill establishing a line of internal grain elevators as a public utility, owned by the public and operated by the public. The legislature of Saskatchewan has accepted the same principle. This means that so far as the elevators at initial points are concerned the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have promised to provide such elevators under government ownership and operation. Now, a great deal of the benefits which will undoubtedly be derived by the grain growers of the west from the policy of the local governments will be lost unless the Dominion government is prepared to implement that by taking over the operation of the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. I would prefer to see the federal government own these elevators, but it has been pointed out that it would involve a very large initial expenditure. I understand, however, that both the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway companies have stated that they are prepared to let the government operate their elevators. I have no doubt that the owners of the other elevators would also agree to the proposal. So that the bugbear of finding a large sum of money to purchase these elevators outright need not stand in the way of the government taking them over, paying a rent for them, and operating them in the interests of the grain growers of the Northwest.

I notice that the government are bringing in Bills to amend the Grain and Inspection Acts in some minor details. I am prepared to agree that a considerable amount has been done of recent years in the way of improving these Acts, but they are not yet perfect, and I would earnestly commend to the Minister of Trade and Commerce certain proposals which were made at a meeting of the grain growers of Manitoba recently held in the city of Brandon for the amendment of the Grain and Inspection Acts. They are comparatively small matters and yet they are matters of very great importance to the grain growers of this country and I trust that we shall see most of them embodied in the Bills which the government now have before the House. The grain growers are a wide-awake, useful and a most able body of men, and I have been impressed by the splendid work that they have done at the conventions. The very high order of thinking and the high order of speaking that one hears at these conventions show that they are thoroughly imbued with a desire to promote the interests of the grain growers of that country. I trust that the very greatest consideration will be paid to the

proposals which they have made in regard to the important Acts which especially concern our interests in the prairie provinces.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAKE. There is another matter which I wish to bring to the notice of the government—another problem which I wish them to take in hand and endeavour to solve. It is not very difficult of solution, and if they will try to live up to the character given them this afternoon by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell), they should certainly be able to provide a solution by a wave of their magic wand. I refer to the question of providing harvest help to the Northwest. That is a very serious question indeed. During the past harvest, we had most excellent weather and every facility for getting in the crop; and yet the difficulties in the way of procuring help were so great that it was only by the narrowest margin we got that crop saved before the winter set in. We have had an enormous growth throughout the Northwest, and there can be no doubt that the expansion is likely to increase in the near future, but unless some arrangement be made for a better supply of harvest help, that development is likely to be cut short. If people grow crops and then find it impossible to save them, they will not continue to increase their acreage, which would be a great set-back to the country. I would, therefore, most earnestly recommend the government to take this matter into their consideration. Up to the present it has been left entirely to the railway companies and to private enterprise and it is time the government took hold of it. If they cannot find a means of meeting the difficulty, they should appoint a commission to find out some way by which help can be obtained during the brief period of harvesting. I have had several suggestions made to me in the Northwest, but I do not think it necessary to enumerate them at present as there will be abundant suggestions if the government take up the inquiry, as I trust they will in the very near future.

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has been held up to us just now by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) as the greatest Minister of Agriculture we have ever had. The minister has, according to my hon. friend, performed such great prodigies that I have no hesitation in asking him to perform one more, and that is to do something to put our cattle industry on a better basis. I am speaking more particularly of the cattle industry in the Northwest. I have been a very long time in that country and have seen the cattle industry there in a very flourishing condition, but for several years past it has been steadily going down hill, and it is time the government did something to put it on a better footing. For many years past the Minister of Agriculture has taken no steps whatever to have the cattle embargo removed by the mother country. He has taken, as far as I can learn, and as far as answers given in the British House of Commons indicate, no step whatever during many years past to have that embargo removed. The ministers in the old country ought to be very friendly to the hon. gentleman and no doubt should be anxious to do something in return for the indirect assistance he has given them. It was our minister who, by his utterances to a great extent, let them out of the preferential tariff difficulty. He made the statement that the farmers of this country did not desire any preferential treatment for their products in the markets of the old world. That was a statement which was certainly made use of by the ministers in the old country. It was very useful to them when the colonial prime ministers were endeavouring, at the conference of 1907 to obtain some concessions from the mother country in that respect. If the Minister of Agriculture is not able to prevail on the English government to remove that cattle embargo, he ought to turn his attention to some other means of getting our beef products marketed in a better condition in the mother country.

We had a disquisition this afternoon on the question of surpluses. Well, we are a practical people, and when we spend more money than we earn, we call the difference a deficit. They do the same thing in Great Britain and the United States. Why should we depart from that common sense policy and try to make out that we are having surpluses when, as a matter of fact, we are having deficits from year to year. I am very glad that the Finance Minister adopted the recommendation from this side at the last session of parliament, and charged the armaments of our militia and the expenditure on the Dominion land surveys to consolidated fund account instead of to capital account. The hon. gentleman told us that he did not think any particular reference had been made to the subject came from this side, but, speaking for myself, I made that suggestion when the budget was being discussed at the last session. The hon. gentleman cannot get rid of deficits by any juggling with accounts. They are there all the same. Take the bounties paid. They should be charged to consolidated fund account instead of to capital account, as is done at present. They certainly should be charged against current expenditure because they are only another form of protection and are given to the manufacturers in lieu of protection. Political economists generally speak of the bounty system as the most per-

nicious form of protection, and such I believe it to be. How has it worked out in our own case? We have given $18,000,000 from the treasury during the past few years, taken from the pockets of the people, to build up a new industry; yet, as was pointed out by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), one of those industries was able to pay the other day, in addition to its dividends, a bounty of 20 per cent, in addition on the capital stock held by its shareholders. That is a very curious commentary on the necessity of applying bounties to industries. Why should the government pay bounties to industries which are in such extremely good shape?

I can join heartily in the congratulations expressed on the year of prosperity we have just passed through, and it is very gratifying to western men to hear the frank admission on all sides that the general prosperity is due in no small measure to our western country. We have had good crops and good prices. Our hon. friends opposite have become so accustomed to claim all the credit for this condition of things that, even in this debate, we have heard them claiming credit for the present price of wheat. But if they are to get the credit for the present price of wheat they should take the blame for the low prices of two years ago. The year before last our wheat was very much damaged and was of a very poor grade in certain districts so that it had to be absolutely sacrificed. Thirteen or fourteen cents per bushel were accepted in some cases for wheat which would have made good feed if it could have been got to the people who required it. Wheat, which had been damaged by the frost, was sold at from fifteen to twenty cents per bushel in many other cases. The government no doubt was greatly to blame for not having taken some steps to bring that damaged wheat from the northwest and place it in the hands of the Ontario farmers who were most anxious to get it for their cattle because they were suffering from a shortage of feed. Much credit for the prices prevailing for wheat in the northwest today is due to the careful marketing practised by our farmers during the present season, which prevented any serious wheat blockade on our railways. But while the Liberals take great credit for the prosperity of the country, they ought not to refuse the Conservatives credit for what they have done. It was a Conservative government that acquired that western country and added it to the Dominion, and it was a Conservative government which gave it the first transcontinental railway, the Canadian Pacific railway. It has been the custom to blame the Conservatives very much for having given so large a land grant to the Canadian Pacific railway, but we should bear in mind what were the conditions then existing. It was then absolutely necessary to offer strong inducements for the building of a railway, and, viewed from the standpoint of that time, the bargain made by the Conservative government was a fairly good one. As a matter of fact, it will be found by anybody who chooses to consult the record of that time that a law was left on the statute-book by the preceding government, the Mackenzie administration, offering to give away an immensely larger area of the lands of the northwest in return for the construction of only a portion of the railway, the whole of which the Conservatives were able subsequently to procure for a very much smaller grant. And the Mackenzie administration were willing to give these lands upon conditions which would seem to us now absolutely outrageous, and which, if carried out, would have been quite intolerable for the country to continue.

Even in their immigration policy, of which our friends are so proud, they have only been carrying out the work inaugurated by their predecessors. The member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin), the other day, asked why the Conservatives in 1894 and 1895 could not get immigrants. There were others who could not get immigrants at other times. I would like the hon. gentleman to employ his spare moments in looking up the record of immigration, for instance, under the Mackenzie government which represented the party to which he belongs. From 1874 to 1878, the Mackenzie government pursued an active immigration policy and succeeded in bringing in 149,000 immigrants at a cost to the country of $8.40 per head. From 1879 to 1883, the next period of five years, with the Conservatives in power, the government brought in 373,000 immigrants at a cost of only $3.52 per head, which, I think, my hon. friend from Regina will agree, shows a great advantage in favour of the Conservative methods both as regards numbers and as regards expense. The hon. member will find also that the moderate sums which the Conservative government asked for immigration were constantly attacked by their opponents, and that in the year 1889 the Liberal opposition of that time went so far as to move for a reduction of the very moderate estimate asked for. The amount asked for by the government of that day was $93,135, and the Liberals moved that it be reduced to $50,000. That was all the Liberals of that day were prepared to allow the government in order to carry on an active immigration policy. The entire Liberal party in the House at that time voted for that reduction, including the present Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and several other hon. members, who now sit in the

Liberal cabinet. Compare that with the expense of the present time. We are spending something like $1,000,000 a year—sometimes more and sometimes a little less—and the Conservative opposition of to-day are offering no objection to the amount, they are only criticising the manner in which the money is spent. We want to see a generous immigration policy and as many immigrants brought into this country as can possibly be brought in. But we want to see the money devoted to the service properly, legitimately and economically expended. The last two years for which returns are made are 1908 and 1909. These returns show that in 1908 the immigrants brought in cost $4 a head, which is considerably more than the cost in Conservative days. The immigration in 1909 amounted to 146,908, at a cost of $6.60 per head. In 1883, under Conservative rule, the immigration amounted to 133,624 persons at a cost of only $3.15 per head. So, the immigration policy of the old Conservative government contrasted most favourably with the immigration policy of the present Liberal government. Besides, the present government have had the immense advantage of having a great period of trade expansion throughout the world beginning very shortly after they came into power, and that is the reason, to a great extent, why we are able to congratulate ourselves upon the continued prosperity of the country. If the policy of this government was the means of bringing prosperity into the country, why did it not have an immediate effect? If you turn up the records, you will find that it did not have the immediate effect that is claimed for it. I was looking through the report of the Minister of the Interior, and came across a very interesting table in regard to prices of land in the Northwest, and it struck me that it might be instructive to read the figures in that report to the House to show that, at any rate so far as land values in the Northwest are concerned, the advent of the Liberals to power in 1896 did not bring an immediate result. The following are the figures:

Average Price Obtained by Railways and Other Land Companies for Land in the Northwest.

1896	$3 34	per acre.
1897	3 23	"
1898	3 18	"
1899	3 28	"
1900	3 27	"
1901	3 36	"
1902	3 56	"
1903	3 46	"
1909	11 08	"

Thus we see that it was five years after the present government assumed office before the land values of the Northwest rose to the point at which they had been when the Conservatives went out of power. The price has been gradually rising since that year until now, this year, we have the magnificent average of $11.08 per acre. So, if it was the advent of the Liberals to power which is considered by our friends opposite to be accountable for the prosperity of this country, I think they will have to cut out the first five years and acknowledge that they were a failure at any rate for that time.

I have spoken at much greater length than I had intended and so I will leave undiscussed for the present other matters of general policy.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to answer either the criticisms or suggestions which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has offered to this House this afternoon. I believe, however, that I should devote one or two observations to some of the subjects he has touched upon. The greater part of the hon. member's address has been devoted to questions largely pertaining to the country which he represents particularly in this House, and, as I claim no special authority to discuss these subjects, I shall not follow him upon that ground. The hon. member prefaced his observations with a reference to the question which now occupies the attention of the whole country, the question of naval defence. If I remember his words correctly, he expressed his hearty concurrence in the policy adopted by this government.

Mr. LAKE. No.

Mr. RIVET. I understood him to say that—the principle of coming to the rescue of the mother country was the right principle, but the government was not going far enough, and should do a great deal more. That is the way I understood the hon. member.

Mr. LAKE. That is right. I did not understand the hon. gentleman's meaning.

Mr. RIVET. That is what I was coming to. I must say that I do not entirely share the views of the hon. gentleman; and I will not surprise any one in this House by say that I propose, in all earnestness and sincerity, to support the policy propounded by the government. It is my belief that this policy is based upon a sound principle, that it is an application of a principle which is common to every one, which is in the heart of every one, the principle of self-defence. But I do not propose to give my views on that subject to any extent, because I shall have an opportunity of doing so on the second reading of the Naval Defence Bill.

The hon. gentleman has also referred to another subject which I consider of vital interest to this country, he has touched upon the construction of the Hudson Bay

railway. I really cannot understand the criticism of the hon. gentleman, after the position taken by this government upon that question. If I understand correctly the position taken by this government, the country is pledged to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and so far as the resources of Canada will permit, the construction of this railway should be proceeded with as quickly as possible. But I may be permitted to observe that I am rather surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the expenditures of Canada as being extravagant, while on the other hand, hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), are constantly rising in this House and crying out for a larger expenditure.

Mr. LAKE. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the government has set aside a special source of revenue, created by Act of parliament a couple of years ago, to meet the construction of this railway?

Mr. RIVET. Does the hon. gentleman ask if the construction of this railway will create a new source of revenue?

Mr. LAKE. No. A source of revenue was provided for by the Minister of the Interior in the Dominion Lands Act in 1908, according to which the revenue from preemptions and purchased homesteads should be applied to the cost of building the Hudson Bay railway, and the fund already is something over $12,000,000.

Mr. RIVET. I am not familiar with that question. All I can say is that I am confident that the government will act fairly by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and will proceed with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway as soon as, and as fast as, the resources of the country will permit. Now, Sir, I propose to make some general observations upon some of the features of the document which is called the budget speech. About two months ago, in this House, an event took place of more than ordinary importance for the representatives of the people and for the entire country. In the fulfilment of a constitutional duty, with his accustomed eloquence, the Minister of Finance, as administrator of the finances of Canada, gave a solemn account of the national assets and liabilities of our Dominion. Even as men of precaution, so Canada needs each year to be posted on the true financial standing, the extent of her obligations and possibilities, so as to safely prepare for future contingencies; and it is the business of the Finance Minister to make known, clearly, loyally and exactly the situation.

It is a delicate and difficult task, and it demands complete impartiality, a jealousy of the truth, all the truth, be the consequences what they may for the minister and the government to which he belongs.

In full justice to the minister, and despite all assertions to the contrary, we must say that he fulfilled his duty, in this regard, most scrupulously and in the accomplishment of his mission he merged the politican in the guardian of the country's affairs. And, without any misgivings, the honourable minister was enabled to enter sincerely and honestly on an examination of Canada's financial situation—for, in all ways that situation is encouraging and should be, as it has been, approved of by the whole country.

Not only does the budget show a considerable and normal increase in revenue, expressed in round figures by 17 millions, but, from a hurried glance at the economic condition of the country, it is clear that such growth in revenue is merely the natural result of the general prosperity and not, as has been pretended, of increased taxation.

Yet, despite its favourable characteristics, the budget speech could not find favour with its official critics. Our friends on the left sought to drown the optimistic note in the minister's address with the old cry of alarm.

As usual it was the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) who constituted himself the apostle of pessimism. He is a powerful speaker, a well informed debator, possessing a prodigious memory, a great flow of language, and a remarkably sophistical talent. He excels especially in so manipulating facts and figures as to make them correspond with his own theories. In listening to him one might be tempted to apply to him the remarks of Beaconsfield in regard to his illustrious adversary Gladstone : 'A sophisticated rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity and gifted with an egoistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent or to glorify himself.'

Rising after the hon. minister, the hon. member felt the difficulty of his task; wherefore he saw fit to draw upon all the varied resources of his oratorical talent, and as usual with him, he made a great display of words. Yet, no matter what good or ill may be said of his financial criticism, it would be difficult to credit him with anything new; and the same may be said of all his friends who followed in his footsteps.

Despite their thirteen years of opposition, our opponents, like the Bourbons of France, have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. When, then, will they ever have any other criticisms than the following to make

(a). The assets in the budget increase

so much the worse for the poor consumer who has to bear the burden of the taxation imposed on him by the administration; notwithstanding the well known fact that the average of taxation on the consumer has been reduced three points, and that the total revenue could only increase in the direct ratio of the purchasing power of the Canadian people.

(b). The expenditure is lower than the revenue; that expenditure is still too high, is the chorus of our critics, for the government's policy is one of extravagance, as regards the public service, while, individually, in the estimates they complain that certain districts are ostracized as far as public works are concerned.

Here we have the amusing spectacle of an opposition that finds fault with the total expenditure, while it complains of its insufficiency in matters of detail. This was the position of the hon. member for Victoria, British Columbia, (Mr. Barnard), whose speech was a long philippic on the ill-treatment of his province by the government. According to him, British Columbia does not receive its due amount of public moneys, in proportion to the importance of its sea-ports. On that reasoning, Montreal ought to get 45 per cent of the moneys voted for public works since 45 per cent of the foreign business of Canada passes annually through Montreal. But our friends on the left have a logic that will not bear sifting.

The increase of the public debt is also a favourite theme with them. Canada's credit, they say, goes from bad to worse, because since 1896 the public debt has increased. It has long since been seen that such increase is not alarming and that it presents no analogy with what took place under the Conservatives. Under their government they borrowed to cover the rising deficits, and to meet expenditure chargeable to revenue. Under Liberal management the government borrow to defray the cost of permanent works that increase the assets of the country, such as the Transcontinental railway which marks the greatest addition to the debt, while Canada's credit is in no way decreased thereby, for in a few years the interest accrued will be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Again we have the eternal refrain of scandals in the administration of certain branches of the service, scandals that have been twenty times explained away and which are constantly repeated by those gentlemen, inspired perhaps by the old saying: 'Lie and lie ever, something will always stick.'

I do not propose discussing to-day, either the country's budget or the machinery of the public debt, or any other questions belonging to the financial aspect of affairs; no more do I desire to take up the criticisms of the opposition regarding the public service. That duty has been well performed and, moreover, by their votes in 1908, the Canadian people have done ample justice to the subject. But as the budget speech sets forth, in a proud and defiant manner, the admirable economic status of Canada, I desire to take advantage of the latitude allowed in this debate to briefly indicate the general effects of the government's policy as far as concerns the advancement and progress of the Dominion. Undeniable is the general and phenominal development of Canada under the Liberal government. But the contrast between this condition and the state of stagnation under the Conservative regime is calculated to afford subject matter for serious reflection to our friends opposite. Still, instead of taking a lesson and reforming their party, our friends to the left lose themselves in fruitless recriminations which constitute the main feature of their criticisms. Here are the leading samples: Canada's progress cannot be denied, they say, but that progress is the result of the general economic laws that are felt even in a more pronounced manner in all countries. Or else: Canada's development is fictitious, since our foreign trade shows an ever increasing balance against us. Or else: No matter how great that prosperity, the government has no hand in it, or, in any case, it is but the application of the policy and methods of administration taken from the old regime.

I do not now intend to dwell on all that is specious, contradictory and ill-founded in these arguments of the opposition. But I desire to give them an indirect answer and I invite your attention to those two propositions:

1. Since 1896 has Canada grown in proportion to the aspirations of its people?

2. Is that advancement absolutely foreign to the action of the public authorities, or, on the contrary, is it due in a certain degree to that influence?

1. To the first question statistics reply in the affirmative.

In every sense Canada's economic situation has been a revelation to the world. On this score our country to-day holds a model place, the envy of all civilized nations. Apart from the fluctuation of population, it is agreed that the best barometer of a country's material progress is the position of its leading industries, the volume of its trade, and the condition of its working classes. What does that barometer indicate for us? According to the Minister of Finance, Canada will soon have a population of seven millions. This increase of prosperity, inasmuch as it is the two-fold result of a regular repatriation of our people from the United States and an increased immigration of the best elements. Men do not seek homes in a coun-

try that is economically depressed and without a national future.

Agriculture is the fundamental source of Canada's prosperity. I've never yet heard any serious denial of this fact. Abundance, comfort, happiness and even wealth in our agricultural classes constitute a fact unprecedented in our annals. The law of supply and demand acts in their favour in a most marvellous manner, until through the increasing value of their products, they have become almost a privileged class in the community.

Statistics establish in a striking manner the industrial and commercial progress of Canada. I shall not at this moment weary the House with statistics which have very often been quoted. I shall simply say that Canada stands second to none in the list of new and developing countries. From the statistics supplied to me by the Department of Trade and Commerce, I see that in a comparison of the progress of trade per capita for Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States for the latest available period, Canada has a proportion of total trade per capital of $89.97 as against $58.11 for France, $60.24 for Germany, $118.29 for Great Britain, and $35.30 for the United States, so that in this respect we rank second to Great Britain. It has been claimed that this comparison is fictitious. This claim has been advanced by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In order that I may do no injustice to the hon. gentleman I quote his own words:

The gentleman proceeds as follows:

I say that when under our adminstration and its policy you have an adverse balance continually increasing, something is wrong in connection with that trade policy, and it ought to be the duty and endeavour of the government to so arrange its policy that this adverse balance should be made as small as possible, that it should be reduced instead of continually advancing.

Now, Sir, how often are we called upon to refute this old friend the argument as to the balance of trade. The hon. member for North Simcoe also dwelt upon this question of the balance of trade and he was particularly eloquent in reference to the different schools of political economy. May I be allowed to quote from the French author who deals with this question very ably. Leroy Beaulieu writes :

That doctrine of the balance of trade, or of the utility of the excess of sales over purchases, attractive as it may be, is erroneous; it is based on an incomplete interpretation of facts. During the course of the 19th century experience has given it a most formal denial. Thus England, which is the richest country of the world, for over half a century, in a most energetic form, shows a very extensive excess of importations over exportations. Great Britain is not the only country in a like position. France is in the same case, though in a lesser degree.

Now, why is this? It is because certain elements which tend to bring to the country a certain proportion of gold are not taken into consideration in the official returns, and if you allow me I will refer to the case of the United States in this connection. It is true that our trade for the last fiscal year, with the United States, shows an adverse balance of $79,000,000 but we find from the immigration statistics that during the last year over 90,000 immigrants have come to this country from the United States and according to the superintendent of immigration they have brought with them property to the value of $90,000,000, and by this means alone more than compensating for the balance of trade against us with the United States. On this example the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite falls to the ground.

On another side, it seems to me that that excess in American imports could only seriously affect the economic situation in Canada by its effects on our manufactured products. But the regular advance and the extremely encouraging condition of our industries ought to reassure us on that score. In this sense our opponents' arguments fall flat and something else must be invented to mask our splendid development.

From a social standpoint Canada holds a most advantageous position. Warfare of classes is unknown here, and the relations between labour and capital are more harmonious and more beneficial than in any other part of the world. Contiguity of a country where the social questions often create nightmares, seems in no way to have affected the peaceful character of our labouring classes. Thus in every way the admirable material progress of Canada, and the magnificent national evolution that has realized the dream of its people, have justified for our country the title of a nation so aptly applied to it by the Prime Minister.

If we look into the causes that produced the state of things we find them divided into many different categories. Our opponents, as I said, have undertaken to explain away, in their own way, this sudden and marvellous change. For them, Providence, that treated them as would a stepmother, and in 1896 came back to maternal tenderness, the laws of economy and the initiative of our population, are the sources whence flow, they say, this wonderful phenomenon; this bad Liberal government was careful not to help in any way. A wonder they do not accuse it of having opposed the movement.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, we do not forget that to Him we owe the fertility of the soil; our national resources, the development of which creates our wealth; our climate, rigorous but healthy, that is a mag-

net to draw to us the best possible immigration. Far be from us the idea of lessening the active and effective participation of our honest, laborious and progressive people in the grand work of Canadian prosperity. It would be equally childish to maintain that the application of economic law to the conditions of labour and to the natural elements found in the land, could be fruitless. But in contradistinction to the opposition, we claim that the co-operation of these elements is reduced to a minimum under the influence of a government that is unworthy of its mission. And this brings us to the answer to that question: In what consists the operation of power in a country like ours? Which of the two following ideas should prevail in the administration of the government? Is it the Cesarian idea of a state Providence that absorbs all the national life and constitutes itself the conservator and regulator of all individual energies which it paralyses with an excessive protection? Or, is it the doctrine of the free school—let go, let alone—that assigns to the state a merely passive role, under the false pretext that the economic and social mechanism should be completely abandoned to itself in order to produce a maximum of energy and wealth? Neither the one nor the other of these two extreme theories should serve as the basis of governmental action, and it is at an equal distance from both that the true function of a democratic state should be found. About seventy years ago, Lord Macaulay took upon himself to define that part in a precise manner in one of his admirable speeches on electoral reform. Lord Macaulay said:

> The end of government is not directly to make the people rich but to protect them in making themselves rich; and a government which attempts more than this is precisely the government which is likely to perform less. Government do not and cannot support the people. We have no miraculous powers, we have not the rod of the Hebrew law-giver —we cannot rain down bread upon the multitude from heaven—we cannot smite the rock and give them to drink, we can give them only freedom to employ their industry to the best advantage, and security in the engagement of what their industry has acquired. These advantages it is our duty to give them at the smallest possible cost.

It follows from this definition that if the government is not qualified to be and should not be the foster father of the people, it should not either be content with being exclusively the guardian of security, order and justice. While respecting the domain wherein private initiative finds most profitable action, the state owes it to itself and to the people it governs, to second with all its power the collective efforts of the community and to direct that community in the way of its temperament, its aptitudes and its calling. Now, we have ever held and we still hold that the government has faithfully fulfilled that mission, and because it knew better than did its predecessors its own role, it has powerfully contributed to the wonderful impetus that lifts Canada high up in the region of economics. In defying us to prove this assertion, our adversaries forget that it is often impossible to indicate the immediate results of a special measure, but it is easy to estimate or analyse the general work of a ministry, or of a parliamentary majority and to appreciate its influence on the life of the country. It is unnecessary to make that analysis or express appreciation of the ministerial work done, but, after the recent attempts to deprive the government of the credit due it, I may be pardoned if I briefly refer to the subject.

It suffices to glance at the geographical and ethnical conditions that obtain in Canada to be convinced that its development, economically speaking, depends on four principal factors: 1. A wise fiscal policy; 2. An active and sound immigration; 3. A rational policy in regard to means of transportation; 4. Harmony and peace between different classes and races. I claim that the Liberal government has approached and solved each of these problems in a vigorous manner, in a spirit and with a knowledge of the country's needs, all of which were absolutely unknown under the old regime.

The present fiscal policy is merely the protectionist policy of 1878, they say, with slight variations. Even were such the case, we could triumphantly answer that the success and beneficial results of a policy depend less upon the underlying principles thereof than upon the wise application of it.

But is such the truth? Are there not in the government's customs reforms special traits to which the old national policy of our friends to the left have no resemblance? What was the predominating characteristic of the old Conservative policy? Privilege; that is to say, being conceived and established to protect the manufacturing industry, that policy paid attention only to and was solicitous only for that one branch of national production.

From 1878 to 1896 the trend of the customs tariff bears the impress of that idea: the industries first, the other classes afterwards. So that, what originally, and in the mind of Sir John A. Macdonald was intended as a financial expedient became, under his successors, the base and pivot of a fiscal system under which the vast majority became tributary to a small minority.

So that, independent of the injury resulting to the larger number, from the two-fold point of view of finance and economy, that systematized protection brought about two principal results that its founders had not foreseen, that is to say, the insufficiency

of the revenue derived from that source, and the instability of a tariff that was constantly changed despite the incessant requests of manufacturers.

In order to remedy the injustice and inconveniences of such a policy the Liberal party proposed to substitute for it a revenue tariff based on an equitable redistribution of custom dues, in conformity with all the needs of all classes of society.

Having secured control in 1896 the Liberal party put its programme into execution, and the success which crowned its efforts prove it was right.

I heard the other day a very curious argument from the hon. member from North Toronto. After having given different classes of schools of economics, after having pointed to the mercantile school, to the agricultural school, the industrial school and to the high protectionist school, he said: 'Now, to what school do the members of the present government belong?' I have only to say that if some of the members of the present government profess to belong to one of these particular schools, they must not be judged by what they think, but they must be judged by what they do. That is to say, that the government of this country is not composed of theorists but of practical men who do not profess to belong to one school more than another, but who recognized conditions first and then endeavour to apply their measures to the facts as they arise according as the best interests of the country demand.

Now, that no radical change was effected in our fiscal system, that the tariff was only reduced three points, that some of our leaders were accused of going back on their 'free trade' flag, are all specious criticisms that do not very much interest the people of Canada. What the country knows and understands is that the fiscal policy of today is governed by facts and not theories, and that the tariff established by the Liberals feeds the public revenue in a manner unlooked for and assures a sufficient protection to Canadian industries.

I merely refer, in passing, to the different aspects of the present tariff: the preference given to England, which has had, despite all to the contrary, excellent results, and which our opponents would gladly hide if they could; the German surtax, a just return for lack of favour; the intermediary tariff which brought to our fiscal system an element of elasticity that increases its effectiveness; all measures of Liberal origin, which have imparted a great impetus and a lasting stability to our fiscal system.

If the Conservative party lays claim, as its own, to the fiscal policy of the government, it cannot surely have the same pretension regarding the immigration policy which it fought against in a most determined manner and which it still likes to criticise in every possible way. A large volume could be made of the speeches delivered by our friends on the left, great and small, in denouncing the methods adopted by the Interior Department, in the recruiting of immigrants. In their day they had a safe way to escape like criticism; simply by abstaining from all immigration. Their apathy in that direction, was as culpable as their indifference regarding the exodus of our own people to the American republic. To console themselves for having done nothing when in power, they now try to cover up the results obtained by the ministerial policy, under petty considerations of detail. It would be puerile to think for a moment that the opposition's criticisms and ill-advised curiosity regarding the North Atlantic Trading Company could change public opinion, for while the course of the opposition shows it to be devoid of public spirit, the influence of the stream of immigration to Canada since 1896 has been conducive to the progress of the Dominion. We are right in saying that our country is one of the largest, the most beautiful and the richest in national resources in the world. But the country, to reach its rightful economic rank, needs arms and capital. The immigration campaign carried on so actively and devotedly by the government has given us both of these.

The hon. member for North Toronto is glad to be able to say, with Sir Edward Clouston, that the magnificent harvests of the west saved Canada from the crisis of last year. Can the hon. member pretend that such harvest grew alone like mushrooms without the aid of the thousands of immigrants that the government's policy brought into the west? Here is another point on which the government can fairly lay claim to a share in the prosperity of the country.

I will now ask, Mr. Speaker, to be allowed to briefly touch upon the government's policy in regard to transportation. In a vast country like Canada the transportation highways are like the arteries and veins in the human body, they are indispensable to its economic life and its fecundity.

Acknowledging this truth the government was led to make the creation and development of the rail and water highways the two grand works of the administration; the Department of Railways and Canals and the Marine Department. Each year large sums are voted for these two great public services, either to improve the waterways and ports, in order to draw a share from the advantages afforded by nature to our country or for the construction or subsidizing of new railways. This is an expenditure that the people of Canada will always look upon with favour, as long as it is carried on in a judicious manner, for it ever contributes to the commercial and industrial supremacy of Canada.

The government's policy regarding our

transportation highways bears the mark of a solicitude and remarkable spirit of progress. I do not pretend that the Conservative government misunderstood its duty in this connection, but I fear not to say that the Liberal policy, in this regard, is more methodical, more enlightened and more daring than that of its predecessors.

From 1896 to 1908 statistics show that the sum of $121,215,115 was used in the improvement of transportation facilities. That sum was principally divided between the canals, the St. Lawrence channel, the Canadian defence harbours, the subsidies to railways and the cost of the Transcontinental. Which means that such expenditure was not made at hap-hazard for local works, more or less justifiable, but in accordance with a general plan of improvement confirmed by the recommendations of a special commission and in a manner to derive the most profit possible from the geographic conditions of Canada, in view of the traffic between the east and west and between the St. Lawrence ports and those of Europe.

Such is an essentially national policy that our opponents may have sometimes criticised in details but of which they can neither blame the directing spirit, nor disallow the beneficent results. Moreover the construction of a second transcontinental line and the henceforth assured supremacy of the St. Lawrence route, which have heretofore been two points of resistence in the government's transportation policy, exempt me from all necessity of commenting upon the effects of that policy on the destinies of the country.

A few days ago, the New York 'Herald,' in an editorial referring to the port of Montreal and the St. Lawrence route, pointed out the dangerous rival our country might become in regard to transportation. I am confident the government will not stop short in its splendid pathway, that it will save itself no sacrifice, compatible with its resources, to preserve and augment the advantages flowing from its water-ways. Our neighbours are not inactive; they devote vast sums to their ports and canals. During recent years, the project of the Georgian Bay canal has given them reason to reflect, and to redouble their efforts to improve their own water-ways. In the interests of our metropolis, in the interests of all Canada, I again appeal for the construction of that canal, the utility of which was foreseen by the great explorer Champlain, and the accomplishment of which is destined to affirm for all time the commercial supremacy of Canada.

In fine, Mr. Speaker, I desire to remark that the government, by its social legislation, and by its conciliatory policy between the different races, has succeeded in putting aside two great and serious obstacles to the general progress of Canada. In Canada, as elsewhere, two great forces co-operate in all industrial production—capital and labour. On the organization and functioning of these two forces, and their reciprocal harmonious relations, to a great extent, depends the success, as well as the industrial prosperity of the country. The Conservative party, during its long tenure of office, seems to have misunderstood the part taken by labour in the general economy, and to have exclusively showered its favours on capital.

No one would dream of blaming the Conservative government for having encouraged the use of capital in the industries had it not stopped half way, and neglected to accord the workman a share of its solicitude so generally granted to the capitalist and the industrial contractor. It was reserved for the Liberal party to look after the workman and to assign him a place in the legislation and administration of the country. From its first moment in power, that party set itself to re-establish between the two great elements of national production, that equilibrium of justice and protection necessary to harmonize their relations and to maintain social order. The measures flowing from that policy, amongst others, may be called the creation of a Labour Department, the 'Labour Gazette,' the Labour Act, the abolition of the sweating system, and the Fair Wage Act, and finally, the Lemieux Act, the success of which has challenged the admiration and envy of the older countries that had wrestled with the social problem. In this regard, the Liberal party not only has the well-merited approval of the labouring classes, but has also assured to the industries an indispensable element of progress and prosperity.

How can I pass over in silence the admirable work of national pacification which, for twelve years, the government has carried on with the marvellous results that have so affected Canadian unity? The favourite motto of the Conservative party, 'divide ut imperes' has vanished from the councils of the nation. In its place an ideal of harmony and union reigns, drawing the two races closer to each other, and inspiring them to common action and collaboration in the work of erecting the edifice of Canadian prosperity. It was that ideal of union and harmony that inspired the government with the conciliatory policy which allowed it to satisfactory settle the ticklish questions of religion and race which, at other times and under other conditions, would have widened the gulf between the two principal ethnical groupes of the Dominion. And yet, what violent assaults were not made upon this phase of the ministerial policy, when racial passions were kindled and fanned into fury by the extreme wings of the opposition. Do we not still hear the echoes of the

danger raised by the attitude of the statesman who personifies that policy, when, in the midst of the conflict of ideas, he arose to the heights of genius, calm and dignified, to apply the remedy suggested by both justice and national interest.

It may be too early yet, Mr. Speaker, to ask all parties and all political sections to praise without stint the great wisdom which saved Canada during the religious crisis of the years that have gone. But if it be true that distance imparts to men their true stature, and, when the jarrings and discords of their day are quieted, calm and immutable justice renders to each his due; if it be true that the judgment of posterity corrects the errors of contemporaries, I am certain that impartial history—the great judge—in speaking of the present premier, will say, as of the King now gloriously reigning, that he was the 'peacemaker' of his country; and thus will history accord him his most glorious title to the admiration and gratitude of the Canadian nation.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say a word about the influence brought to bear on the national situation in Canada by the diplomacy of the present ministry. I know that the word 'diplomacy' makes our friends opposite smile, for they never could admit or understand our country enjoying the national prerogatives claimed for her by the Prime Minister of to-day. Yet, it is historically true, that abroad, as well as in the mother country, the diplomacy of our Canadian statesmen has brought to Canada an increase of autonomy that has enlarged its prestige and its possibilities of the future. We may well say that if the inflow of people and of capital is abundantly apparent in Canada to-day, it is thanks, in a great part, to the independence and extreme liberty that affects our relations with other countries and that gives a colour to our fiscal policy. In this sense again the external policy of the government has been a great factor in our economic system.

I beg pardon of the House for having inflicted upon it this long list of acts and facts that henceforth belong to history. I would not have gone over them had not our friends opposite, despite all evidence to the contrary, persisted in the fiction that Canada's progress has been absolutely foreign to the operation of our administration. It is, therefore, necessary, from time to time, to take up the gauntlet and to show, were it only briefly, that in ours as in all other countries there exists between the government and the people, between the life of the people and the action of the government or parliament, a close relationship, the real influence of which varies according to the spirit and the methods of the men in power.

I know that, as adversaries will pre-

tend that the ministerial party follows the pathways traced out by the Conservative policy; and they think thereby to silence us and to defy us to point to any new markets open to Canadian exportation. This last argument falls to the ground before the Franco-Canadian treaty, which in the minds of the most eminent business men, is destined to have a great effect upon our trade with France. I may add that the preference accorded New Zealand gained that colony as a market for our preserved goods from British Columbia. But there is a still better answer to that objection, as I believe experience has taught that it is more profitable and rational for Canada to foster systematically existing outlets by means of new agreements and more active and better organized propaganda, than to make new contracts, practically one-sided, with people who are, as yet, unacquainted with the advantages of trading with Canada.

To the general remark that the government's policy has been a Conservative policy with a Liberal label on it, I reply by drawing your attention to the two fundamental characteristics of the present administration—those that essentially distinguish it from it's predecessors. The first of these is the Liberal idea of liberty and progress, in contra-distinction to the reactionary principle that is at the bottom of all Conservative policies—especially in England and in Canada. It has been said of certain nations that by temperament, tradition and vocation they were advance guard nations. History also shows that the Liberal party, in England as in Canada, has been in the vanguard, that is to say, it ever saw higher and farther along the way that democracy travels.

Since 1896 the Canadian Liberal party has sought to be faithful to its principles and its mission and has applied to the entire administrative mechanism a spirit of initiative, a daring in conception and a sense of national responsibility, all of which you vainly seek for in the policy of lethargy, privilege and routine that marked the old system.

Such is the first mark of distinction between the present government and the Conservative government. There is also a second one—it consists in the judicious application of principles to the changing conditions of our society and to the fresh needs created by its evolution. Mr. W. J. Bryan, in 1896, in Chicago, said: 'Changing conditions make new issues. The principles upon which democracy rests are as everlasting as the hills, but they must be applied to new conditions as they arise.' An English statesman also said: 'Political doctrines were not like the axioms and definitions of the geometer, of intrinsic truth, wholly uninfluenced by time and place, their worth and force depended on

experience and were necessarily as changing as the circumstances on which all experience is founded.'

Such has been the Liberal party's line of conduct since 1896: to adapt the principles of governmental science, which science is essentially experimental, according to the conditions of a new country, which is in a state of economic and national transition.

It was by adhering faithfully to these two political truths—progress in liberty and the wise application of ideas—that the Liberal party was enabled to draw order from chaos, reform from inertia, prosperity from stagnation.

Beaten again on this latter issue, still our opponents will not lower their arms. With a zeal worthy of a better cause, and in default of better resources, they will try to view the government's administrative record, in order to point out, from time to time, in the glass of their imagination, the few specks that are to be seen on the bright sun of the Liberal policy.

Such were the tactics whereby they sought to regain that power that they certainly did not lose through any too pronounced administrative honesty. The success that has accompanied those tactics is far from causing us to regret it, but, it seems to me, that it should cause our friends opposite to open their eyes. Our opponents should prove that in the traditions of their party, in their programme and in their political ideas, they present the country with a more enlightened, more honest and more progressive administration.

Unhappily, for them, they have not and they cannot present such a certificate of capability. So far they have confined themselves to a purely negative role, and they have not revealed any of the characteristics required in the government such as a programme of positive reform, and a dominant and uniform political conception of the great problems of national interest. The programme formulated by their chief at Halifax, disregarded by some, repudiated by others, was soon wrecked and, I doubt, if one could even find some of its debris at the convention announced for next autumn.

Now I do not propose to dwell upon the hopeless division that prevails to-day in the councils of our good friends opposite. The leader of the opposition was eloquent yesterday when he propounded a policy of assistance to the mother country and of defence to Canada. Immediately after he sat down his lieutenant for the province of Quebec (Mr. Monk) rose and expressed his indignation because he had not been consulted on the policy to be adopted in this regard.

Driven about by winds that blow now from east, now from west, with a crew divided as to the course to follow, and in regard to command, very like a dismantled ship, without a compass, running aimlessly through a fog, the Conservative party is surely not sea-worthy, nor would it be safe to trust the destinies of our country to such a wreck.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to pose as a prophet, but I can see what is coming. I have good reason to fear that the opposition are preparing to raise prejudices in the province of Quebec against this government, and more particularly against its leader, in the coming election, on this very question of naval defence. The Liberal administration and its faithful supporters will be charged with having been traitors to the interests of Canada at large, and particularly with having betrayed the interests of the French Canadians of the province of Quebec by juggling this country into the vortex of militarism. On the other hand, I perceive the argument they will use in some of the other provinces. They will contend that the present government have not gone far enough in their policy of naval defence, and it should be driven out of power as unworthy of the confidence of the Canadian electorate. Under such circumstances, it is wise for the Canadian people to cling to their true friends, to support the men who have exercised their power with patriotism and devotedness, and whose ability and character are on a level with the grand and difficult task they so splendidly accomplish. To-day, as yesterday, problems, affecting the future of the nation are set for the consideration of the government. The solution of such problems requires unity in direction, regularity in administration, courage and devotedness in execution. Where are we to find these essential conditions if not in the government that has tested them for thirteen years, and that, in the face of an opposition divided beyond repair, is now prepared to settle, in a spirit of union and patriotism, one of the most vital questions that can possibly affect the Canadian nation?

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). We have listened to-day to two very well prepared and eloquent addresses from the government side of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rivet) who has just sat down has certainly made some very severe charges against the old Conservative party. I think, however, we can discern a certain weakness in the foundation of his arguments. He seems to have directed the greatest part of his energies against men who have ceased to be members of this House, men who are dead and gone, men who were in this House at one time but who can never return to it. Now I think we should always speak well of the dead. I would just say in regard to the Conservatives who have been so roundly abused here

to-night, that there are not half a dozen of them at present in the House. The Conservative party, with which much fault has been found, were driven from power in 1896, and there is no possibility that dead men can return. If they were here, if one of them should rise and take my place, I am sure that all that has been said against them would soon be annihilated and would have very little force in it. It is not, I think, a brave act to attack men who have gone, and who have no opportunity to return and defend themselves. It is not necessary to go into details in regard to this matter.

The two last speakers, who gave us a great deal of information and whose speeches certainly were very well delivered, seemed to be a little wrong in their bookkeeping. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Mr. Schell), in discussing the public debt, quoted a certain amount of debt with which he said the Conservative party had to contend at confederation. He forgot to tell us that the very act of confederation implied that the government in power at that time had to assume certain burdens as the very foundation of confederation. They had to assume $109,000,000 of debt from the different confederated provinces. This is laid to the charge of the Conservative government but it could certainly not have been avioded. They had also to build the Intercolonial railway as one of the conditions of confederation; the maritime provinces came into confederation with the understanding that the Intercolonial railway was to be built, the Conservative government of that day built it and it cost the country $50,000,000 to do so. They completed it, they were bound to complete it and no blame could be laid to their door for carrying out the agreement made at confederation. British Columbia came into confederation with the understanding that the Canadian Pacific railway was to be built to the Pacific ocean. The Conservative government agreed to do that at confederation and they fulfilled their contract. It cost the country $62,000,000 but the government was certainly not to blame for doing that, that was something which it was impossible for them to avoid. It was understood and it was only right that if these large amounts of money were to be spent on the maritime provinces, and for the benefit of British Columbia and the west, a certain amount of money should also be spent in the two older provinces and from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 were spent in deepening the canals and improving the waterways. Adding these four items together, the $109,000,000 of debt taken over from the provinces, the $62,000,000 spent on the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, the $50,000,000 spent on the building of the Intercolonial railway and the $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 spent in deepening our canals in Ontario and Quebec, and it will be seen that every dollar of debt that was on the country when the Liberals came into power is accounted for, and every dollar of that debt was in fulfilment of the conditions of the pledges that we assumed at confederation. The Conservatives during all the years that they were in power did not run the country into debt a solitary dollar according to that estimate. They governed the country and built post offices, wharfs, harbours, public buildings, purchased and paid for the Northwest Territories and they also built these magnificent parliament buildings and paid for every one of those without leaving any debt on the country beyond what was involved in the very beginning of confederation. The Liberals came into power in 1896 and they have run this country into a debt of $80,000,000. What have they to show for it? They have a partially completed railway—they have completed no great work. However, it is not necessary for me to defend these Conservatives of old days, these men are not coming back to this country and it is not necessary that I or any other person should talk longer on that subject; that is ancient history and I feel that if the two eloquent speakers who addressed us to-day had spent their time in discussing present day affairs, it would have been much better for them and for us and we would not have lost so much time. They were also wrong in their book-keeping in some other respects; in fact as I followed the particulars as they were brought out item by item in regard to the finances of this country and the condition of affairs, I came to the conclusion that the whole system of government bookkeeping in the departments in Ottawa and elsewhere is defective, and misleading. The more it is examined, the worse it appears.

It seems to me that if it had been especially devised for the purpose of deceiving and misleading the Canadian public and the Canadian electorate it could scarcely have done so more effectually than it does. Every business man knows and we all know that in any properly arranged system of book-keeping vouchers or receipts must be produced to prove the accuracy and bona fides of every separate item of expenditure, fraternal societies, joint stock companies, school trustees, village, township, county, and town-councils are all rigidly particular in this respect. They insist that everything shall be made absolutely clear and satisfactory, not only to the auditors and the people's representatives, but also to the people themselves. Yet, in the highest book-keeping establishment in the land, in the departments here in Ottawa where we

are told that high salaried accountants are so numerous that they are said almost to be falling over each other, Conservative members of parliament who are really the peoples' auditors, are not allowed even to look at vouchers or original documents. It appears that the Liberals are treated very differently in these departments. Liberals from all over the country, it appears, can come into these departments and carry off anything they like, because in East Huron, in the last general election, Mr. Blair, a Liberal lawyer from Goderich, was able to flourish and to read in my presence in a public meeting original documents which he said had been taken from the files here in Ottawa. I would like to know why it is that Conservatives are not given equal privileges? We all know that the auditors of the people, that is the Conservative members of parliament, would not be allowed to go into the departments and look at these documents, much less to put them into their pockets and carry them away into the back lines to bulldoze the people and contradict those who rise to make statements and who have not equal opportunities and so are not in a position to prove the inaccuracy of the statements made. I would ask why is this unfair advantage given to Liberals? Why this lack of manhood and British fair play? Why this discrimination against Conservatives —and I would ask with particular emphasis why this secrecy? Is there something to hide? I really believe that there is. In fact there is suspicion abroad that if the truth and all the truth were known about the system of book-keeping that we have in this country and about the records that are made in the departments and the transactions that should be there recorded, whether they are or not, that then these brazen-faced Liberal heelers who go around the back lines with their pockets loaded with original documents taken from the files of the departments would be compelled to give up the game and hide their heads in shame. This thing has not been carried on very long in these departments, we can fix the time fairly well when this new system of book-keeping was introduced. It is only two or three years since one of our most open-minded and fairest minded ministers was compelled to admit that the book-keeping in his department was so entangled that it was absolutely necessary that expert accountants should be called in to unravel the difficulties.

It appears, however, that the confusion was so great and the blunders so numerous that no Canadian expert accountants could be found who were fit for the task and consequently a crowd of so called New York expert accountants were engaged and brought to Ottawa and some of these wonderful bookkeepers were paid by the government as high as $70 a day and their board. They began their instruction in true Tammany fashion by charging $85 each as railway fare between New York and Ottawa although at that time the first-class passenger rate between these two points was only $22, and they finished up their work by each of them charging something like $5 a day for board, although Mr. William Jackson, Conservative member for West Elgin, stood up in his place in parliament and stated that he had boarded and roomed in the same house with some of these men and he said he would stake his position in the House of Commons on the statement that these men did not pay more than $1 a day each for their board. To cap the climax they marched off to New York without leaving any proper vouchers for the $46,000 of good Canadian money which they had received. Expert accountants they certainly were. And I have no doubt that if a thorough investigation were made of the book-keeping in some of the departments of the government it would be found that they left behind them some very apt pupils and perhaps good imitators. Think of an accountant who after a year's book-keeping could hold out in one hand $16,000,000 of a surplus while in the other which he hides behind his back you find an accumulation of debts and liabilities amounting to the enormous sum of $45,000,000. That man may not be a Yankee but he is certainly an expert. In the good old days when there was nothing to hide, book keepers made use of a profit and loss account and they were always able to prove the accuracy of their work by means of a trial balance, but nowadays losses are charged up to capital account and paid out of moneys borrowed for permanent improvements, and then afterwards so manipulated that they are turned into profits, or made to look like profits, and I have no doubt that after a while many of them will be shown up as actual assets of the Canadian people. For example, the government let the job of building an important railway bridge over the St. Lawrence river to its friends under the name of a joint stock company, limited. Remember it was 'limited.' The company mismanaged the plans or the work or both, in such a way that when the structure was nearly completed it tumbled bodily into the river. In the meantime the individual members of that company are said to have become wealthy; in fact some say they have become immensely rich, while the poor little limited, paper, sham, company became bankrupt leaving something like $6,000,000 of debt. Well, the government took over the debt and charged it to capital account and paid it out of money borrowed for permanent improvements, and the result no doubt will be in time that this bridge—the real cost of which will have been im-

properly increased by $6,000,000—will be held up to the public by some future Liberal historian (or perhaps expert accountant) as one of the assets owned by the Canadian people.

Again, there is a collision between two tugs and $7,000 damages were paid by the government as a result of that collision, and the government charged that amount up to capital account and paid it out of moneys borrowed for permanent improvements, and I suppose that after a while they will be able to make out that $7,000 as an asset of the Dominion. Then again, there is an accident on the Intercolonial railway, the track is damaged, the rails are broken, the engines and cars are knocked to pieces, new equipment has to be bought to replace that which was damaged, and do you think the government charges that up to running expenses? Not a bit of it. Although the train was injured while it was running I suppose, they charged the damage up to capital account and they add that sum to the original cost of the Intercolonial railway. As I told you in the beginning of my little speech, up to the time the Liberals came into power the Intercolonial had cost $50,000,000, but to-day it has cost the country $81,000,000 or an addition of $31,000,000 to the cost in 13 years. Now, suppose a farmer had a farm and stock and implements valued at $6,000, and he employed a manager to run his farm for him and to keep his books. At the end of the year the farm manager may find he has $200 of a surplus; he may find that after paying all expenses his books not only balance but he has $200 cash on hand. He can honestly report to the farmer that he has a surplus of $200 and if he should invest that $200 in a horse that was worth $200 he could still honestly report that he had a surplus of $200. But, the next year when he would come to balance his accounts he might find no surplus. He would not like to report that to the farmer and he might call in a New York expert accountant and the New York expert accountant would say to him: take this horse valued at $200 and to the $200 add $5 for shoeing out of the current running expense and add it to the value of the horse, and in that way you can increase the value of the horse and decrease the current expenses. Then add again to that $60 for the veterinary surgeon who had to be called in to attend the horse, when he had run away and injured himself; deduct that from your running expenses also and add it to the price of the horse. Then, add to the value of the horse $30 for attendance and $70 for his feed and take that out of current expenses and you will add further to the value of the horse and lessen your current expenses. Then, take $100 for the new buggy that had to be purchased for the one which was destroyed when the horse ran away, and instead of charging that to current expenses put it on the price of the horse and you will be able to show by your books to your employer that you have a horse valued at $465, that you have lessened your current account by $265, and that you have a surplus of $530 for the year. That would be all right perhaps the first year, but after it had gone on for about twenty years and the old horse had come to be valued at $4,000 or $5,000 in the manager's books, the farmer might come to examine into this matter and he would say: It is very strange that the older this horse becomes, the oftener he runs away, the more he eats, the oftener you have to call in the veterinary surgeon to attend him and the more buggies he destroys when he runs away the more valuable he becomes. He would say: There is something wrong here. I think that is just about the kind of bookkeeping we have in the departments at Ottawa and that our surpluses have just about as much basis as the old horse surplus would have.

Mr. THOMAS A. LOW (South Rrenfrew). Mr. Speaker, like hon. members who have preceded me on this side of the House, my first word must be one of congratulation to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for the magnificent statement he has presented to the House this year. Seldom, if ever, in the history of any country, has it been the good fortune of a Finance Minister to present so favourable a report upon fourteen successive occasions. Mr. Speaker, when I listened to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I was rather pleased when he compared the ministers of the Crown to a board of directors. As I listened to several hon. gentlemen speaking on the floor of the House I asked myself the question: Have these hon. gentlemen opposite offered any good reason why these gentlemen should not retain their seats on the board of directors? Is it because the Finance Minister, for fourteen years, has presented a report showing a balance on the right side of the loss and gain account, or is it because the trade of this country has increased from $239,000,000 in 1896 to the enormous sum of $650,000,000 in 1909? Is it because the people of Canada have deposited in the banks to-day $3 for every $1 they had in 1896, or the enormous sum of $771,000,000 as against $245,000,000 in 1896? Or, is it that a few disgruntled shareholders, like the hon. member for North Toronto, feel disappointed because they have not been elected to the board of directors? I think the best answer to my hon. friend from North Toronto is the verdict of 1908. From every hon. member on the other side of the House we hear the same complaint, that expenditures have increased, that in place of an

expenditure of $41,000,000 in 1896 we have almost an expenditure of $100,000,000 in 1909. I have before me the reports of two of the largest corporations in Canada and what do I find? I find that in 1896 the operating expenses of the Canadian Pacific railway amounted to $12,574,015, and that in 1909 they had reached the enormous sum of $53,357,000. I find that the operating expenses of the Grand Trunk railway in 1896 amounted to $7,142,485 and that in the year 1908, the last year for which I have the returns, they amounted to $11,771,955. In the case of the Canadian Pacific railway, the operating expenses are more than four and a quarter times what they were in 1896, while in the case of the Grand Trunk railway, they have almost doubled. Do hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House charge that these corporations are badly managed? I suppose my hon. friend will tell me that these corporations have extended their business. I say that the same thing applies to the government. The development of the country has increased. If the operating expenses of these large well managed corporations have increased so greatly, is it not natural that the expenditure of the Dominion of Canada should also increase? But, Mr. Speaker, the best reply I find to the charge of a large increase in the expenditure is contained in the words of the hon. member for North Toronto when he said:

> Don't their clothes cost them more than they did under the old regime? Don't they have to pay more for their lumber for every shack and every house they build? Is not their hardware more costly to them than it ever was before? And when they come to the labour which has to help them to till their fields, when have they had to pay so much for it as they do at the present time?

That is the very reason that the expenditure of this Dominion has increased as compared with 1896. The same thing applies in every other business and in every avenue of life. My hon. friend from North Toronto has gone to a great deal of bother in figuring up the percentage of increase in the different departments of government but, Sir, I would ask you, what does the average man care how much the operating expenses of his business have increased so long as at the end of the year he finds that his surplus has increased? What does the average man care so long as he knows that in the bank to-day there is $3 as against $1 in 1896? What do the people of Canada care what the increase in the expenditure is so long as they know that the trade of the Dominion has increased three-fold as compared to what it was in 1896? For a moment allow me to examine some of the statements giving the percentage of increase in the expenditure. What do I find? First, in the administration of justice there has been an increase of almost sixty per cent. Is not that a natural increase? The population of this country has increased almost fifty per cent. The Yukon territory has been added to the administration of justice, and I think there is nothing extraordinary about that increase. The expenditure of the Department of Agriculture has increased about 600 per cent, and surely my hon. friend from North Toronto will not find fault with the Minister of Agriculture because he has given aid to the farmers of this country to such a large extent. I think my hon. friend should add to his list the percentage of the surpluses that have accrued during the last fourteen years in order to make it complete. My hon. friend asked the question: What have the people to-day to show for an expenditure of $922,000,000? In reply to him I say, first, the affairs of this country have been carried on in a businesslike manner, and secondly, we have constructed large public works, we have granted aid to railways that have opened up and developed the country, we have improved our waterways and, best of all, we have a united, contented and prosperous people. My hon. friend thinks that the expenditure should have been curtailed in face of the depression that occurred in 1908. I would ask my hon. friend if he were in his seat to-night if he expected the Minister of Finance to cut off all the public works that were then under construction? A greater calamity could not have fallen upon this country than the stopping of these works. I believe that the hand of Providence was guiding our Prime Minister when he recommended the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because if there was one thing which helped to save Canada from the depression that swept over the United States in 1908-9, it was the building of that railway.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked the question, in referring to the lands of the Northwest, whether it was possible that lands which five years ago, were unfit for cultivation, had suddenly blossomed into fertility. I say no, they have not, but the conditions have, under a wise and capable administration, so changed that our lands have greatly increased in value.

Coming to the speech of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), one would infer that our farmers have been badly used by the Minister of Agriculture, but what do we find? In 1896, the farm product of this country amounted to about $125,000,000, whereas in 1909 they amounted to $563,000,000. That certainly does not look too bad for the farmers. For the ten years prior to 1896, our total exports of bacon and ham amounted to $17,671,000 as against $115,000,000 for the ten years ending the 30th June, 1906. During the twelve years prior to 1896 our total exports of cheese amounted to $127,611,428 as against

$247,790,232 for the twelve years ending the 30th June, 1908. For the twelve years prior to 1896, our exports of butter amounted to 57,247,699 pounds as against 259,655,811 pounds during the twelve years ending 1908. For the ten years prior to 1896, the total products of the farm exported including butter, cheese, bacon and hams, am unted to $146,558,000; and for the ten years after 1896, under the able administration of the Minister of Agriculture, these same products amounted to $369,404,000, or more than two and a half times the total under the ten years of Conservative rule. These are some of the results due to the policy and expenditures made by the Minister of Agriculture.

Just a word about the woollen tariff, the pet theme of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). One would imagine from his speech that our farmers were materially affected by the woollen tariff of the present administration. But what do we find? Let us see how much my hon. friend and his associates assisted the farmers during the eighteen years they were in power and how their woollen tariff affected the farmers. I find that when the Conservative government came into power in 1878 our farmers were then receiving for their wool thirty cents per pound, and in 1881 they received twenty-five cents per pound. I hope my hon. friend from Lanark will listen to these figures. In 1884, wool took another drop, and for three years the farmers received an average of twenty-two cents per pound. In 1887, it took a further drop down to twenty cents, and in 1891, it went to eighteen and a half cents. Yet the gentlemen, whose party was then in power, congratulate the farmers for having received so much for their wool and for having benefited so much by the Conservative policy. During five years prior to 1896 under Conservative rule, the price paid was eighteen and a half cents; but for the last five years under the administration of this government, notwithstanding the claim that the preferential tariff worked so badly for the farmers, they received an average of twenty-four and a half cents per pound for their wool as compared with eighteen and a half cents. And the only reason why our farmers are going out of the wool-growing business is because there are more profitable things for them to go into. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) criticised this government because our farmers are not exporting so much wool to-day as they did in 1896. Well, the government have no control over the exportation of wool, and the market is open to-day just as it was in 1896. But the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is liable to charge this government with anything. I heard him last session hold it responsible for the destruction of the business of a couple of mills which were burnt down some twenty or thirty years ago. Therefore I am not surprised that he should refer to the farmers' business as being destroyed by the government of the day. When I spoke last year on the wool tariff I referred to a woollen enterprise in which I am engaged in Renfrew. I am glad to tell my hon. friend that our year's business has just been made up and we find we have had another prosperous year under the tariff of the present administration. My hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) will tell the House how the tariff works so much against the woollen men, but notwithstanding the tariff has been so damaging to the wool business, it is reported that out of that same business my hon. friend has made the large fortune of $250,000 and he is still a young man, and I have no doubt that before he leaves this world his fortune will be doubled, and I only hope it will. I myself am engaged in the woollen industry and I am particularly pleased with the tariff. But there is another industry in the town of Renfrew in which I am interested and in which the capital invested amounts to some fifty or sixty thousand dollars. If the Finance Minister, when he revises his tariff, will include the articles manufactured in that factory in his revision and give them the same protection as the woollen men receive, I shall be perfectly satisfied. I am not finding any fault with the tariff, but there are some fifteen or twenty factories manufacturing these articles in Canada, and the time has arrived when they should be protected to some extent, because the articles I refer to are on the free list.

And now in conclusion let me say that I hope the Prime Minister, as president, and the Finance Minister, as vice-president, of the great national company, may be long spared to guide the destinies of the people of Canada.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough). I have listened with considerable interest to the speech on the budget and the lengthy debate which has followed. I was surprised to hear the hon. the Minister of Finance make the statement that there would be no tariff changes this year. There are many changes which should be made and made at the earliest possible date in the interests of our agricultural population. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Low) spoke quite fluently about the woollen industry. When the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) talked about that industry a short time ago, judging by the expression of some of the members of the opposite side of the House, it was to them an industry to be laughed at rather than discussed. I am perfectly satisfied that the hon. member for South Renfrew has never taken the trouble to study the magnitude of that industry or what it has done for

other nations. Before I sit down, I hope to draw the attention of that hon. gentleman and of the House to what that industry has done and is doing for the great countries of the British empire and of America. Speaking on the subject of agriculture, I feel, as one inexperienced in making speeches and in view of the magnitude of that industry, that I shall not be able to do it justice. However, I am a farmer myself, and if there is anything in the world I am proud of it is of that fact. Not that there are not other high callings in life, but to my mind there is no higher calling than that of tilling the soil and producing food for the nation. According to the statistics of the government, the farmers of Canada last year, in one branch of their industry alone, added to the wealth of the nation, $432,992,100, this being the value of the field crops. I contend, I think, rightly so, that every dollar produced from the soil is a dollar added to the wealth of the country, for no part of it is taken from the natural resources of the country, but, if a proper system of cultivation be used, that production can go on and on through all time. In addition to the amount I have already stated, we may count $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 to represent the other products of the farm, bringing the sum total of the wealth produced by the farmers of Canada last year close to the billion dollar mark. Yet in the face of this, we find one of the ministers of this government, if he is correctly reported, a short time ago practically asking the people by their votes to discriminate against the farmers as representatives in this House, declaring against a candidate on the ground that he was not a trained advocate and therefore not able to represent his constituents. I think we have a right to hold the government responsible for these statements. It seems to me the reason they do not want farmers here is because the farmers, through long practice of economy in making a living, on coming here will be, as I was myself, astonished at the extravagant expenditure of the government along many lines and will go back and tell their fellow-farmers, so that it would not be well for the government. I cannot think of any other reason.

As to the woollen industry, concerning which my hon. friend (Mr. Low) has spoken so elaborately, I think that if that hon. gentleman had studied what this industry has done for other countries and how it has been fostered by other countries, he would have come to the conclusion that it is well worth while to do something for that industry in Canada. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his budget speech the other day told us that the government had paid $13,009,000 in subsidies to the steel and iron industry in nine years. That industry is not what you would call a natural industry of the country; yet we have fostered it and spent upon it millions of the hard-earned money taken from the pockets of the people of this country, while the woollen industry, which has done more for the nations of the world than any other, and which is a natural industry, and which did not cost this country one dollar, has been practically throttled and put out of business.

There are three great essentials in the foundation of a nation, especially in a country with a climate like ours—food, fuel and clothing. I am glad to be able to say that we are in a position to supply food for ourselves, and I hope that in a short time we shall be able to supply food for the whole British empire. As to fuel, we have it in abundance; we have deposits of coal that are practically inexhaustible. There is no reason why we should not provide clothing for the people, but that industry does not seem to be regarded by hon. members opposite as worthy of consideration. In 1899, there were 270 woollen mills in Canada; in 1908 these had decreased to 197. Now, I will ask the members of the government: Can we, having the remedy in our own hands, allow this condition of affairs to continue? According to the United States census of 1905, the capital employed in the textile industry in that country was $1,343,324,605, and the value of the goods produced per annum is $1,215,036,190. The woollen industry, which is one of the textile industries, employed $477,000,000 and the annual value of its product was $517,000,000. Now, these are figures that, in my opinion, are well worth looking into. When we look over the great manufacturing industries of the United States, we find that the production and manufacture of food employ more capital than does the textile industry. We find that the iron and steel industry employs more capital than does the woollen industry. But if you take into account the labour employed in the manufacture of textiles into clothes in the United States, you will find that that industry gives more employment to labour in that country than do the iron and steel industry and the food industry combined. I contend that the value of a great industry to a country is to be judged by the number of people to whom it gives employment. Taking that into consideration, surely every hon. member of this House will admit that the woollen industry far exceeds every other.

Now let us look at Great Britain. The textile industry in Great Britain represents a capital of $1,250,000,000. It is the greatest export industry in that country, and it employs directly and indirectly about 5,000,000 people. I would like hon. gentlemen to pay strict attention to these facts. The textile industry in Great Britain employs about one-tenth of the entire

population, according to the statistics of last year. One-half of the total exports of Great Britain are textile goods. They consume 657,000,000 pounds of wool, of which 100,000,000 pounds are home grown. Now we have been told that we cannot produce wool in Canada, but that we must turn our attention to something else. We find, however, that in England they are able to raise sheep on their high priced land, and to produce wool to such an extent that they have 100,000,000 pounds to consume at home, and exported besides 31,000,000 pounds.

Mr. LOW. Would the hon. gentleman like this country to adopt the woollen tariff of Great Britain?

Mr. SEXSMITH. I will deal with that point later on. I think I can show that it might be better to adopt a protective system all through. The woollen industry in England has grown up behind the most severe tariff walls that we ever read of.

Mr. LOW. Is that tariff in existence to-day?

Mr. SEXSMITH. It was in existence until the industry reached a position where it could compete with the whole world. There were produced last year in England 131,000,000 pounds of wool. I draw attention to these facts to show the great importance of the woollen industry. In France, the textile industry employs 2,008,000 people, and has an output worth 235,000,000 francs. Germany employs more people in the textile industry than in any other industry, and produces woollen goods to the value of 266,233,000 marks. It is the same with some of the smaller nations like Belgium, Holland and Switzerland. Now if the hon. gentleman will listen, I will tell him how this industry was fostered, and he will conclude that it was not by accident that it attained its present enormous proportions. I want to show the means adopted by some of the great nations to build up this industry. We will have to go back some distance in history. In the 12th century we find that under King Henry II wool was the greatest export of England. One writer says that all the nations of the world were clothed with English wool, made into cloth in Flanders. To become as rich as a Count of Flanders was to become very wealthy indeed. It was King Edward III who really created the woollen industry in England, for he sent into Flanders to introduce into England those Flemish wool workers who, at that time, were experts in the manufacture of cloth. Up to that time England hardly knew anything about the manufacture of cloth, nor she exported all her wool. King Edward III introduced these wool workers, who came and settled in England, and through them the manufacturing industry was brought to the very highest point. As soon as the King found he was in a position to manufacture the wool of Great Britain in his own country, what did he do? Sir, he imposed the death penalty on any man who exported wool out of England. Now is not that absolute protection? I would invite the hon. gentleman to delve into history a little, to go into the library and look up the history of this industry in England from the 14th century down to 1774, at which time the woollen industry had grown to such an extent that England was able to supply the world with woollen clothes. In 1774 an Act was passed to protect the machinery that had been invented for the manufacture of cloth. It forbade any one to export such machinery to any foreign country under a penalty of £200. In 1781 that Act was amended. I took the trouble to go into the library and dig up the data, and I would advise the hon. gentleman to look it up for himself, and he will find it very interesting reading. As I say, in 1781 that Act was amended, and the penalty for exporting machinery was one year in prison with fine of £200. If any one on board a British vessel was found exporting any machinery or any utensils used in the manufacture of wool or other textiles, he was subject to a fine of £200 and a year's imprisonment. If a captain of a British ship was found guilty of this, he was disqualified for life from acting as captain. That Act, with a few amendments, continued in force until 1842, at the time the Cobden policy was adopted, or down to the reign of Queen Victoria. Now will any hon. member in this House dispute the fact that that industry was fostered in England and brought to that great pitch of prosperity by the most rigorous protection? Why, Sir, it was fostered by the most active protection ever placed on the statute-book of any country, and it attained a position in which it could defy all the nations of the world. The English manufacturers could manufacture cheaper than any one else, they were supplying the world with the finished product, and it made them wealthy, and they became millionaires. That industry did as much to enrich the British empire as any other, and even more than any other industry.

Now let us look at the history of the growth and development of this industry in the United States. In the United States, in 1812, they found themselves at war with Great Britain; and after the war had been going on for a short time they discovered that they were dependent for their clothing on the very people they were at war with. The United States government found it necessary to do something to place the nation on a solid foundation with regard to

its textile industries. Some attempt was made there and in two years the woollen industry had doubled, but immediately after the declaration of peace with Great Britain we find that the superior position of Great Britain in the manufacturing of goods put the United States home-made form of manufacture out of business, and in 1816, four years after the war, England was supplying the United States with $70,000,000 worth of manufactured cloth. That condition practically prevailed from 1816 until 1865, and then congress took a hand and the patriotic spirit seems to have prevailed; they concluded that that industry should be put on a national basis and become a part of their national policy. In 1859 we see that the protective policy was brought into force. It is said in Canada that if the farmers had a protection on wool it would not make any difference because they would not raise sheep. But in 1859 a similar condition prevailed in the United States, and perhaps the opponent of the Bill in the congress there might have brought forward the same argument. But, Sir, let us look at the facts. In 1859 the wool clip of the United States amounted to 60,044,000 pounds, and in 1862, three years later, to 106,000,000 pounds. Now the average wool clip of the United States is over 300,000,000 pounds, and they use some 500,000,000 pounds in the woollen mills of the United States. We have different classes of wool manufactures in this country. The policy of the government in the past in connection with the woollen industry has not been logical, they began at the tail end. Instead of beginning, as the United States did, by protecting the raw material, the government of Canada started to protect the manufactured article first. Their action was like commencing to build a house at the top story. The manufacture of worsteds in the United States was founded on Canadian wool. In 1854, under the reciprocity tariff with Canada, the United States founded that industry. The worsted men petitioned congress at that time. In their petition they said that the worsted industry had been built upon the wools of Canada and if these wools were prohibited it would practically destroy their trade. I wish to read an extract and partial summary of their petition and its results:

Canadian Wool founded the United States Worsted Industry.

The manufacture of worsteds, which is just beginning to have an important development in this country, owes its existence to the reciprocity treaty, which admitted, free of duty, the wools of Canada. The farmers of Upper Canada, of English and Scotch descent, naturally prejudiced in favour of the sheep husbandry which prevails at home—as England is still called in the colonies—and having a taste for English mutton, imported sheep of the Leicester, Cotswold and Down races, which have thriven admirably on the naturally rich limestone soils of Upper Canada. The present production of wool from these sheep in Canada is about six million pounds. The Canadians have no fine-wooled sheep (meaning merinos). Protected by a tariff, they consume about two million pounds of their own wool in the manufacture of coarse cloths, including tweeds, which have been imported largely into the United States, notwithstanding the duty on cloths; and we use the balance of three to five millions. They added that the introduction of the finer lines of worsted goods and the unexampled development of this branch of textiles was due to the command of Canada wools, which were 'fully equal to the English combing wools,' but there was not enough of such wools grown in the United States to keep one of the worsted mills running. They were fair enough to admit that if these combing wools were to be grown in the United States the worsted manufacturers would fall into line with the national policy, provided their industry could be protected sufficiently to hold the trade during the period of transition. Their views were met by congress, with what results will be seen in figures elsewhere quoted.

It is interesting to observe from this extract that as far back as 1854, Canada had become an exporter of cloth. Had that industry been properly fostered since that time we would to-day have an industry that would give more employment than any combination of two or three industries that we have in Canada. It seems to me that with the facts before us of what this great industry has done in other countries, it is time that the people and the government of Canada should take a hand and see if something cannot be done to stimulate and build up that trade and let it go on as a national industry in the future. There is no reason why it should not go hand in hand with the great agricultural industry of Canada.

The first worsted industry in Canada was started in Hespeler in 1872. They received no assistance from the government and moved to the United States where they have made a fortune for their stockholders, and to-day that is one of the greatest industries in the United States.

I think I have said enough to convince the hon. members of the government, as well as the hon. members of the House, that this industry has not received fair treatment at the hands of the government. It is time the government took the matter up and tackled it in earnest and continue at it until they have made it a success. We were told by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other night that the state of Montana produced 45,000,000 pounds of wool last year, while Alberta produced only 400,000 pounds. The woollen industry is among the greatest industries of civilized nations and were it adequately protected along the whole line from the

production of the wool to the finished product it would mean many million dollars more for the farmers and labourers of Canada. As has been pointed out the balance of trade against us with the United States is something to be deplored. I have here a statement of our exports to the United States and our imports from the United States, and in that table I have been careful to include only purely agricultural products which are of interest to the farmers of Canada and of which we produce an abundance in this Dominion. The first table shows as follows:

IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES TO CANADA, 1909.

Total breadstuffs (under duty).. ..	$11,425,804
" (free)..	3,795,734
Total..	$15,221,538
Green apples..	224,896
Total provisions (lard, butter, cheese, &c.)..	3,791,939
Animals (not including animals for export)..	960,584
Hay..	126,738
Vegetables..	795,791
Grain products (bran, flour, &c.)..	424,639
Total agricultural products..	$21,546,125

Now, the market gardeners of the United States have a market of 80,000,000 people in their own country and the market gardeners of Canada have a population of we will say between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 people to supply, but the market gardeners of the United States are protected and the market gardeners of Canada are not equally protected and the market gardeners of the United States have been able to send to Canada vegetables to the value of $795,791. Now I have here a table showing the Canadian exports to the United States, and I have taken similar articles to those mentioned in the former table of the United States exports to Canada:

CANADA IMPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

Animals living..	$ 1,796,992
Total breadstuffs..	2,592,969
Fruits..	380,870
Hay..	35,008
Provisions (butter, cheese, eggs, bacon and ham)..	382,118
Vegetables..	507,119
Total..	$ 5,695,076
Total trade, exports and imports.	$285,265,717
Imports..	$192,661,360
Exports..	92,604,357
Difference in favour of United States..	$100,057,003

It will be seen, therefore, that the Canadian farmers and market gardeners have been able to sell to the 80,000,000 population of the United States only $5,695,000 worth of these natural products, while the American farmer and market gardeners have been able to sell to the 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 Canadians $21,546,000 worth. Thus, the farmers of Canada are to this extent forced out of their own market and obliged to pay the freight for the transportation of their products to other markets of the world. That is the kind of treatment the farmers of Canada are receiving from this government all along the line. I remember from my boyhood days hearing the Liberals when in opposition talking about capturing the markets of the United States for the Canadian farmers and having reciprocity. The Liberals are in power; have we reciprocity to-day?

Mr. EDWARDS. They forgot all about it.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Yes, they forgot all about it and the balance of the trade between us and the United States is to-day $98,000,000 worth in their favour, deducting the imports of bullion. I contend that the United States last year took that amount of money out of the pockets of the people of Canada and carried it away to their country. I do not believe there is a minister in the cabinet to-day who would conduct business privately with a man who always wanted an advantage of from ten to twenty per cent, and yet, that is the system under which the people of Canada are forced to do their business with the United States. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not a high protectionist, but I am an adequate protectionist. I believe in fair trade, and if the United States put up barriers against us I believe we should do likewise. Let us see how the duties on Canadian products going to the United States compares with the duty on United States products coming into Canada. The following statement will show.

	Canadian duty.	United States duty.
Hay, per ton.. ..	$2 00	$4 00
Butter, a lb..	0 04	0 06
Cheese, a lb..	0 03	0 06
Bacon and hams, a lb..	0 02	0 05
Eggs, per doz.. ..	0 03	0 05
Barley, per bush..	0 15	0 24
Potatoes, per bush.	0 20	0 25
Oats, per bush. ..	0 10	0 15
Pease, per bush. ..	0 15	0 40
Beans, per bush. ..	0 25	0 45
Wheat, per bush. .	0 12	0 25

Any fair minded member of this House will admit that there is nothing fair about that for the farmers of Canada. I do not think that the government have at all taken into consideration the interest of the producer. Had we similar tariff to that which they have in the United States on these articles they would not cost the people of this country one dollar more. There is another thing in connection with the woollen business that I was grieved about last year. I noticed that the Minis-

ter of Agriculture said something about our farmers raising sheep, and his remarks upon that occasion showed that he has not a very high opinion of them. He stated in the House last year that the farmers of the Dominion are a slip-shod set of people and that they lacked industry and enterprise. That will be found in 'Hansard' of March 31, last year. That seems to be a remarkable statement for the Minister of Agriculture to make about the farmers of this country.

In conclusion I would advise the government to take a little more interest in the farmer and spend a little more money upon them. This brings a thought to my mind. Technical education which was under discussion a little while ago, was shelved as far as this parliament is concerned, perhaps for twenty years. It is a very important question. There is no reason why the Dominion government should not have a technical school at least at every experimental farm and at any other points in the Dominion where they would deem it necessary. I had no intention at all of making any remarks on the budget but I was compelled to do so because of the indifferent way the agriculturists and labourers of this country have been treated and because of some of the remarks which have been made recently in regard to this matter. I would ask the government at the first opportunity to see if something cannot be done to protect the markets of the farmers and the market gardeners of Canada

Mr. M. CLARK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the debate to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 14, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

John D. Sperry, Esquire, member for the electoral division of Lunenburg; introduced by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. W. S. Fielding.

FIRST READINGS.

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

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

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Burrell.

FORM OF ADMINISTERING OATHS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) respecting oaths. He said: For a considerable number of years there has been a feeling throughout the mother land, as evidenced by newspaper editorials I now have one before me the Stratford 'Beacon,' November, 1909, as well as in Canada, that the mode of administering oaths by kissing the book is insanitary—unsanitary. I do not mean to treat the matter lightly, I used the word 'insanitary' because that is the way in which it is described in some of the papers which are discussing it. There have been frequent efforts made in the imperial government to change that mode. I may say that I have a precedent for the Bill I now propose. On the 31st of December last a Bill was passed in the British parliament almost identically to the same effect as the Bill I now propose. This Bill reads as follows:

Section 1. This Bill may be cited as the Oath Act, 1910.

Section 2. (1) Any oath may be administered and taken in the form and manner following: The person taking the oath shall hold the New Testament in his uplifted hand (or, in the case of a Jew, the Old Testament), and shall say, or repeat, after the officer administering the oath, the words, 'I swear by Almighty God that (followed by the words of the oath prescribed by law).

(2) The officer shall (unless the person about to take the oath voluntarily objects thereto, or is physically incapable of so taking the oath) administer the oath in the form and manner aforesaid without question, provided that in the case of a person who is not a Christian, the oath shall be administered in any manner which is now lawful.

The words 'in any manner which is now lawful' are different from the words of the English Statutes passed on the 31st of last December. The words in the English statute are 'as nearly as may be in the form and manner aforesaid, but with such modifications of the words or ceremony as may make the same conformable to the religious

faith or binding on the conscience of such person.' I thought it was proper that the words should be added 'in any manner which is now lawful,' in order to simplify matters when a person is not a Christian.

Section 3. In this Act the word 'officer' is defined as including any person duly authorized to administer oaths.

Section 4. This Act shall come into operation one year from the passing thereof.

The following is another change from the English Act.

Provided, however, that after such last mentioned date the fact that the deponent kissed the Testament and took the oath as the same is now administered, will still render the person so taking the oath liable for perjury if such person swears falsely and wilfully.

Now there are a number of reasons besides the sanitary reason, why this change should be made in the mode of taking the oath. Persons of weak moral sense often think that by closing their lips when taking the oath they are evading the requirement of their conscience. There is no rule, so far as I can find, requiring the kissing of the book. I find in the Encyclopædia of the laws of England, page, 249:

The practice of supporting a promise by an oath is probably as old as the existence of belief in a God, and it appears to have been utilized from the very earliest times to ratify and ensure the fulfilment of any special contract or undertaking.

In the same book, on page 250, I find this:

It does not seem possible to fix the date of the first introduction of the objectionable practice of 'kissing the book' in swearing, for there is no trace of any direct authority for it in any Act of parliament, or rule, or book of pactice.

Until a few days ago, when the fact was called to my attention. I thought that the health objection could be overcome by opening the Testament and placing one's hand on it. But I think more importance and solemnity may be secured by the deponent holding up the book in his right or his left hand, as the case may be, and taking the oath. Now, Sir, I ask the consideration of the First Minister and of the Minister of Justice to this Bill. A few days ago I suggested that Bills of this nature should be left to a committee to investigate; and I now urge on the government that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has very little to do, and which is composed of gentlemen learned in the law, should have added to their duties the consideration of Bills regarding legal matters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LEWIS.

WRECK OF THE 'HESTIA.'

Mr. DANIEL. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, who, I presume, represents the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) for the time being, when the papers will be brought down that were ordered by the House on the 22nd of November, referring to the cause of the wreck of the 'Hestia.' The Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised them before recess, but they are not down yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will inquire into the matter.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he can inform the House when the report of the two commissioners appointed to make new regulations regarding international fisheries, is likely to be laid on the table of the House. I may state the reason of my question. In the county I represent there are important herring fisheries, and the officer of the Ontario government who is in charge, has absolutely refused to grant licenses unless on terms of those heretofore passed, without waiting until the new regulations come down. It is most unfortunate for those men. They are thrown out of employment during the best part of the fishing season. I will be glad to know when the new regulations will be laid before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On Monday I will be able to inform the hon. gentleman.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Houe resumed adiourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding. 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.'

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, you, Sir, and this House extended to me a very large measure of indulgence on the occasion of the last budget debate when I occupied perhaps more of the time of the House than was becoming in a new member. I shall endeavour to show my appreciation of that indulgence by compressing what I have to say on this occasion into the briefest possible compass. I think there are two distinct grounds on which I should like to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the statement that he made to the House. I should like to congratulate him,

as so many hon. members have done, upon the excellent financial position that his surplus showed this country to be in at the present time. That statement, following upon many others, showed that we are steadily building up a great people in a great land with a great future and a great destiny, not by booms, not by fits and starts, but by slow, steady, sure and certain progress. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not very generous in the congratulations which he offered to the Minister of Finance on this question. He elaborated to the House the point that that state of affairs was not to be attributed to anything like genius on the part of the Minister of Finance. Well, the reflection which occurs to the uninitiated upon such a remark is that it must in that case have required a very ordinary type of intellect to produce a series of deficits. I cannot help thinking that the country will take a more generous view of the ability of the Minister of Finance. But, I desire to congratulate the minister further on the fact that he was able to introduce this budget while making no increase in the tariff. I think it is well to remember in this connection, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) yesterday in an exceedingly able and thoughtful speech, that Canada has never gone to the extremes that other nations have upon this tariff question. She has never, in what is becoming a very considerable history, gone to the extreme that the old country did before the days of free trade. She has never gone to the extreme that Germany, or the United States, have done in recent years. I think that a young country like Canada can congratulate herself upon the fact that she has been able at least to map out a course of her own and keep to that course. This is all the more a matter for congratulation when we look at the condition of the extremely protectionist nations of the world to-day and the trend of opinion which, I claim, is showing itself in no unmistakable way in these nations. The extreme protectionists of the world never find support for their theory by reference to Russia. Russia is the most highly protected country of Europe. They never find support for their theory by referring to Italy. Italy is another of the most highly protected countries of Europe. It would be far from the line of my political creed to say anything offensive to any other country of the world, but I am sure that those who know the facts of the case will not claim for Russia or Italy that they are bright and shining examples of economic prosperity or national progress. Protectionists mostly base their case upon Germany or the United States. Now, I have said that there is evidence that the system of high protection is breaking down in these two countries. Only the other week the second vice-president of the German Reichstag, addressing the Chamber of Commerce in London, a purely non-political body, a body of the acutest business men in the world, expressed the belief that the system of high protection of which Germany, France and the United States were examples, would become insupportable. Whatever might be the future development of the economic policy of Europe, he was convinced that the period of high protection was approaching its end. The other day there appeared a telegram from the city of Toledo, in the State of Ohio, embodying the information that Mr. O. J. C. Barber, a multi-millionaire and founder of the Diamond Match Company, predicted that:

> The people of the United States cannot long stand the increased cost of living without a revolt, and that unless something is done for their benefit a serious clash between capital and labour might be anticipated. The railways are extorting from the people, the trusts are extorting from the people, the politicians are hoodwinking the people.

Now, Sir, I say, in the presence of opinions like these from Germany and from the United States, it is a matter for congratulation that we have had a ministry in Canada for the last thirteen years which has not gone to the extreme which these nations have gone to.

I regret, because it is a matter of regret when one differs from one's friends, that I was not fully convinced by the argument which the Minister of Finance thought it wise to offer to the House in support of bounties. The minister drew an analogy between bounties on iron and steel and railway subsidies. I was not convinced about the clearness of the analogy. I think it breaks down in three distinct ways. In the first place, in giving bounties on iron and steel, we give bounties on articles that we can get from abroad. We are not compelled to make them in this country. I am not now discussing the question of whether it is wiser to get them from abroad or whether it is wiser to make them at home. I am merely stating the obvious fact that steel rails can be imported. That does not apply to railways. They are not ready-made; at least, I never heard of a business of that kind. In regard to steel rails, the fact is that we must have steel rails, but we must not, from the necessities of the case, make them, while in the case of railways we must have them and we must make them. I think that on that point, in the first place, the analogy of the minister breaks down. Then, I think, in the second place, there is a difference between the two in this respect, that when you make a railway by means of subsidies you establish a general policy applicable to the whole nation. When you subsidize the building of railways and apply that policy, you adopt

the policy clearly of the whole people for the benefit of the whole people. But, I was not convinced by anything the minister said that in giving bounties upon iron and steel you undertake a policy by the whole people for the benefit of the whole people. Why, Sir, to establish that position it would surely be necessary to give bounties upon everything we produce, and if we tried a policy like that we should have the iron people paying money out of their pockets as a bounty on the production of wheat and we should have the wheat people paying money out of their pockets to help the iron people to produce iron. We should have the Canadian people engaged in the not very beneficial process of trying to make themselves rich by taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into another.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the government's policy.

Mr. M. CLARK. No, Sir, that is not the way bounties work. The fact of the matter is that the way the system works is that one portion of the country is helped at the expense of the rest of the country. I am reminded of a story. A Scotchman was suffering from a disease which had proved unamenable to all the ordinary remedies, and the suggestion was made that a perfectly new remedy should be tried on him in the shape of a tune on the bagpipes. The remedy was tried. The doctor going through the hospital the next morning met the nurse in charge and said: 'How is the patient on whom we tried that extraordinary remedy yesterday?' 'Oh,' she said, 'the Scotchman is wonderfully better, but the other patients are all dead.'

There is a third point at which the analogy of the Minister of Finance breaks down. So far as I have been able to inform myself, a bounty is invariably accompanied by a tariff upon the article receiving the bounty. In France they have been bountying for years, if not for generations, beet sugar, but the bounty there is accompanied by a duty on sugar and the effect of the tariff and the bounty together is that the Frenchman has been paying regularly more for his sugar than the people of wiser countries who follow the common sense plan of taking their sugar from those parts of the world where Providence evidently meant it to be made. How does that work out on these bounties on iron and steel? I remember very well that last session when my friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was defending with his usual ability the increased expense of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, he mentioned as one of the causes of that increase that more had to be paid for steel rails because the duty on steel rails had been increased. I do not think that any one would argue in this House that when you build an extra railway you decrease the amount of railway accommodation or make the railroad service worse for the people of the country; but you have this remarkable position in regard to the bounties on iron and steel accompanied by a tariff here, as they are always accompanied elsewhere, that while our country is calling and calling in the loudest tone for an extension of its railroad system—and you cannot build railroads without iron and steel—you have actually this fundamental material entering into the composition of railroads made dearer and more difficult to get. Thus while by your railroad system you are trying and trying successfully to bring people nearer to the realization of one of their great needs, better transportation in this country, by the bounty system on iron and steel you are putting difficulties in the way of the development of our railroad policy.

Speaking of the general aspect of this question, high authorities differ very largely in regard to the respective merits or demerits of a bounty as compared with a tariff. Gladstone once described bounties as the worst form of protection. I suppose he was looking at the question from the point of view of a Chancellor of the Exchequer and so viewed a bounty as bringing nothing into the treasury, as a clear handout of money to some interested section of the country or some interested portion of the commercial community. Bastiat, on the other hand, while he did not regard a bounty with any particular favour, described it in a phrase which is well translated into English by the words 'plunder by premium', but still he regarded it as not quite so bad as a tariff. His reason for this, however, was a somewhat whimsical one. His point of view I suppose was more that of a philosopher. He regarded a bounty as less harmful than a tariff simply because in his judgment the people were more likely to see through it sooner and remove it sooner. That is what happened to bounties in Great Britain, because I do not think they have paid any bounties worth speaking of since 1830, and it was sixteen years later before they established free trade by the practical abolition of tariffs.

I close my reference to this subject by expressing the hope that the time is not far distant when a nation exceptionally shrewd, exceptionally progressive, as it should be, seeing that we have come to our manhood in the fullness of the years of men, we come in the fullness of time to reap the advantage of the experience of all who have gone before us, that such a nation as Canada will not be long in finding out the folly of bounties. I would like to endorse what my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) said when he ex-

pressed the hope that by the end of 1910 or the beginning of 1911 these bounties would disappear. Such curious views are held on this side of the Atlantic on the matter of building up industries. We have heard a great deal about wool during this budget debate. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) introduced the woollen subject and if wool has not been pulled over our eyes it certainly has been pulled all over this House since. I am not very much concerned to go into the woollen industry at large, but my hon. friend from East Grey referred to the fact that there had been a decline in the number of sheep kept in the province from which I come, Alberta. I wonder it did not occur to my hon. friend to reflect that after all, if we have fewer sheep there we have more men, and that if those men are not engaged in raising sheep, they are probably engaged in some employment which they find easier for the moment and more profitable. If that be the case, I cannot see that Alberta has lost by the reduction of the tariff upon wool. I cannot see why the people of Alberta should not be employed in the kind of industry which they find most suitable and most profitable. There are reasons apart altogether from the tariff why sheep are not kept in Alberta. The fencing for sheep is difficult and the raising of horses and cattle is an easier line to get into. I speak from close experience in this matter. If the people of Alberta find that they are expanding their own fortunes and developing the country at the same time more easily by growing horses and cattle and wheat, I cannot see why we should have this mournful wail about woollens associated with the decline of the sheep industry in Alberta. The fact is that men are a good thing to be going forward in anyhow. The position of the hon. member for East Grey could be summed up in a parody of the well known lines of Goldsmith:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where men accumulate and sheep decay.

I cannot think that this is a grief which will be very largely shared by sensible people like the Canadians.

On this question, Sir, of the building up of industries, I should like to remind hon. gentlemen of that of which they must be aware because the theory has been often advanced, that there is a definite natural order according to which the industries of a country grow as it passes from the earlier period of its history to that of advanced commercial civilization. Occasionally, good friends of mine on both sides of this House, taunt me in a perfectly friendly way with being a theorist. Well, that proposition is a theory but it is also a fact. It is the history of every country in Europe, and it is the history of the United States, and it is the history of Canada so far as that history has been developed: that apart from tariff and special encouragement of bounties to certain industries there is a natural order for the development of the industries of a nation. In the early period of this journey of a nation you have primitive and pastoral agriculture. That is not theory; it is a fact illustrated in the history of every nation in the civilized world. Along with that primitive and pastoral agriculture you have primitive manufacture, for every nation in its early stages manufactures, for instance, most of its rough household furniture and of its rough clothing. As you pass from this, what I may call initial stage, a nation rapidly develops an excess of agricultural produce, and the next stage in the development of its industries invariably comes because to get rid of that excess of agricultural produce the nation is compelled to develop a foreign commerce. In the intercourse of foreign commerce we compare our primitive manufactures and our primitive agriculture with the more advanced manufactures and agriculture of other nations, and there follows naturally a more advanced condition of agriculture and manufacture in the nation which is visiting these foreign lands to dispose of its excess products. That is an excellent theory, and good practice always agrees with sound theory. It is not a matter of theory only; it is a fact demonstrated by the history of all nations. There was a time not very long ago, easily remembered by the oldest people living, when the manufactures of the United States were nearly all in the east, but with the growth of population and with the intermingling of the people from the west to east, and east to west, the area of manufacturing increased, and to-day Chicago is as large a manufacturing centre as there is in the world. Apart from tariffs altogether we are now at a stage where we should have our manufactures arising in the east, and in that connection I should like to say a word on the policy known as the national policy. I do not want to say anything that may be considered of a party character, and I do not want to say anything offensive, but I do say that in my judgment the policy known as the national policy failed because it neglected to recognize this natural order of development; it placed the cart before the horse, it tried to build up advanced manufacture and it neglected the agriculture of the country. The success of the present government of Canada has been due to the fact that it has to some extent at any rate reversed that process. The present government has built up an agricultural country, settled the people upon the land, and out of prosperous agriculture naturally grows manufacturing and commercial prosperity I was pleased to hear the recent

recruit to the ministry—a young man with a great deal of life, we all hope, in front of him I was pleased to hear the Minister of Labour say in emphatic tones: We must in Canada have a foreign commerce. And, if from my little humble experience and reading I were to give any advice, which I believe is useful to this country at this juncture in its history, or if I would further dare to give a little advice to the ministry, I would say that they should lose no opportunity that presents itself to promote the foreign commerce of Canada. Why, we cultivated last year in the three prairie provinces something like 10,000,000 acres, and it is estimated that there are 300,000,000 acres of splendid arable land in these same three provinces. We must in time have a huge surplus of agricultural products, and in the years that are before us, years of hope and promise to which we are eagerly looking forward, we can hardly realize to what vast extent agricultural produce must grow, and what an enormous surplus we must have. Are you going to let your wheat rot on the prairies; are you going to keep men like myself who may have a surplus of cattle to dispose of running a zoological garden in the wilderness with no market for our extra stock? Of course not; you are going to enable us to get rid of this surplus, and the only way you can do it is by the extension of Canada's foreign commerce. Holding these views, I voted with the very greatest satisfaction for the French treaty, and I heard with equal satisfaction the statement of the Minister of Finance that in the near future negotiations may be entered into with Italy and Belgium for more extended trade relations. I do not know either that I differ very much from the leader of the opposition as to the small effects that are likely to come from the French treaty as things are at present between the two countries; nevertheless, I hail all these as steps in the right direction, making for the peace of the world, making for the friendly intermingling of peoples along the lines of trade, which are the paths we must follow if ever the nations of the earth are to turn their swords into plough shares—and produces the other metamorphoses described in that text. I am not at all sure, Sir, that in this connection the commercial world will not attach greater importance to some simple words which fell from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister—not in this debate, but which have a distinct bearing upon this subject. I was exceedingly pleased to hear the right hon. gentleman use these words:

> I have no hesitation in saying that for my part I am not satisfied with our trade relations with Germany; they are not natural or what they should be.

In that statement, Sir, if I may say so without flattery, you have the instinct of the highest possible statesmanship, because coming at this time such language is calculated to do more for peaceful relationship with Germany than a dozen jingo orations about the greatness of the flag and our being ready to fight. From the commercial standpoint these words show a keen knowledge of the importance of the German market for Canadian goods, and I can only hope that this expression of opinion will lead my right hon. friend to bring under the early consideration of his cabinet and of the Minister of Finance especially, the policy known as the German surtax. I have thought about that subject, as I have thought for many years and read for many years about the general subject of retaliation of which the German surtax is an example, and the more I think of it the more I am inclined to believe that such legislation as the German surtax is unwise. It is very easy in such matters to appeal to the fighting instinct in man which is never very low down in any one of us, but what I want to know about the surtax as a Canadian business man is: Is it good for my country? Surely, Sir, whether I speak as a Canadian or a Britisher, I am not going to cut off my nose to spite my face. The surtax certainly was not calculated to extend Canadian trade with Germany, and I am bound to say that in the history of this subject I have not any where found evidence that retaliation does make for increased trade between peoples. Supposing the United States put a duty on some article of ours, we are compelled, in accordance with this fighting clause to put an equal duty on a similar article of theirs. Take an agricultural implement which costs $100—before the increase in duty, I as a farmer, am buying it for $100; but when you put a retaliatory duty on it, the effect is, according to the hon. gentleman's own doctrine, to increase the price by at least the amount of the duty, and I have to pay $120 for a $100 article. Upon whom then does this retaliation fall? Evidently on the Canadian farmer. Mr. Asquith quoted not very long ago Gladstone's way of putting the question, which cannot be easily beaten. Mr. Gladstone said: According to the old law of non-retaliation, when a man strikes you on the one cheek, you turn to him the other; but according to the new doctrine, when a man strikes you on the one cheek, you ought to strike yourself on the other.' Some one else has said very aptly that retaliation is a weapon with a blunt point and a sharp handle, and I think that is exactly how it works out economically. My hon. friends will tell me I am theorizing once more, but there are some practical facts resulting from the German surtax that have come to my mind. I was told by a Canadian the other day, who understands the business very thoroughly, that there is a kind of ladies' cloak

produced in Germany which is the best article in that line made in the world to-day. The result of the surtax was that Canadians ceased to buy those cloaks. Who benefits? Are the people engaged in making them paid any higher wages? No, they are working for the same wages. What then has been the effect on the consumer? My friend told me that the consumer had to pay a rather higher price for a slightly inferior article. But who does benefit? The one who benefits is the cloak manufacturer in Canada. The people employed do not get any higher wages and the one who loses is the Canadian consumer. The whole Canadian people suffer for the benefit of the producers of this article, and we are not hurting Germany but Canada. Let me hope that these few words on that subject will attract the attention of the Finance Minister and that he will give those talents, with which nature has so liberally endowed him, to a further examination of the German surtax before he makes another financial statement.

I have already spoken as long as I thought would be necessary and will refrain from taking up much more of the time of the House. In that speech of two hours and thirty-five minutes duration, which my hon. friend from North Toronto made, one would have thought that he would have paid some little attention to the economic aspects of the budget statement. But his speech consisted in the unfolding of a number of things, which certainly should be looked into in eastern Canada—some criticisms of the Department of Public Works. I shall not make the mistake that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Miller) did of endorsing some of these propositions and then saying that I do not know anything about them. In regard to what my hon. friend from North Toronto said about eastern affairs, inasmuch as his attention was taken up largely by the Department of Public Works, I think it would be wise for a western man to slightly alter the old proverb and set a New Brunswicker to catch a New Brunswicker. But my hon. friend also went to the west lately, and I am bound to say that if his eastern examples of maladministration and bad policy are no better than those he was able to gather in the west, I am afraid his case is an extremely thin one. There were two subjects to which he referred, and on which I should like to speak just a moment. He referred to what I thought would really be allowed to die a natural death as a cause of scandal, and that is the Saskatchewan Valley land deal. Now the statement which the opposition make at the outset is an inaccurate statement of fact. They say that $250,000 acres of land were sold for $1 an acre. That is not the case. The 250,000 acres were sold at $1 an acre with settlement conditions—a very different matter indeed. It would be just as accurate to say that when a homesteader comes into this country, he is sold 160 acres of land for $10; but having taken a homestead myself, I know that is not the case. I took it with settlement conditions, and after I had put the money into it, which I had to do under these conditions, it was an excellent bargain for Canada. These 250,000 acres were sold on settlement conditions. What is it we want in our western country? Is it not settlement? But the salient point is that the settlement conditions were carried out to the letter, and I am stating the facts when I say that you have in that district, in which that deal was carried through, one of the most successful portions of western Canada to-day.

The other matter in the west to which my hon. friend referred was the paralleling of railways. I was surprised to hear him make objection to the government policy on that score. Not long ago I had a conversation with an ex-judge of the Court of St. Louis who is now ranching some thousands of acres in my constituency—a man of long experience in the United States—and he said: You will never get any railway development until you lose the fear of paralleling railways. Where the trunk lines are parallel in a measure—although the distances between them at many points are greater than one would gather from the speech of the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), —the two roads are in competition as to which will furnish the most branch lines and so supply people which the main trunks will not touch. I give that as my opinion, and the facts evidently indicate that in the west at any rate, we do not see anything of the complaints and we do not find the objections which my hon. friend did during his recent journey. If these were all the acts of maladministration or bad policy which the hon. member for North Toronto can find in a journey over the whole of the west, he could not have offered a more magnificent testimonial to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for the wise policy and administration which he is carrying out.

My hon. friend from North Toronto touched on the subject of prophecy; and I am glad to see that the advice I gave him last year has borne fruit, for he said that neither he nor any one man would be justified in prophesying concerning the British elections. I will not depart from my own advice of last year, but there is this comment to be made upon the state of things which ought to influence my hon. friend, that, on the other side, his protectionist allies have now given up the preference to the colonies

as the main portion of their programme. They are going for straight and pure protection, and their declaration on the preference ought to be a startling rebuke to those who object to the tariff policy of the Laurier administration. They are saying now over there that if they do give any colonial preference they will give it as a voluntary gift to the colonies exactly as this country of Canada gave a preference as a voluntary gift to the mother country.

I indicated dissent from my hon. friend in regard to the debt of Canada. I think it is well to keep one's eye on debt, whether as an individual, a statesman or a politician; but at the same time, I think there are good grounds for believing that in this matter Canada occupies an exceptionally sound position. When you reflect upon the fact that the New Zealand debt per head, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Warburton) last year, is $345, and that of Canada $45, I do not think that we are in a condition that need cause us to worry, especially considering the admirable resources which are to be developed by the money for which that debt has been incurred.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) returned to that old topic the balance of trade. I do not want to enter into that at length; but really it does seem to me unworthy of a gentleman of his standing in the economic world to recur to that subject. After correcting for the roundabout trade between Great Britain, Canada and the United States, he arrived at a figure—which I do not wish to question—of what he called a balance against us in our trade with the United States of $55,000,000. I do not know whether all the members of the House paid the same attention that I did to a calculation which was given a night or two before the adjournment by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) which went to show that by a careful calculation it could be arrived at that the wealth which had been brought to this country by the settlers who came in from the United States last year amounted to $59,000,000. The House must be struck with the correspondence between what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) designates as an adverse balance of $55,000,000 and the $59,000,000 that came in as the capital of those who came from the United States to settle in Canada. As I understand this question, the capital of these immigrants from the United States comes into this country in the shape of goods, and is entered upon our list of imports. And this accounts for what my hon. friend is pleased to call an 'adverse balance of trade.' I can only say that it suggests to me a new reading of Shakespeare's line, 'Sweet are the uses of adversity.' For, after all, we are spending large sums of money in getting these immigrants to come and bring their capital with them. 'Adverse balance of trade!'—I wonder how any man can use that language in referring to an excess of imports over exports when all the world knows that for years and decades England has had a huge 'adverse balance of trade' even during the time she was building up the greatest commerce in the history of the world, the greatest that will be seen for many a day to come. But I know that Canadians like facts concerning Canada. Well, let me refer to a fact in the history of Canadian trade, which I referred to in the budget debate of last year. In the year 1895, after seventeen years of the National Policy, the total trade of Canada was less by some millions than it had been in 1883, twelve years before. I would like to point out this further fact, that in that year 1895, Canada had a correct balance of trade according to the protectionist theory. In that year, Canada was exporting more than she was importing. Will the hon. member who follows me—will any Conservative—rise in this debate and claim that Canada was more prosperous in 1895 than she is to-day? I do not notice any great alacrity to take up my challenge in that respect. The country would laugh at any such contention. I was not here, but I have read that at that time the population of Canada was stationary. I know, from the trade figures, that her trade had declined, as compared with twelve years before. Canada was doing her business on the back alley-ways of the earth as compared with to-day. And yet at that time she had what the hon. member would call a favourable balance of trade. I think hon. members in this House should not use again that phrase 'adverse balance of trade.' Why, we are prosperity itself this year as compared with what we were then, and this in spite of this adversity. Italy, to-day, is not one of the greatest commercial nations of Europe, but Italy has an excess of exports over imports. The best example that I know of a favourable balance of trade according to the protectionist theory is a bankrupt stock—it is all exports and no imports and the whole thing comes to an end at the end of six weeks.

I have only one point more to refer to, and then I shall endeavour to fulfil my promise of brevity. I was glad to hear the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) say that the rising success of Canada was due to the farmers. Well, I am not so sure that that is not quite a new-found love on his part. I have examined, so far as I could, the record of what was done for the farmer before 1896, and I am bound to say that I have failed to find much in that record. I have referred to the fact just now that my hon. friend from North Toronto was in western Canada last year. In

the city of Edmonton, he gave exposition of the boons which had been conferred upon Canada by the National Policy. They were rather peculiar reading from my point of view. He said, amongst other things, that the National Policy built up the industries of Canada by putting up the tariff, and he said at the same time that the government had encouraged the shipping of Canada by giving subsidies for the building of ships. When I reflected upon these two heads of the policy, in the first place, I could not see much that was a benefit to the farmer. But, in the second place, I could see much that would lead to the failure of the policy. Because, for the life of me, I cannot see the common sense of subsidizing ships to carry out exports—and, presumably, bring in imports—while, at the same time, you build up a tariff wall to prevent the imports from coming in. I need information, doubtless, about the condition of Canada. I shall be glad if the hon. member who follows me will tell me, and will tell my constituents, who are largely an agricultural population, many of them new to this country and honestly seeking political truth, what was actually done for the farmer during the previous Conservative regime, or—what is equally to the point—what is going to be done by the hon. member for North Toronto and his friends if they are returned to office. An hon. friend asks what has been done for the farmer by this government. That is a point I had to study; I had to ask myself that question in all honesty. I am thankful to my hon. friend for the interruption. When I came to homestead land in western Canada I had to study that point, and I have learned in the school of experience how to answer my hon. friend's question. I found when I came to western Canada the first thing I needed was a bunch of milk cows, and some means of separating the cream from the milk. I had to get a separator, and when I bought the separator I found it had been put on the free list by the Laurier government. I will answer my hon. friend's question a little further. After I got my bunch of milk cows and began to separate the cream from the milk I had to get food for the cows in winter by tilling the soil. When I came to bind the crop in the harvest season I found binder twine on the free list, placed there by the Laurier government. Then I had to use fence wire to keep my cattle in the field, and I found that that wire was also on the free list, put there by the Laurier government. Then I had to buy some agricultural implements, and under the Bill of two sessions ago I found there was a reduction of duty in agricultural implements to the very moderate extent of two and a half per cent—it would have suited me better if it had been twelve and a half per cent—but even the two and a half per cent was secured against the determined opposition and resistance of Mr. Cockshutt and other members of the Conservative party.

Now, I will close by saying this, that I am glad to observe the tardy repentance of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I took him to be a sincere man, and he admits the claim the farmers make for themselves that they are doing a great deal for the prosperity of Canada. I hope that that thought will be present all the time with the members of any administration that rules the destinies of Canada for the next ten or fifteen years. Agriculture in this country is far more than in any other country the basic industry of all others, it is the true and solid foundation of the nation's prosperity. This truth was well expressed by the grandson of Confucius four hundred years before our era, who said: 'All the industries of a nation may be compared to a tree, of which agriculture is the bole or trunk, and the other industries are the branches.' Do not trouble yourselves about wool, the wool will come if you make your farm right. Sir, I offer my sincere, though not unqualified support to the administration which now rules Canada, because so far as I can examine the facts, they have got the right end of the stick in the matter of the development of the industries of this country. They have, at least, given more attention to the agricultural needs and wishes of this country than did the previous administration; and if a future Conservative administration is to do better upon this subject, I shall be glad to hear it from the hon. gentleman who is going to follow me.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). I do not propose to follow the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) throughout the speech he has just addressed to this House. I would like to have heard him go a little further than he did, and tell us how much cheaper binder twine, and wire, and the other articles he mentioned as having been put upon the free list by the present government, are to-day than they were before by reason of having been so put upon the free list. I would suggest to the hon. member for Red Deer that he establish in Room No. 16 a series of revival meetings to bring back the government and their followers to the principles they advocated in 1896; and when he has succeeded in reconverting them to the great principles of free trade, it will be time enough for him to apply his logic and his eloquence to the members who sit on the Speaker's left.

Sir, viewing things upon the surface and with a somewhat circumscribed vision, one feels disposed to congratulate hon. members on the other side of the House upon the confidence and courage displayed in presenting their case to this House and through it to the people. Did the

status of this country depend upon its purely material advancement, one might rightly claim that it is in a fairly prosperous condition, indeed in some respects in a very satisfactory condition. Especially during the last few years we have had a marvellous growth of population, development and wealth. We have attained great domestic prosperity, and world-wide importance. Just what might have been expected in the circumstances. Were our conditions less favourable, we would be exposed to the charge of gross stupidity. In fact, I question very much whether our advancement has been at all commensurate with our opportunities. However, Mr. Speaker, had the hon. gentlemen, mindful of their past record, contented themselves with an enthusiastic recital of our achievements as young and robust people, and with becoming modesty had expressed their gratitude therefor, little criticism could have been justly made. But for hours and days we have listened to their bewildering arrays of figures and fictions, eager not so much to describe the prosperity of this country as to ascribe it to some imaginary sagacity exercised by themselves, eager rather to glorify themselves than to glorify the country. The hon. member for Hochelega (Mr. Rivet) last night charged us on this side of the House with never having forgotten anything. Well, Mr. Speaker, I take that as a compliment, knowing full well that a potent influence in the maintenance of character is a good memory. Were I disposed to make a counter charge, I should say that the hon. gentleman and his political friends forget everything—principles as well as facts, knowing full well that a treacherous memory is the ever constant companion of an unreliable politician. That remark does not apply to the hon. member for Red Deer, because he still holds to his principles of free trade, he still announces them before this House; and to be consistent, he should undertake to reconvert to the principles of free trade the great party of which he is a member.

Now, under these circumstances, it would seem expedient 'to stir up their sincere minds by putting them in remembrance' to dispel their mythical creations, and for a time to seek relief in the calmer regions of the real. To what do we really and truly owe our present position, appealing to facts and ignoring treacherous figures and pointless fiction? What of nature? What of Providence? What of world-wide circumstances? What of the fathers? Who piled up the majestic mountains and stored them with treasures untold? Who carved out the beautiful valleys and bedecked them with flowers and fruits? Who spread out the fertile plains and clothed them with verdure? Who established the seas and filled them with life? Who planted the forests to yield their millions of wealth? I suppose the answer will come from the other side of the House—the right hon. the leader of the government. Who gathered together these almost boundless territories, and provided them means of intercommunication, who put fleets upon the sea to carry our products to the markets of the world; who established the system under which our industrial life has been stimulated for the last thirty years? In natural resources this Canada of ours is probably the richest country on the face of the globe, stretching from ocean to ocean across the continent and northwards from the great inland seas and international boundary thousands of miles to the resting place of Sir John Franklin, in variety and salubrity of climate unsurpassed in wealth of field, forest, mine and sea unequalled half a continent committed to our keeping to maintain and develop. Enjoying all the privileges and rights of British institutions without the cost of monarchy, surely our lot is cast in pleasant places and we have a goodly heritage. What of our people? The great majority of them whether Liberals or Conservatives, are neither office holders nor office seekers, neither party heelers nor greedy grafters, but they are plain, self-reliant, honest workers, striving in industry and economy to improve their condition in life and to discharge their whole duty both to their families and to the state. At the same time, they desire a progressive and virtuous administration of public affairs to the end that the great natural resources of this country may be wisely developed, and that the intelligence and manhood of the people may be permanently promoted. They constitute the stability and moral fibre of the state and without them 'the rise and fall of Canada' would soon be written in the world's history. Some day—I hope in the not distant future—this important element of our people will abandon that intense partisanship, too prevalent to-day, and unite to exercise a more potent and salutary influence upon the public life of this country. Not only has nature provided the resources I have mentioned, but for a long period of years, with scarcely an exception, the tillers of the soil have been rewarded with bountiful harvests, abundance for ourselves, and an enormous surplus for others. In 1896 hon. gentlemen were transferred from your left to your right, Mr. Speaker, to govern a country possessing great natural wealth and singular advantages, a country wherein the great outlines of national pioneer work had already been performed. Systems of canals constructed and railways operating in and through every province, fleets carrying our products to the remotest nations, and an industrialism established, founded upon the principle of 'Canada for Canadians.' Shortly before the accession

to power of our friends opposite began a world-wide revival of trade, an era of bountiful harvests and of unprecedented material and industrial expansion which, with but slight interruption, have continued to this day. While we, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House have some pride in the past as well as high hopes for the future we must not be expected to sit in silence and meekly submit to unfounded accusations and sophistical inferences. Had hon. gentlemen opposite, during this debate, while appropriating credit to themselves where due, meted out justice to their opponents, little objection could have been taken, but some of them, whose political faculties seem obscured by the intoxication of power and pride and consumed by the vices incident thereto, have accused us of deficiency in some of the important elements of good citizenship, and magnified the part they have played in the development of this country. If I remember right, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowkes), was the most unfair in this regard. In these circumstances, it might be salutary to ask hon. gentlemen and others similarly affected a few questions, although the answers thereto might involve a slight knowledge of somewhat ancient history. What I would ask, Mr. Speaker, have hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as a political party, ever contributed, in a large way, either to the development of this country or to its very existence as the home of a distinct people. Where would this country be to-day, had the people accepted their guidance a few years agoé Where would Nova Scotia be to-day, where would British Columbia be, where would this whole country be had unrestricted reciprocity, advocated by the leader of the government and those sitting beside or behind him, been accepted by the people? Let the Hon. Edward Blake answer. Not a self-governing portion of the British empire but both politically and commercially a mere annex to the United States. Hon. gentlemen, to inspire or revive in them the virtue of political humility, need to be told that it was the great political party, of which we on this side are proud to be members, which conceived and executed every great project that has been conceived and executed for the acquisition, consolidation and development of this country, and that too in the face of the most strenuous opposition offered by hon. gentlemen opposite, who raised their puny arm in futile efforts to thwart all such projects. They opposed the acquisition of Prince Edward Island, of British Columbia, and of Prince Rupert's land, they opposed the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway which, with the activities of the company after its construction has done more to develop this country than all other agencies combined. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway and the activities of the company since its construction, have done more to develop this country than all other agencies combined, not excepting those put forth by the government itself. Hon. gentlemen opposite not only opposed all these projects, but they opposed the adoption of protection and for eighteen years characterized it as legalized robbery, and described manufacturers as robbers great and robbers small. When they came into power thirteen years ago—I see the Hon. Minister of Customs (Mr .Paterson) looking across here and he knows it as well as I do—they adopted and have practised during these thirteen years the very same principle of protection that they so denounced for eighteen years.

Now, when the superstructure is naturally rising on foundations thus laid, although thus so violently attacked, hon. gentlemen from the house tops shout: 'See what we have done.' As well might the faithless and ungrateful son whose father had felled the forest, fenced and drained the farm, removed the stumps and stones, erected the dwelling and built the outhouses, say: 'See what I have done'—although his only achievement was the erection of a modern windmill. Mr. Speaker, the consolidation of the various portions of this great country was effected and the foundations for the development of her great natural resources laid for all time by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and others, some of whom still remain men wise in counsel and bold in execution, giant nation builders all, compared with whom their immediate and remote successors were and are—well the English language fails me. No Saskatchewan rifles for them, no ripe fruit dropping from the parent tree, no discrimination against the mother country, no mere fairweather sailors they, staunch in stress as well as in sunshine, from Alpha to Omega Canada must remain in the empire, now and ever. The hon. gentleman from South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) was bold enough to accuse those of us who have the honour of sitting on this side of the House of being wanting in loyalty to the mother country. He appreciated British connection, and trade relations with the mother country and lashed himself into paroxysms of eloquence over some imaginary statesmanship manifested somewhere or some time by the present leader of the government. Such wholesale and fulsome assertions have not a feather's weight when it is remembered that his worship was just as devout and demonstrative when his leader saw more beauty in the Yankee dollar than in a British shilling, and, so zealous a devotee at the shrine of

fame is the hon. gentleman that I have no doubt his hero worship would sustain him were the right hon. gentleman now to propose prohibition of British goods and unrestricted reciprocity with the Fiji Islands.

Hon. gentlemen who compare trade returns—when the Conservatives were in power with the trade that we have to-day, should remember that this is not the first Liberal government that has been in power in Canada. Although only a boy yet, I remember very well when the right hon. gentleman who leads the government to-day (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sat upon the treasury benches before, and I also remember that during those days the trade of this country dwindled down to a point less than half what it had attained when he returned to power. Why, I would ask, did he withhold from his suffering country in those days the magic exercise of his masterful genius? Why did he, in those days, permit the wheels of progress to cease their accustomed revolutions? Why did he permit commercial stagnation to settle down on this country and industrial distress to exhibit its ghastly form in every populous centre? Why did he not, in those days, convert the soup kitchens into homes of plenty? In those days and later, hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that in respect to commercial prosperity governments were but flies upon the wheel and now they tell us that the success and prosperity of the country depends very largely upon their trade policy. A few years ago surpluses were stealings from the country. Let me read to you a few words uttered by the present Finance Minister in those days respecting surpluses:

> If these surpluses were created by the government in some magic way, there must be in them a cause for thankfulness. But when it is considered that every dollar of the surplus is taken out of the pockets of the people without the shadow of an excuse—money not required even by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not much cause for rejoicing. A surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain?

And yet in the face of that we have hon. gentlemen boasting to-day of an aggregate of surpluses amounting to nearly $150,000,000, which, according to their statements a few years ago, are simply so many stealings from the people.

But we have had recently a new cause assigned for the great prosperity that this country is enjoying. I have noticed that the Prime Minister in Toronto last week accounts the restoration of peace and harmony in this country as the most signal triumph of his public career, that to it rather than to his trade policy should be attributed our prosperity. Let us see what he said, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe':

> The country was torn by agitation which threatened to take the form of civil war. It is a self-evident proposition that there can be no prosperity in a country where there is no harmony amongst all classes that inhabit it. There can be no such thing as progress where discord is rampant in the land. And our effort when we went into office in 1896 was to establish harmony, to establish concord amongst all classes of the population.

Mr. Speaker. this is a striking illustration of the suppressio veri. It requires a very high degree of courage as well as an assumption that memories are universally short, to so present events so recent in our history. In the first place these are gross overstatements of the facts of the case. The pertinent question is: What provoked the conditions to which he referred, and truth demands the answer that the discord such as it existed was the nefarious handiwork of his own political friends, performed with his own assent and expressed in the most eloquent terms of silence. When a word from him would have allayed the agitation he crouched behind the lines of Torres Vedras, preferring civil war to peace and harmony, so that it promised relief from the shivering shades of opposition. And when that discord, so started and nurtured. had attained its object, its authors were taken to his bosom and placed in the seats of the mighty. And in the face of these facts we are now seriously told that we were the authors of the discord and that he restored peace. It is too early. Mr. Speaker, thus to pervert the facts of history. The easy grace with which these hon. gentlemen pass from one side to the other of most important questions would invite hilarity in one unfamiliar with the dexterity usually exhibited in their mental gymnasium. To-day protection and surpluses are legalized robbery and stealings from the people, to-morrow they are evidences of statesmanship. Public lands for the settler to-day, to-morrow vast tracts of land and timber given to political favourites. Provincial rights to-day, to-morrow central control at Ottawa. Looking to Washington to-day. unfurling the old flag in a foreign capital to-morrow; all things to all men, principles abandoned, opportunism embraced. During the past thirteen years the government of this country has been carried on more with a view to strengthening one political party than to promoting the public weal. Every question that arises is determined by party considerations rather than by national interests. Under the patronage system as administered by hon. gentlemen opposite almost every institution in this country has been grossly degraded. The revenues have been squan-

dered and the public patrimony plundered to strengthen the party ascendant and that the party may remain in the ascendant. What was the explanation given a few days ago of the Newmarket canal transaction, and given by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself? He actually told us that a delegation composed of Liberals and Conservatives alike asked for the construction of that canal, and the Minister of Finance tells us that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have asked for public buildings, and he thinks that is a sufficient answer to the charge of improper expenditure. Could affected political innocence go further? Fancy veteran politicians skilled in all the arts of the game making such innocent professions. They both know full well that if there was the slightest prospect to secure an expenditure of $1,000,000 on the most absurd proposition imaginable, a large and enthusiastic delegation could be gotten together from any constituency in Canada, even from that represented by the Minister of Customs himself. Were a child in any well regulated nursery found giving expression to so much innocence he would be told: 'The goblins will get you if you don't look out.' Seats in parliament have been exchanged solely for political consideration without regard to quality or patriotism. Even the bench, Mr. Speaker, even the judiciary has not been spared the blighting influence of this pernicious system. In many cases in the province of Ontario the County Court bench, and in some of the other provinces even the High Court bench has been prostituted to the necessities of political exigencies, and we have seen here about twelve months ago a high and important office of a judicial character bartered for a minimum of mentality plus a maximum of perpetual political pull. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite may learn some salutary lessons from instances occurring in the public life of other nations. It is recorded of the late President Lincoln that when about to fill the chief justiceship of the United States, a delegation waited upon him to try to dissuade him from appointing a man with whom he was not on friendly relations personally. Mr. Lincoln, great big man that he was, said: What has that to do with it? Here is one of the most important positions in the United States. It is my duty to appoint to it the best available man. In my opinion, Salmon P. Chase is that man, and I shall appoint him; and he did appoint him. I commend his conduct to the right hon. the Prime Minister. I implore him to study well the public career of that truly great man and to apply the lessons gleaned therefrom to the material and moral interests of his native land.

We have heard a great deal in favour of excluding the orientals from this country and I do not propose to discuss that question, but let me say here: It would be well were the public men of Canada to become inoculated with the characteristic virtues of the Japanese. If a great war, conducted on both land and sea with consummate skill unparalleled and unvarying success and with the tenderest regard for fallen foes is any test, then the Japanese are one of the greatest peoples known to history. Whether toiling in the trenches at Port Arthur, or bleeding upon the battlefields of Manchuria, or shattered on the decks in the sea of Japan, or lingering in the hospitals for the wounded, the sick and the dying, they manifested a courage, an endurance, a devotion to country and a humanity never witnessed in the annals of war before. In Japan one constantly hears the question: What can I do for my country? But in Canada under this government, one blushes to confess it, thousands are asking: How can I do my country? And those who do her to the greatest extent are those whom we most devoutly worship. Mr. Speaker, we are in danger of attaching too much importance to the lower, to the neglect of the higher elements of national weal. It is vastly more important, that the great natural resources of Canada should be wisely developed than that they should be speedily developed. It is very much more important that the multitude of the people should have an object lesson of righteous administration on parliament hill than that our immigration should increase by 10,000 or 50,000 a year. The people have been taught to believe that public property is legitimate game for all those cunning and bold enough to seize it; and as a consequence, we have them reaching out a greedy hand to grasp everything of a public character, whether seen or unseen. It seems to me that the most lasting impression which this government will leave on history is that their reign was signalled by the blight of greed and the decadence of patriotism and that this era will be known in Canadian history as the golden age of graft. Although many of us hope that the Finance Minister, as such, will not deliver many more budgets in this House, we all were pleased with his closing words. We all have confidence that Canada has a great future and that some day she will attain unto it, although on the way she may be obstructed and marred and scarred by scheming and selfish politicians. We are proud of our Canadian citizenship but prouder still of our British citizenship. Canada is only a small part of our country. Our country encircles the globe. We are proud of our British citizenship in which we desire to live and for which, if need be, we are prepared to die. I would

like at this stage to go into the question of the navy. What is involved is not simply the protection of this country. That is not the question. What did British statesmen say in the House of Commons? One after another they rose in their seats and declared—what? Did they declare that they must have a navy merely to defend the British isles in which they live? No, every one of them declared that what was wanted was a navy strong enough to defend the remotest part of the British empire—the one empire, strong, indivisible and perpetual, under one flag, presided over to-day by a King, a gentleman and a man—His Majesty Edward VII, long may he reign.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon). When one gazes upon the venerable form of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Crothers), it is somewhat difficult to believe he is still a boy, but as one listens, the difficulty disappears. A gentleman who can imagine that he can carry on a tariff discussion by abandoning what he calls treacherous figures and by addressing himself instead to mountains, valleys, forests and streams, is giving the best proof that he is not yet past his boyhood. A gentleman who imagines that he can substitute strutting phrases for sound arguments and that, by making broad declarations, he can establish sane conclusions is, I think, entitled to all the benefit he can obtain from the most extreme youth.

My hon. friend wondered why the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) addressed some of his arguments to the opposition. Well, it is perfectly plain that arguments of that kind, like sermons, are usually addressed to the vilest sinners in the hope of accomplishing most good, and one cannot doubt that the arguments in question are more needed on the opposition than on the government side of the House. My hon. friend from Red Deer pointed out that the whole policy of the Liberal government has been in the direction of an endeavour to secure a broader measure of free trade to this country. Whereas the policy on the other side has been exactly the reverse. But now we have my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers), who has just taken his seat, saying that the policy which has been the cause of such immense success in our manufacturing industries is that which was initiated by the late Conservative administration. Well, let me invite the attention of the hon. gentleman to the language used by Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Conservative party and by the hon. member for North Toronto, (Mr. Foster) with regard to the Fielding tariff. That language was to the effect that the Fielding tariff was of such a character that it would utterly ruin

and destroy the industries of this country. It was easy enough for those hon. gentlemen then, to make that prophecy, to point out that nothing but misery and ruin would follow; and it is just as easy now, when the very reverse is shown to have followed, to say that the tariff inaugurated in 1896 by this government was nothing but the old Conservative tariff. The hon. gentleman then claimed the distinction for his party of having initiated the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, but it does seem to me that the Mackenzie government which was in power before 1878, had something to do with the construction of a road that corresponds with the Canadian Pacific railway. And the Mackenzie administration then initiated a policy with regard to the construction of railways which was much more in the interests of the country than the one subsequently followed. No one can doubt that the building of the Canadian Pacific railway has worked great benefits to Canada. No one can doubt that it has done much to open up our Northwest, but it must not be forgotten that that road had been opened twelve years before the present government came to power and that, until the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) became Minister of the Interior and substituted for the old antique methods, modern, scientific, active and energetic efforts, there was absolutely no development commensurate with what the people had a right to expect from the great sacrifices they had made. And the end is not yet with regard to the injuries inflicted by the Canadian Pacific railway. If I am correctly informed that company, by virtue of the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for, is now in possession of the alternate sections on the Grand Trunk Pacific and propose to hold the sections up and not sell them, merely in order to ruin the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the policy which my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) lauds so highly. It is one which has been a curse throughout the Northwest and is a curse to-day and will be more and more a curse as the country opens up.

It seems to me that my hon. friend differs somewhat from the hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with regard to the appearance of affairs at present. The hon. member for North Toronto, in his desperate gloom and horrible despondency, could see nothing cheerful except the countenance of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Well, I think that most people in this country would like to see some of the cheerfulness exhibited in the countenance of the Minister of Finance reflected in the countenance and language of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

The time has passed when it is wise for any man in this country to speak of the

affairs of Canada as being 'in a slough of despond.' I venture to say that there is no man who knows anything about our affairs—except the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—who would speak of the affairs of this country being now or having been at any time recently in anything like a slough of despond. There never was a time when Canada was more prosperous or more hopeful than at the present day. And the only man in this House, who does not realize that appears to be the hon. member for North Toronto. In order to make a point he said that, in the budget of 1908-9 the Finance Minister, instead of curtailing instead of trimming sail for the storm which every man saw approaching, he had continued under full sail risking disaster. It is not well for the captain who has been dismissed from his employment by reason of not being able to carry the ship of state through the storms to criticise another captain who has been successful on the ground that in such and such emergencies something might have happneed through his carrying too much sail. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said:

> The minister might have added to the financial position of this country very materially if he had done as every business man in the country did, as the chancellor of every exchequer that I know of did, as any prudent business man would do—curtail in the face of the storm that was yet to come and so save in that way what he could of the strength and credit of the country's finances.

Now, Sir, I do not know as much about the chancelleries of the world as the hon. member for North Toronto. Yet, I begin to think that even he does not know as much about them as his language would indicate. For, if he had gone to the budgets of Great Britain and the United States he would have found that the very contrary to that which he stated was the fact —that the masters of those ships of state, had the same confidence in their crafts to weather the financial storm that was approaching—and with as much reason as shown by the result—as had our Minister of Finance in the Dominion of Canada. For, in that year, and in the subsequent year, both in Great Britain and in the United States, not only the estimated but the actual expenditure exceeded any previous year except one from 1905 to that time.

Now, the hon. member for North Toronto is even despondent about the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. I do not see how any one who looks at the condition of affairs in the new provinces and in the Northwest Territories can doubt the wisdom of the policy which is endeavouring—and is succeeding —to provide for this country another great transcontinental railway. Not only was such construction necessary in view of the enlargement of the country and in view of the necessity of saving the great Northwest Territories of Canada from falling absolutely into the hands of the Canadian Pacific railway, but it was necessary in order to provide for the enormous development which was foreseen. And I venture to say that we are on the eve, as soon as that road is opened, of the most marvellous material and commercial development known in the history of the Dominion. You see, here and there, small towns which undoubtedly will blossom forth into large cities; you see villages ready to become towns; and from the Atlantic to the Pacific the whole Dominion will undoubtedly receive a great impetus from the construction of that road. It would not be surprising if the policy of the government should finally lead to the extension of that road to the port of Halifax. The eastern provinces, I believe, are in as hopeful a condition as ever they were and will soon begin to reap, more than they have done heretofore, some measure of the benefit of this prosperity spreading over the Dominion. There is nothing to hinder the Atlantic Canadian port, either Halifax or St. John—Halifax, I believe, for it seems to me to have been designed by nature as the seaport of the largest portion of the trade of the Dominion—I say I do not think there is anything that will hinder Halifax and St. John on the Atlantic and Vaucouver, Victoria or Prince Rupert or all of them, from being centres of as large a freight and passenger traffic as ever has been in the history of the world. How any hon. member can entertain any doubt with regard to the benefit that will accrue to this country from the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway entirely passes my comprehension. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) has dealt with another feature of the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—the question of the balance of trade. If the argument advanced not only by the hon. member for North Toronto, but also by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) and some others in this House is correct, if it be really an adverse balance of trade for us to have more imports than exports, and if the favourable condition of trade be an excess of exports over imports, then India to-day is a prosperous country and Great Britain is very much the reverse. For, as pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer, the imports of Great Britain for years and decades have exceeded the exports, whereas the exports of India for as many years have exceeded the imports. I believe that the reason can be found in the words of Fawcett—and I would invite the attention of my hon. friend from North Simcoe to some of portions of the works on political economy that he has been reading and ask

him to give some attention to what they say on the subject of the balance of trade upon which he talked a great deal but concerning which, apparently, he had not taken the trouble to read the very authorities to which he referred. Fawcett said:

If a country is in debt to other countries her exports will exceed in value her imports by an amount equivalent to her annual indebtedness. If, on the other hand, a country should be a creditor and not a debtor of other countries, the value of her imports will exceed that of her exports by an amount which will be equivalent to the indebtedness of other countries to her.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that Great Britain is a great creditor nation. Other countries all over the world must pay interest on their indebtedness to Great Britain, and the only way in which they can pay it is in the form of exports from their own countries which become imports into Great Britain, making an excess of imports into Great Britain. Most of the other political economists with whom I am acquainted—and I have been realing up the subject—claim that this idea of an adverse balance of trade is a foolish and exploded notion. As Blanqui says, it is 'proved a vagary.' Why, if there were anything in it the Minister of Customs and the Minister of the Interior make a very serious mistake in not instructing their officials all along the international boundary to meet the Americans coming into this country and say: 'Gentlemen, you can come in but you must not bring in your effects, for if you bring them in you will swell the adverse balance of trade against Canada.' One can understand that if you take some particular item of trade you might possibly say that, in regard to that particular item, it is desirable that our exports should exceed our imports—though, I must say I cannot think of anything of which that would be true. But to talk of the whole trade of a country and say that, because the imports exceed the exports, that country has an adverse balance of trade, appears to me a vagary which, if not exploded, ought to be exploded very shortly. Let me point out one way in which this so-called adverse balance of trade is swollen. In the Yukon territory, several million dollars worth of mining machinery has been imported and set up, machinery of a kind not now manufactured in Canada. To wait for the development of that country until the machinery was manufactured in Canada would mean the absolute abandonment of the country for many years. Consequently, I think every one will recognize the wisdom of going abroad to get the machinery, to hasten the development of the mining industry. The imports of Canada are swollen by the amount of the value of that machinery. Does any one say that it is not a desirable thing for Canada to purchase abroad the mining machinery that is required in the Yukon territory in order to start mining operations, and thus give employment to a large number of labouring men, increase the business of every merchant and every person engaged in business in that country, although it does create what the hon. gentlemen call an adverse balance of trade?

Another thing I wish to mention and that is trade between Canada and the United States. I have always frankly expressed my views on that question. Now, Sir, while I am as loyal a British subject as there is, I have the very highest regard and esteem also for the republic to the south of us, and I believe that the greatest function that Canada can perform, in her own interest and that of the empire, is to assist to bring about the most friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States of America. Speak of a fiscal policy which would make Canada an annex of the United States! What ridiculous nonsense! Do you imagine that because we are carrying on trade which is profitable both to Canada and the United States, therefore we must become annexed to the greater country? For my part I believe that the most desirable condition of Canada would be one of absolute freedom of commercial intercourse with the United States. Our social relations, our commercial relations and all other relations should be of the most friendly character. I say that so far from involving any danger of our political entity being absorbed in that of the United States, it would be postponing it, removing the danger of any such fusion of the two countries. There is a large and growing portion of the people of the United States who realize that our country is a magnificent example of an endeavour to carry on republican institutions. They are a republican democracy, we are a monarchial democracy. We believe, and some of them believe, that under our system of government we are accomplishing greater freedom for the community and for individuals even than they are in the United States; and the wisest, the sanest, and the most advanced minds in the United States realize that it may be well on this continent for two independent nations to exist side by side, aiming at the same object, the attainment of the best interests of the whole people, that these two experiments should be conducted concurrently, one learning from the other, so that if one fails in the experiment the other may take warning by the failure, and avoid the errors that led to it. So far from intimate and close trade relations between Canada and the United States involving any danger to our political institutions, I believe, and I think I am supported by all who have studied the

question carefully, that such relations will advance the interests of Canada and tend to our continued separation as a political entity.

Now hon. gentlemen think that it is a horrible thing that trade between Canada and the United States is greater than trade between Canada and Great Britain. Sir, the result is inevitable, and is a consequence of the ordinary movement of trade currents. Trade naturally follows meridians rather than parallels of latitude, for the simple reason that in pursuing parallels of latitude you are trading with a country similarly situated, whereas when trade follows meridians it is reaching out to countries differently situated, having different products, performing the mission which Tennyson ascribes to commerce 'to mix the seasons and the golden hours.' That doctrine is as applicable to Canada as it is to the rest of the world. It has been well established throughout the rest of the world; and, try as much as you please, give as great a preference as you will to Great Britain, it will not be possible for this country to make trade with any other country in the world which will exceed the trade of Canada with the United States. For my part I welcome it, believing as I do, that it is one of the best things that can happen, not only to Canada but to the United States, and that the soundest trade policy is one which will be as beneficial to the one country as to the other.

There was one portion of the address of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to which I wish to direct the especial attention of the House, not that that it is a matter in which this House is especially interested, because I have found a most wonderful lack of interest in eastern Canada in anything relating to the northern part of Canada. The residents of eastern Canada, and also of western Canada, for that matter, are so deeply engaged in the development of their own sections of the country that they take very little interest in anything beyond. The common notion with regard to the Yukon territory, or of any other part of our northern territory, is that it is a great barren wilderness filled with icebergs, behind which the inhabitants are dodging and trying to keep themselves from freezing to death. A greater misconception never existed. The hon. member for North Toronto has never been able, in any speech made in this House, to mention the Yukon territory, or the officials, or the people, of the Yukon, without saying something derogatory of them. He knows no more about the Yukon territory, about the conditions there, than Balaam's ass knew about Hebrew grammar. Now, the hon. gentleman tries to belittle the Yukon territory by saying that it has a population of less than 8,000, probably 5,000. If it has only 5,000, I say they are one of the most remarkable 5,000 that have ever been collected together in any part of this mundane sphere. Imagine what would happen in the rest of Canada if every unit of 5,000 people added so greatly to the wealth of the country as the 5,000 people in the Yukon territory. Last year, and for several years before that, the gold production of the Yukon territory fell off. It was absolutely inevitable that it should fall off. In the earlier days there happened in the Yukon territory what happened in every other mining camp. Men flocked into the richest spots and these were capable of being easily worked. Men who knew nothing of mining, only enough to dig a hole in the ground, found a gold yield sufficient to make their fortune. But that ground naturally gets worked out in time, and if you could live in the Yukon territory and visit that ground which yielded these immense fortunes, you would still see gold bearing ground which I believe is richer than in any other part of the civilized world. The area which can be worked to-day is ten times as large as the area which could be worked nine or ten years ago. The area that can be profitably worked is increasing in extent and, is so enormous that its output only depends upon the cheapness with which it can be worked. Now hon. gentlemen should remember this fact. He blames this government for the falling off of the gold yield in the Yukon. I do not think the hon. gentleman seriously meant to say that, but perhaps he did. But I say that the falling off of the gold production was exactly what has happened in every other country between the first wild rush when riches are dug out easily, and the second stage when scientific methods are necessary to get the gold out of the ground. Last year our production in the Yukon was a little over two millions, this year it has jumped up to $3,662,000. I venture to say that for the next ten years you will see an annual increase in the production of gold from placer ground alone with a continued improvement in the scientific mode of mining.

Now with regard to the government of the Yukon, and the reflections made by the hon. member on the government of that territory. It must be remembered that in the beginning of the Yukon territory there occurred one of the most remarkable movements of men that has occurred since the Children of Israel started out from Egypt on their famous wanderings in search of easier work than making bricks without straw. That movement differed from all other movements that I know of. We had a large body of men moving together. Other movements of

men were homogeneous; they were composed of men of the same language and the same ideas, and because of that fact it was easier to control and manage them than a movement such as this in which were represented every nation of the world, every trade, every profession, every occupation and every degree of morality. We had the pious deacon and the pickpocket and we had the preacher deserting for a time his sacred calling in the hope of being able to add to his poor stipend by striking a good claim, and men of every description. The worst feature of the crowd, numbering about one hundred thousand, was that while there were splendid men amongst it—no better could be found in the world—and while the large majority was eminently fit, capable, respectable and good, there was a lack of confidence in one section of the crowd with respect to the others. The individuals did not know one another. It might be that a man in a little group knew the members of that group but he knew nothing whatever about other groups, and the consequence was that the crowd that rushed in there was filled with distrust of itself and of its different constituents. This naturally created in the government of this country, being guided, I suppose, by the reports of the authorities who had the management of the Yukon, a distrust which was likely to grow. I do not think that any government will be greatly blamed it if takes pains to maintain the integrity of its territory. That is one thing that every government, whether British or Canadian, will protect. No government will take any chance in regard to the integrity of its territory. This government took no chance with regard to maintaining the Yukon territory as a territory of the Dominion of Canada. It sent into that country a force which I think was needless. But, it is easy to be wise after the event. Those 155 battleships that the British government 'scrapped' a few years ago were unnecessary but at the time they were constructed they were not deemed unnecessary. They served a purpose and the fact that they were ultimately 'scrapped' is no condemnation of the action of the government in constructing them at a time when they were believed to be necessary. This government sent into the territory a large force of the Northwest Mounted Police. No better force could have been sent, although I am not given to overpraise of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police or any other body of men. I realize that they have their faults and failings. In addition they sent in a large field force. That field force cost Canada $721,737. That was merely the result of the foresight of the Dominion government in taking such measures as would ensure the retention of the Yukon territory to the Dominion of Canada. In the public accounts the cost is included as a charge against the Yukon territory. I do not think it is a fair item to include to make up the deficit to which the hon. member for North Toronto referred. At the time the Yukon territory was first opened up there was no idea that there would be any danger of an attempt to wrest that territory from the Dominion. It was at that time that the statement was made in this parliament that the Yukon would be made to pay for itself. There are some extraordinary expenditures which, as a matter of book-keeping, have been charged to the Yukon, but which are of such a character that they should not have been so charged. One is the $721,000 that is charged against the Yukon with respect to the field force. If there were danger of an invasion of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Ontario or any other part of the Dominion, and the Dominion government, in its wisdom and foresight, thought it necessary to incur an expense of that kind in order to ensure that portion of the Dominion against that danger, no one would think of charging that up to the particular province in which the danger arose. It would be treated as a national charge. And so, I say in regard to this charge, that the Canadian field force sent into the Yukon should not be considered as a charge against the Yukon. The Yukon did not ask for it, a good many people in there did not think it was necessary, and it was because the authorities of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and others thought there was some danger from the promiscuous character of the people and the surrounding country of an attempt to wrest the Yukon from Canada that this force was sent in. So in regard to the expenditure upon the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the Yukon territory. It is easy enough to say now that there was no excuse for expending upon that force the large amount shown in the Public Accounts. We are charged with an expenditure of five million and some hundreds of thousands of dollars upon the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. You will find that the major part of the expense was incurred during the few years when this danger of an attack upon the Yukon was feared—I do not mean an international attack but an attack from filibusters, and during that time the force was kept at a strength that certainly was not necessary to maintain order within the country. In regard to the expense of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the Yukon territory, it is reasonable and fair to charge against that territory the proportion of the expense of such a force as would be necessary to

maintain order within the territory. But the expense of that portion which was kept there as a sort of precaution against the danger of an attempt upon the country is a portion which should be charged not against the Yukon but should be considered a national charge, and I do hope that the Minister of Finance will so rectify these accounts in this regard. It was most natural to put them where they were put in the first instance, but they should not now be considered as charges against the Yukon. When one comes to ask for some vote for the Yukon, member after member will get up and say that the Yukon has been a loss to Canada instead of a profit, thus illustrating the unfairness of charging these extraordinary expenditures to that territory. In addition to that we are charged, not only with the original capital cost of the telegraph, but with the whole annual cost. I find that $600,000 of the cost was for the portion of the line in the province of British Columbia. Last year the expenses of operating that line were, in the Yukon territory, $62,000, and the total cost of operating it in British Columbia was $158,000. Although our cost was only $62,000 we are charged with $220,000. The total cost of constructing the telegraph line was something over $700,000; the cost of the portion in British Columbia was $600,000. That should be deducted. The cost of operating that line since its initiation in 1901 up to the present time has been $1,770,000, of which $500,000 have been expended in the Yukon, and have been charged against the Yukon. The way this occurs in regard to the telegraph is that originally it was treated as the Yukon system, and ever since all the expense incurred in British Columbia or anywhere else in connection with the Yukon telegraph system including even the branch line from Hazelton to Prince Rupert has been charged to the Yukon territory. I think the account should undergo revision in order to bring into it only those items which are legitimately and properly chargeable against the Yukon. I find in addition that $283,000, the amount paid as damages to Mackenzie and Mann are charged to the Yukon territory. I do not think it is fair to take that amount into consideration in estimating whether the Yukon has been a source of loss or profit to the Dominion of Canada. By including these various amounts the hon. member for North Toronto showed that the deficit of the Yukon amounted to $2,300,000. I think if that account were corrected in the way I have indicated and in the way that, I submit to the Finance Minister and this House, is the proper and legitimate way to correct it, it will be found that the Yukon has a surplus of over $3,500,000. In addition to that I wish to point out that it is utterly impossible to take the Yukon territory, or any other section of Canada, and make out from the public accounts the cost or benefit to the country of that particular section accurately and properly. The hon. member for North Toronto was surprised that while in 1900 and 1901 we had a surplus we had later used that up.

The government of this country adopted with the concurrence, with the express approval of the members of this House, a mistaken policy in the first place in respect to the Yukon Territory which was only corrected about 1901. It is the same policy as is being adopted to-day in the province of Ontario and, without any reflection on the motives for the enforcement of that policy, I repeat that it is a mistaken one. It is based on the idea that the rest of the country can take a large mining district and make money out of it for the other public services of the country. That is not right, it is not the correct policy with regard to any large mining territory to impose any taxes in addition to those which are imposed on the whole country and to expect that the rest of the country and not that particular territory will get the benefit of the special taxes so imposed. I think that a very few years will demonstrate the lack of wisdom, for instance of the province of Ontario, in thinking it can take such a large royalty from the mining production of Cobalt and other regions, and that the rest of Ontario outside those regions can derive any advantage from that royalty. Ontario will find a little later, when she has had more experience, that while it may be wise and proper to impose some measure of royalty upon the minerals produced in those districts it is absolutely essential that the income thus derived should be expended exclusively for the benefit of the districts from which it came. Down to 1901, the idea of this parliament and the idea generally prevailing was that these enormous sums of money that were coming out of the Yukon Territory should, some of them, find their way into the exchequer of Canada for the benefit of the rest of Canada, and as I say it was not until 1901 that this government realized, and adopted a policy founded on that realization, that the only sane and proper use to make of the royalty got from the Yukon territory was to devote it to local uses in the Yukon. Previous to that time we had no public building, the telegraph line was not constructed, we had no roads which are the absolutely essential needs of that country, and whatever large expenditure there was after 1900 was due to the fact that the government, as I think, realized that the royalty which they had received from that territory ought to be devoted to the development of that country. They adopted that policy and expended for these objects the surpluses which they had

previously piled up and the surplus of that year.

There are several causes which account for the reduction in the revenue from the Yukon since that time. In the first place, the royalty in the Yukon territory was ten per cent, which was subsequently reduced to five per cent and later to two and a half. Necessarily the year in which the royalty was reduced from ten per cent to five per cent showed a decrease in the revenue, and this decrease was still greater when the royalty was reduced to two and a half per cent. Then, in the beginning of the Yukon, the people of Canada made a greater mistake than any mistake which the government made. They were not very familiar with mining localities and made the great mistake of imagining that anything was good enough for a mining camp, whereas any one who knows anything about mining camps knows that nothing is too good for them. The miners have the money and will pay for good articles, especially if they are far away from commercial centres, because the cost of transportation is so great that they have adopted the wise policy of buying the very best. For instance, some Canadian manufacturers or merchants sent into the Yukon butter not fit for axle grease, and it took four or five years to get over the bad impression created in the Yukon by that horrible butter; only in recent years would people in that country eat Canadian butter which they now find as good as any produced in the world. That is one matter in which the farmers, or whoever were responsible for the butter made a mistake. Another matter in which the Canadian manufacturers erred was in respect to boilers. The country needed thousands of boilers. I have seen the streets of Dawson for half a mile piled up with small boilers and hoisting machinery. I came to manufacturers in the east and I know others came and asked them to meet that requirement of the Yukon and manufacture suitable boilers. Their answer was that their business was booming so rapidly that they could not undertake that business. One said that his business in the previous year had been so increased that he was obliged to double his capacity and if he attempted to fill the demand of the Yukon he would be obliged to still further increase his power of production and as a consequence he did not attempt to supply that market, and I venture to say that not one-half of one-quarter per cent of the boilers and hoisting machinery that went into that country came from Canada; it all came from the United States. The people of the Yukon were quite willing to buy in this country and made endeavours to buy here, but when Canada would not furnish the articles demanded, they were obliged to turn elsewhere.

Another cause of reduction in the revenue from the Yukon is the change of the customs, and if I may express my opinion on the subject I hope that the Ministers of Finance and Customs will recommend a further change, because I think there is no policy which can be wiser for Canada to pursue than the policy of making absolutely free those articles of machinery, those articles of necessity which go into a new country and are absolutely essential to build up its industries. Take the conditions in the Yukon. A mining proposition is of necessity always hazardous, and I maintain that as little taxation as possible should be imposed until the venture has been absolutely set afoot and has been proved to be a profitable one. By imposing large taxation at the beginning, you are crippling and perhaps rendering impossible an industry. Take for instance an industry that proposes to instal a large power plant to work mining machinery. It requires, in the first place, a large sum of money for installation. It is told that there is a heavy tariff on all machinery which it is required to import. That, of course, gives a little black eye to the scheme of promotion and then the promoters are obliged to pay a duty on that machinery at a time when their industry has not produced anything and is not in a position to produce anything, and when the promoters are not absolutely certain it will not be a failure. In one respect a royalty is the best of all taxes on a mining territory, because a man is only asked to pay when he has the money in his pocket to pay. A tariff on mining machinery is the worst form of taxation, because it is a tax at the very initiation of an industry, which may and does stop thousands of developments that otherwise would take place.

Another cause of reduction in revenue in the Yukon, is due to the increased proportion of Canadian manufactured products used in that country. In the earlier days the major part of the importations into the Yukon was of American origin. I shall not weary the House with figures, but, for instance, in 1899 the domestic importations into the Yukon amounted to only 9,800 odd tons. By St. Michael's there were imported 3,334 tons and via Whitehorse, 6,510 tons. a total of 9,844. Of foreign importations via St. Michael's. there were 12.000 tons, and via Whitehorse, 2,700 tons, making a total of foreign importations of 15,000 tons against 9,800 tons of domestic importations, the total importatons at that time being 24,856. Every effort was made by the Department of Customs and by every one in that country who had any authority to direct the trade of the Yukon territory into Canadian channels, and this effort was successful to the extent that in 1906 the do-

mestic importations into the Yukon were 14,309, and the foreign 10,698, so that you have about the same gross importations, but the proportions of Canadian and foreign goods are reversed between 1899 and 1906. The change in the source of the goods imported into the Yukon necessarily caused a falling off in the customs revenue from that territory, even although some of those goods that appear as domestic may be foreign. But let me give one instance to show how difficult it is to get at the exact revenue which the national treasury receives from any particular portion of Canadian territory. There is being installed about 40 or 50 miles below Dawson a large power plant which will distribute that power to Dawson and its vicinity, and furnish power which is absolutely essential for mining purposes. The company promoting that power plant were unable to make arrangements for the transportation of its machinery with the railway company that runs into the Yukon territory, and which I may say is the most horrible incubus that any country has ever laboured under. The power company were compelled to land their machinery at Vancouver, so that the province of British Columbia gets the credit for the revenue of $58,000 from the duty on that machinery, which is intended for and will eventually go to the Yukon. Of course it makes no difference so far as the revenue of the country as a whole is concerned, but if the Minister of Customs can find any way to credit that amount to the Yukon territory rather than to the province of British Columbia, I suggest that he should adopt it. That, however, is only one instance, and there are very many others of a similar kind which go to prove the suggestion with which I began, that it is impossible to show the revenue derived from any one section of the dominion. For example, I am informed that the customs revenue paid in the city of Montreal is one-third of the whole customs revenue of the Dominion of Canada, and while Montreal is a great city in a great province, yet there is no doubt that a very large part of the revenue paid there should be credited to other provinces in which the consumers who use the goods are located. In the same way, British Columbia gets credit for some of the revenue which should rightly be credited to the Yukon territory.

There is one other thing which I wish to say with regard to the Yukon territory before concluding my remarks, and that is that I think the government has adopted a correct policy in reducing to the very lowest possible amount the expenditure on the official administration of that territory. At one time undoubtedly the whole official staff employed in the Yukon was needed, and it is not an easy thing to determine the exact moment when a change in conditions renders it no longer necessary to retain the whole staff previously existing. However, I think that now the time has arrived when the official staff in the Yukon territory should be reduced, and I say that out of no spite or malice against any of the officials. I believe it has been intimated that I secured the dismissal of some of them for political reasons. Indeed, it has been stated in a despatch to the public press that they had incurred my displeasure because they refused to give $50 each as a contribution to a political campaign fund. Although, some newspapers have published that despatch, I notice that when these gentlemen who are alleged to have made the change were interviewed in Vancouver, if they were ever interviewed, they made no such statement as that credited to them. At all events I invite any hon. member of this House who wishes to investigate the charge, to go to any or all of these officials and I think he will find they will deny that they ever made such a statement. I might add that I never made a request from them or from any man in my life for a contribution to my own or to any other campaign fund, and any one who knows me knows that I am one of the worst collectors that ever appeared in any country; I cannot collect even my own debts not to speak of collecting campaign funds. I may point out also that not one of the gentlemen who have been dismissed in the Yukon territory has had his place supplied by another official. He was dismissed simply for the purpose of economizing, and so far from having any malice against them I have been eager to induce the government to adopt a system by which when it becomes necessary to get rid of an official in the Yukon he shall not be set adrift like an old horse but that he shall be transferred to some other branch of the service of the government, corresponding perhaps to the service he was in in the Yukon territory. I hope the members of the government will endeavour to carry out that idea, so that these officials may be transferred from places where they are not needed to offices where their services will be of benefit to the country. I am particularly desirous of reducing the expenses of administration in the Yukon in order that there may be a larger amount available for developing the resources of that rich country. I could spend hours, Mr. Speaker, dilating on the possibilities of the Canadian Yukon. There are I know some who imagine that its days of prosperity have passed, but I can assure them that the beginning of the development of the Yukon has not yet come. I am supported in this belief by those who know the territory best and who declare that the

output from placer gold mining will increase year by year for many years to come. It will continue beyond the life of even the youthful member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers). Apart from the placer yield of the country there are the most wonderful deposits of quartz. You cannot turn in any direction without finding quartz leads, quartz ledges, and stringers, which were it not for the excessive cost of transportation would be developed at once. We have scores and scores of mines which were they situated at an accessible place would to-day be developed and yielding profits. There are, however, mines at the threshold of the territory at Carcross which are being developed. No enormous amount has been expended upon them because in the development of a large mine half a million dollars is inconsiderable, but, they will no doubt greatly add to the mineral wealth of that territory. Then you pass to Whitehorse and you have at a crescent of territory twenty-five miles in extent on which you can scarcely go 200 yards without finding outcrop of copper of the highest grade. Recently on the dome between Hunker and Dominion Creeks they have struck at one place on the 550 foot level and at another place at the 100 foot level indications of the good paying quartz. Last summer from the Mackenzie river side, the prospectors returned with specimens of some of the richest quartz ever known. Of course I do not know whether it will turn out as anticipated, but at all events the existence of these minerals in every quarter shows that the mining industry in the Yukon territory is practically only in the same initial stage that it is in British Columbia and in Ontario. I do not think it would be rash to say that within twenty-five years Canada will exceed any country in the world in its mineral production. Then, experience has taught us, as in the case of the northern regions, and Cobalt, and Gowganda, that the best thing to promote settlement in a territory is mineral discovery, because the minerals will not only yield wealth themselves but they will bring in population which will remain there to develop agriculture and other natural resources. The subject is perhaps more entertaining to me than it is to the members of the House, and I must apologize for detaining hon. gentlemen at such length, but at all events I feel confident that the Yukon territory deserves the encouragement of the government and of the country in the development of its extraordinarily rich resources.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

Mr. CONGDON.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 30) An Act respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—Mr. Lavergne.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) An Act to incorporate l'Institut Notre-Dame des Missions.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Taylor (New Westminster).

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. Stratton.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 92) respecting a Patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—Mr. McGiverin.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). The budget debate, Mr. Speaker, is a wonderful institution. It allows the erudite scholar to exhibit his knowledge of the dead languages, and to some others it gives the opportunity to expose their dense ignorance as to the conditions of this country. It appears to me that it is largely used by hon. gentlemen opposite to vie with one another in lavishing praise on the present administration; and I have no doubt that they have succeeded in impressing on our cabinet ministers the conviction that to their administration is due every advantage which the country now enjoys. To their wisdom is due everything from the copious rains that have blessed our soil as well as the withholding from the supposedly free citizens of Ottawa their rights and privileges in this House. Judging by this debate, we have to wander abroad in order to learn some things of our own country. I have lived in the west a considerable number of years and thought I knew something about it, but this debate has revealed some wonderful things about

it. We have heard a great deal about the railway development in that country, and I would like to give to the House some experience respecting the constituency I represent, a constituency consisting of 16,000,000 acres of land, or something over 25,000 square miles. When the Conservative party went out of power in 1896, there were 350 miles of railway in operation in that constituency. Since then there has been added, during all these years of peace and plenty, some 80 or 90 miles of railway to the mileage then in operation. We all know that the Railway Department receives statements from the railway corporations on the 30th of June each year, giving their mileage. I have not the figures before me, but I know that the statements made to the Railway Department on the 30th June, 1908 and 1909, in so far as Alberta is concerned, do not show the increase of one mile of railway, while in the province of Saskatchewan some 500 or 600 miles were added during 1909. We all know that railways are being built in Alberta as well as Saskatchewan; I merely mention these figures to show the preponderance of railway construction in Saskatchewan over that in Alberta.

Now, I had not the slightest thought of taking part in this debate, nor would I do so now were it not that the Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, made certain references to the postal revenues with which I cannot agree. And I feel that I would not be doing my duty to the people who sent me here if I allowed the views thus expressed to go unchallenged. There was evident pleasure in the announcement of that hon. gentleman that the policy of his government—a policy which undertakes to make money out of the Post Office—had yielded him such a handsome profit. Last session, when he was engaged in a similar task, I very well remember—if I may so put it—his gleeful reference to the splendid surplus from that department. The late administration has been criticised in this House and in the country because it conducted the Post Office Department with a deficit. I am not so sure that we should criticise that government for such a policy. I hold the opinion that an intelligent government, in upbuilding a young country, should not attempt to turn shekels from the post office into the treasury. We might as well turn our militia service into a money-making establishment. I assume we are an intelligent people. I presume the Minister of the Interior is endeavouring to get intelligent people to come into this country with whom we will share our citizenship. And I believe that one of the requisites of an intelligent people is an up-to-date mail service, in other words, I believe that the intelligence of a country, to a large extent, is measured by the character of its mail service. We invite people to come here and settle upon our undeveloped areas, and turn over the sod. They are the men who are making Canada. We ask them to take their families away from older settled sections in other countries, to deprive them of the privileges and comforts that they enjoy there and to go out pioneering for us, in short, to turn their backs upon civilization and to go forty or fifty or seventy miles away from railway facilities. And when they ask us to give them a new post office or more frequent service than a weekly one, I say we are not justified in sometimes returning the answer that the service will not warrant the expenditure—in other words, that the service must be self-supporting. In support of that statement, I wish to read an extract from a letter recently received from the Post Office Department:

> The offers received for the performance of the mail service to the proposed office, are moreover so high as compared with the probable revenue of the office as to render it impossible for the department to consider the establishment of a post office at this point at present.

I do not think it necessary to refer to other communications, but merely read that one in justification of the statement I made. Besides, we are specifically taxing the periodicals which follow our settlers from the United States into our country. I have before me an account rendered against myself by the 'Literary Digest,' published in the city of New York, the annual subscription to which is $3. That figure will deliver it in England, in Alaska or anywhere in the United States. But the first item that I see on this account is 'Canadian postage, 85 cents'—or 28 per cent of the price that will deliver it ten times further than Canada. And this has to be borne by the subscribers in this country on account of the regulations of our post office. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to throw up their hats because of the results of the post office service, we have excellent opportunity to see how they are obtained, and for my part, I do not believe in such a system. The United States does not assume to tax the papers which follow our people who settle in their country—and I wish to announce that there are a few people going out of this country as well as coming in. The United States does not attempt to turn its post office service into a money-making establishment, and I do not think we should attempt it either. I am very sorry that the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat. I told him this afternoon that I wished to make reference to some matters in his department. I believe that the officials of his department are doing all in their power to serve the public; I have no complaint to make against the officials.

Nor have I any complaint to make against the Postmaster General, but wish to acknowledge the courtesy he extends to me from his seat in this House. But when it comes to another feature of his administration, the political end of it, I am determinedly opposed to the system. I believe that in a free country like this, our Post Office Department should be organized free of political managers. I believe that local pooh-bahs should not be appointed as dispensers of post offices. If the people elect a representative to this House and select wisely but not well according to hon. gentlemen opposite, then there is a gentleman in the west selected as a pooh-bah, as purveyor of post offices. I have evidence of this—any quantity of it. And I say that this is wrong. It is immaterial to me what government adopts that policy, I say that the sooner it is changed the better it will be for a young country like Canada. I would like to see the Postmaster General place more post office inspectors at work in the west. And when a petition for a post office is handed in, if the inspector, on looking over the ground, states that a post office should be established and that John Smith would be a good man to appoint as postmaster, that should settle the matter clear of politicians. That is what the country wants. I received letters from the Postmaster General last session in which he informed me that he had done certain things and added a paragraph to the effect that he had done so at the request of a gentleman in the constituency whom he evidently constituted a purveyor of post offices. I do not object to any one assisting in securing a post office; it is a matter of indifference to me who helps to get it or by whom it is secured so long as it is secured. I wonder if the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has the idea that unless he puts such a paragraph in his letters, I will go into my constituency and say to the people: 'I have got the Widow Jones this post office at the munificent sum of $10 a year?' so that they will think I am a wonderful individual, or that I will try to impress the man who is keeping a stopping place at which the mail service passes once a week that I am a wonderful individual because I have succeeded in getting a service twice a week, whereby he is able to sell double the amount of oats for the mail driver's horses, which gives him that additional profit. If that is the conception of the Postmaster General as to the duties of a public man in this country, I may say that I do not see eye to eye with him.

The Finance Minister appeared to take a good deal of pleasure out of a statement which he presented to this House dealing with the debt per capita. So far as I can see, in a country which grows by natural means, the debt per head is a very fair measure of the intelligence of the financial administration of the country; but where a country is growing by leaps and bounds, I cannot see that the net debt per head is any measure of intelligence on the part of the hon. gentleman opposite. I have taken the liberty to extend the hon. gentleman's figures. His statement shows in its first column the population between the years 1891 and 1910, and in the next column the net debt. Then he gives the net debt per head. It indicates that in 1891 the net debt per head was $49.09, and that during the present year it will be about $45.85, or a reduction of $3.24. Now our net debt, I understand, represents money borrowed on the London market, and we have to pay on it, in the neighbourhood of 4 per cent interest. As to this reduction of $3.24, it simply means, a tax on a 4 per cent basis of about 13 cents per head each year. I believe I am correct in that. I have extended the hon. gentleman's figures, showing what that interest amounts to on the net debt per head, and I have added another column, showing taxes gathered from customs and excise during the year in question. I have added still another column showing what the taxes amount to per head during the years mentioned:

TABLE GIVING CERTAIN INFORMATION REGARDING POPULATION OF CANADA, TAXES COLLECTED AND NET DEBT PER HEAD, WITH 4 PER CENT INTEREST ON SAME.

Year.	Population.	Net Debt.	Net debt per head.	4 p. c. interest on Net Debt per head.	Taxes, Customs and Excise.	Taxes collected per head.	Taxes collected from average family of five and purposes to which applied.			Year
							Purposes to which applied.		Total collected.	
							General	4 p.c. Interest on Net Debt.		
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
1891..	4,844,366	237,809,030 51	49 09	1 96	30,314,151 15	6 26	21 50	9 80	31 30	1891
1892..	4,889,266	241,131,434 44	49 15	1 97	28,446,157 31	6 43	22 30	9 85	32 15	1892
1893..	4,935,748	241,681,039 61	48 96	1 96	29,321,367 42	5 91	19 75	9 80	29 55	1893
1894..	4,983,903	246,183,029 48	49 40	1 98	27,579,203 09	5 53	17 75	9 90	27 65	1894
1895..	5,003,839	253,074,927 09	50 57	2 02	25,446,198 71	5 08	15 30	10 10	25 40	1895
1896..	5,086,061	258,497,432 77	50 82	2 03	27,759,285 42	5 45	17 10	10 15	27 25	1896
1897..	5,141,508	261,538,596 46	50 87	2 03	28,648,626 11	5 57	17 70	10 15	27 85	1897
1898..	5,199,267	263,956,398 91	50 77	2 03	29,576,455 64	5 69	18 30	10 15	28 45	1898
1899..	5,259,491	266,273,446 60	50 62	2 02	34,958,069 21	6 65	23 15	10 10	33 25	1899
1900..	5,322,348	265,493,806 89	49 88	2 00	38,242,222 99	7 18	25 90	10 00	35 90	1900
1901..	5,413,370	268,480,003 69	49 59	1 98	38,743,550 28	7 34	26 80	9 90	36 70	1901
1902..	5,537,500	271,829,089 62	49 08	1 96	43,389,111 87	7 83	29 35	9 80	39 15	1902
1903..	5,712,190	261,606,988 87	45 79	1 83	49,015,505 90	8 58	33 75	9 15	42 90	1903
1904..	5,890,096	260,867,718 60	44 29	1 77	53,661,318 84	9 11	36 70	8 85	45 55	1904
1905..	6,091,136	266,224,166 60	43 70	1 75	54,020,123 40	8 86	35 55	8 75	44 30	1905
1906..	6,323,557	267,042,977 75	42 23	1 69	60,074,818 19	9 50	34 05	8 45	42 50	1906
1907..	6,655,904	263,671,859 96	39 61	1 58	.....	**	.....	.....	.....	1907 (9m.)
1908..	6,863,500	277,960,859 84	40 49	1 62	73,325,962 93	10 68	45 30	8 10	53 40	1908
1909..	7,145,040	323,930,279 17	45 33	1 81	62,353,093 12	8 72	34 55	9 05	43 60	1909
1910..	*7,450,990	*341,680,279 17	45 85	1 83	*70,057,636 05	9 40	37 85	9 15	47 00	1910

* Estimated. ** 9 months period.

These figures go to show that the present administration has received vastly greater sums of money from the people of Canada than the previous administration. My object is to place the figures on record, and people can do their own analysing. I do not believe in attempting to analyse figures for the constituency I represent in this House, because they have the intelligence to do that for themselves. As it is a frequent custom of hon. gentlemen opposite to compare the records of the past government with the present government, I have decided to place on record two statements showing what amounts of money have been placed in the hands of the two governments respectively. For instance, my first statement shows the moneys entrusted by the people of Canada to the present Liberal administration for expenditures during twelve and three-quarter years, from 30th June, 1896 to 31st March, 1909.

Total receipts from all sources collected by this government during above period..	$823,867,836 55
Total amount borrowed, thereby increasing public debt, during period named..	152,817,890 29
Total..	$976,685,726 84

The other statement I desire to present to the House shows the moneys entrusted by the people of Canada to the late Conservative administration for expenditure during the 13 years ending the 30th June, 1896:

Total receipts from all sources collected by that government during above period..	$468,803,460 35
Total amount borrowed, thereby increasing public debt, during period named..	123,558,432 43
Total..	$592,361,892 78

The difference in the two totals above is $384,323,834. In other words, the present administration has had the control of nearly $400,000,000 more during the twelve and three-quarter years mentioned, than the total moneys controlled by the late Conservative government during the thirteen years preceding the change of government. To be exact, the difference referred to means an average annual amount of $30,-

143,045 which the present government has yearly been expending (down to the date of the last available figures, 31st March, 1909) over and above the average annual amount which the preceding Conservative government controlled for expenditure during practically a similar period. These figures I have taken from the public accounts, and I am satisfied they are all right.

There is another matter to which I would like to refer briefly. We are frequently told that Canada is a great country. Unquestionably she is possessed of great natural resources, of vast virgin wealth. But if she is going to be great, she is already on the highroad towards great and grave crises. We need not attempt to overlook that, because the fact is evident. Great internal questions will arise, and none more important perhaps than the conservation of our natural resources for the people, so that predatory wealth may not get loose among our natural resources, as it unfortunately has done to a considerable extent in the United States. Then we will have great issues to settle with our neighbours, and with other countries. Let me take the case of a great industry which employs to look after its interests a prominent legal firm, which knows the business of that corporation from the ground up. Now, if that firm should have some legal controversy with another firm, its solicitors will be able to look after its interests properly. Now to what extent are we moving in that direction? Very slowly, so far as I can see. It is a great pleasure to me to visit the campus of some of our universities and see the young men they are turning out. It is a refreshing sight to see the photographs of the faculties of our different universities. They are loaded with intelligence. The young men who pass out of those universities are absorbed, largely, into our commercial and professional life, while many of them leave the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to see this government make some arrangement with the presidents of our universities for throwing a mesh around the graduating classes in say, arts and engineering, and what the sieve held back to throw some of them into our Archives, and keep them there for a few years under proper direction, investigating old treaties, &c. Sir, if we should do that it would return us our expenditure ten times, nay, a hundred times, more than such a service would cost us. Let us start in this country an engineering branch, an engineering board, as other countries have done. These men will be of great utility to the nation when important questions come up in this country for consideration. If we could breed such an investigating force into the life of this country, it would mean much for Canada—that is, if we are going to be a great people; of course, if we are not going to be a great people, it is unnecessary to look into the future. But I believe we should do it, and if we do, my opinion is there will in the future be less opportunity to make the charge that Great Britain has surrendered our rights in an attempt to appease some other nation.

I want to offer a few remarks regarding our outside service. A few years ago, previous to the last general election, we had the inside service placed under a commission. The outside service is still in the same old condition. The members of the inside service were advised that they were to receive an increase in salary previous to election. The outside service have not been so treated. Unfortunately for them they are not hived together in any locality, but I believe, Sir, it is our duty to place the outside service under a commission and to do it at once. If they have any rights, if they are entitled to increases, by all means let them have increases, but put them in a position in which they can be properly looked after. I occasionally visit the public accounts committee of this House of parliament and I see some things that are not particularly agreeable to me as a citizen of this country. I see officials of the outside service brought before that committee. I have in my mind at the present time an instance in which a gentleman who almost forgot his name when under examination by hon gentlemen opposite on this side of the House but, when he happened to be taken in hand by hon. gentlemen opposite it took almost twenty gentlemen to carry away what he had to give. Was that gentleman so seriously to blame? It is true that he gave his sacred oath that he would tell the truth and nothing but the truth, but I fear very much, Sir, that he juggled with the truth. His bread and butter was at stake with the political head of his department gazing into his countenance conveying the intelligence that if he should allow himself to give away any idea that should injure the government his official position would not be worth the paper on which it was written. Was that right? I do not care what government is in power, the system is wrong. Probably that man has a family whose bread and butter is at stake. Let us get these things right because I realize that political parties are drawn from the people of this country and that the same policy might result in the same effects. I am not going to make an admission of that sort, but it is probable and we want on this side of the House to see that method done away with.

We had the sight in this House some few weeks ago of no less a personage than the Prime Minister so entangled in the rules and regulations that he could not get

footloose in order to let the people of the city of Ottawa have their proper representation in this House. I am not going to say anything against the premier. I have no thought or desire to do it, but I am going to say something else. Where do the people of Ottawa come in? The criticism is too frequently levelled at public men in this country that they are not doing their duty. I would like to know what the people of Ottawa have been doing all this time. Has there been any effort on their part to have this matter rectified? As far as I can see there has not. I may be treading on dangerous ground but the spice of life comes to a man who steps out of the beaten track and freely expresses his views and I want the people of Ottawa to know my view of the matter. If that condition of affairs existed in the city of London there would be a few processions passing back and forth in front of the Prime Minister's door in Downing street, and I think that if we had that kind of energy shown by the people in this new country it would be better for the country.

I do not see my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in his seat, but I want to offer him my condolences, because I think I can sincerely offer them, in the loss of the deputy minister of Railways and Canals. The business of this government is the biggest business in the country and it is an astonishing state of affairs that the largest corporation—the country itself—can afford to allow smaller corporations to take from them men of that character. I suppose it is done by paying them more money. I say it is regrettable that this gentleman should be allowed to pass out of the service of this country. I have had the pleasure of meeting him occasionally, and I feel that we had occupying this position a gentleman of the very highest ability and a credit to whoever selected him for the place. I have had a very high opinion of him and not only of him but of many others among the deputy ministers. I merely wanted to put myself on record in that respect. Now, Sir, I have nothing further to say and I thank the hon. gentlemen for the attention they have given me.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, with the year 1908 the whole world entered into a most difficult period for industry and commerce.

Throughout the economic crisis, Canada has been able to preserve unscathed her financial prestige, and the people at large are to be congratulated upon their steadfastness in the midst of numerous difficulties. Our financial institutions have, by their prudent, skilful and enlightened policy avoided economic disaster. They now require from the government the opening of new avenues for the extension of our trade, in order to be able to compete successfully against the organized effort of foreign nations.

Foreign trade is a sure indication of the progress or decadence of any nation. There can therefore be no financial question of more paramount importance than the choice of our commercial representatives in the different countries with which we trade.

On May 14, 1909, we had seventeen trade commissioners and six commercial agents abroad. Did those gentlemen possess the requisite qualifications for the promotion of our commerce? Are they in a position to enlighten us as to the best means of shaping the national effort on the newest lines of production and sale? The greater nations have commercial representatives stationed systematically in all civilized countries. They are the great commercial travellers of trade and industry. Such servants of the state must be active and disinterested instruments of our commercial expansion.

In every country with which we trade in agricultural or manufactured products, our commercial agents should be men of good education and well informed as to our natural wealth and economic conditions. To Canada, the markets of Great Britain and of the United States are at present the most important. But we have only four commercial agents in the British Isles, and none in the United States, in Belgium or in Germany. We desire to extend our trade with France, but we have only one commercial agent at Paris. Every country desirous of extending its trade relations should secure influential commercial representatives.

A magnificent future may be reserved to the foreign trade of the Dominion if we make an effort towards training young men for such service, and take care to send out only carefully selected persons.

Our universities taking, as they do, so constant an interest in the progress of the Canadian people, might undertake the training of young men for our commercial and consular service.

If we desire that our agricultural, forest and mining products should be disposed of to the best advantage, we should endeavour to improve and perfect the means of transportation. During the financial year 1908-9, the ordinary and special expenditures of the country amounted to $126,000,000, and the public debt was increased by $45,000,000.

Among the special expenditures, those incurred by the construction of the National Transcontinental were the most important; they amounted to $24,892,351 during the fiscal year. This year we will spend, under the same head, twenty millions, and during the fiscal year 1910-11, twenty-seven millions.

I desire to make a few remarks concerning the section of the Transcontinental be-

tween Quebec and Moncton. On November 29, 1909, the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals made the following statement: 'According to Mr. Lumsden's estimate, the total cost of this section will amount to $26,935,902, exclusive of the Quebec bridge, the section leading to it and the terminals at Quebec. On November 13, 1909, $17,334,113 had been spent.'

The construction of the Transcontinental is of vital importance to the people of southeastern Quebec, and I hope the government will make all speed in completing the Quebec-Moncton section. Farmers whose holdings are situated to the south of our beautiful hills, have contributed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway and to the prodigious development of the west. They have really earned their right to a legitimate share in the advantages of our great national undertakings.

In my opinion, the government should have long ago constructed a railway through the southeast region of the province of Quebec in order to develop its natural resources.

Such a railway might have joined the Intercolonial at certain points and thus perfected our national railway. We have sunk more than 80 millions in the Intercolonial and the financial results have been deplorable. A line running from Edmundston, through the colonization townships of Kamouraska, L'Islet, Montmagny, Bellechasse and Dorchester and joining the Intercolonial in the county of Levis, might have secured financial prosperity to the government railway.

A railway through that country would give a vigorous impulse to colonization, agriculture and forest industries in the valley beyond the southern hills. That is a country where the producer requires means of communication with the consumer, the same rule applying here as in all outlying regions aspiring to be linked with the centres of commercial activity. The agricultural and forest wealth of the country to be opened by the Transcontinental railway between Quebec and Moncton does not appear to be very generally understood.

The people of the district will not be content with the Transcontinental alone. Between that railway line and the frontier extends a broad plateau richly wooded and very fertile. We are at present negotiating with the directors of the Quebec Central railway for a road running from St. George, of Beauce, to the Temiscouata railway. The Quebec Central Railway Company has performed patriotic work in the county of Beauce and in the Eastern Townships, and we hope that their efforts will prove at least as useful in the southeastern part of the province. The proposed line is bound to develop a very important and brisk

trade throughout the region and with Quebec, its natural market for agricultural products. When the Transcontinental and Quebec Central railways come into operation there the wealth developed in the border townships will be a revelation. In a new country, agriculture, commerce and industry cannot develop without adequate means of transportation which, for the most part, must be by rail.

The directors of the Quebec Central railway have made considerable sacrifices and they deserve government help for the extension of their system.

Let me once more state that the city of Quebec is our agricultural market. On the prosperity of the city of Quebec depends in a great measure that of the whole of the eastern portion of the province. We are desirous of making a national mart of the old historic city and we hope that the government will help us in our endeavour. Our object and our desire is to place it on an equal footing with the ports of Boston, of Portland and even of New York. Deep water wharfs with modern appliances should be immediately constructed.

Very important deputations have waited upon the government representing the necessity of the immediate construction of a dry dock large enough to accommodate modern shipping. Government is also in a position to understand that the present legislation concerning dry docks has fallen behind the requirements of trade. I hope the minister will be able to accede to the wishes of the representatives of the district of Quebec.

No generous effort should be spared to promote agricultural progress. As the hon. the Minister of Agriculture said on the 3rd March, 1909, 'Without scientific guidance, practical agriculture in our country and on this continent, cannot hope to make that progress which would be otherwise assured.' The establishment of an experimental farm in the district of Quebec would secure many necessary reforms and render still more popular the ideal of scientific agricultural development. I am convinced that in the course of the present session the government will ask the House for an adequate sum of money with the view of establishing an experimental farm in the eastern portion of the province of Quebec. By this means we would be enabled to appreciate the beneficial effects of the important resolution submitted on March 3rd, 1909, by my hon. friend the member for Kamouraska, with respect to agricultural experimental stations.

All the people of this country are greatly interested in the Intercolonial railway, but those who are particularly concerned in the administration of this great national railway are the people of the maritime provinces and of the Lower St. Lawrence val-

ley. It would take too much time, at the present moment, to inquire into the causes of a deficit that has reached the enormous sum of $2,300,000 between 1905 and 1906. At a time when all the important railways give large returns to their shareholders, the financial results of the operation of the Intercolonial railway are most deplorable.

I wish to make a few remarks concerning the advisabilty, or even the necessity of having a French speaking representation of the province of Quebec on the Government Railways Commission. On the 20th April, 1909, the government instituted a commission for the administration of the state railways. The said commission, specially entrusted with the administration of the Intercolonial railway is composed of four commissioners: Messrs. J. Butler, Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, D. Pottinger, E. Giffin, traffic manager, and T. P. Bready.

Mr. Butler resides at Ottawa, and the other commissioners are stationed at Moncton. At the opening of a new era in the history of the Intercolonial railway, the government had ample opportunity to deal justice to the French-speaking section of the population, I have nothing to say against the integrity of the present members of the commission, but the complete elimination of the French Caandians and of the French language, in the composition of the commission, constitute a most serious grievance. It is a hardship that is sorely resented by the population of that section of the country, as it might imply the inferiority of the French race in Canada.

The Intercolonial railway runs through a portion of the province of Quebec and is doing there a large traffic. In the maritime provinces the Intercolonial railway runs through large centres where the French-speaking population is taking an important part in agriculture, in commerce and in industry.

The Intercolonial railway has been constructed with the money of the people of this country. The province of Quebec contributes its full share to the federal treasury and in the receipts of the road.

The French province of the confederation has paid large sums for the construction, the maintenance and the improvement of the railway, and in spite of all that, the government did not think proper to appoint a single French Canadian on that commission.

I submit that the presence of a French commissioner is a necessity to properly discuss the great transportation problem in the province of Quebec, to deal wih the question of rates, of operation, of reorganization of the staff, of appointments and dismissals.

The French Canadians are obliged to use the English language in their dealing with that commission. Can it be said that that does not constitute an injustice?

Several workmen on the road, French-speaking workmen, have been dismissed by the commissioners, and they complain of race prejudice; they are under the impression that they are victims to organized plots to lessen French influence, and they look to the commissioners as oppressors of their nationality. Surely the commissioners are inspired by higher principles and purer motives, but nevertheless, it is with a sense of great humiliation that I see that the French race and the French language have been completely ignored in the composition of a commission appointed to deal with questions in which thousands and thousands of my fellow countrymen are interested.

I wish with all my heart that the administration of that commission will be successful. It should be composed of men having a thorough knowledge of the economic, and social and commercial conditions of the country, but I submit that we could find amongst the French Canadians men fully qualified to fill that high position.

All I am asking from the government is that they adhere to the spirit of the contract of 1867. I do not suppose that we could find in this House any one disposed to deny the rights of the French language, but it seems to me that the demands of our national life are not always well understood.

Two nationalities equally proud, equally strong, equally intelligent are engaged in the same progressive path, and happily, thanks to our constitution, all British subjects are guaranteed equal rights.

The French race has representatives in the federal cabinet, in the Supreme Court, in the Railway Commission, in the National Transcontinental Commission, and in all the great public institutions of the country.

In the provincial government of Quebec, in the courts of the French province the English speaking minority is also fully represented. The French speaking population of Ontario have a representative in the government of that province. In the name of justice, I say that the French Canadians should be represented in a commission appointed to deal with questions in which they are greatly interested. The appointment of a French speaking commissioner would be in the interest of the public and also in the interest of the employees of the road.

This exclusion of a French representative on the administrative board of the Intercolonial railway tends to strengthen a feeling that cannot be but distasteful to our nationality always so generous towards other nationalities. Unhappily, some people in this country are under the impression

that there is in Canada a dominant race, whose representatives are controlling all the highest positions and an inferior race, whose representatives are hardly fit for second rank.

I have exposed to the House a serious grievance and I hope that the government will see the necessity to appoint a French Canadian on the administrative board of the state railways.

We have just learned that Mr. Butler, the president of the board has resigned and the time seems to be well chosen to ask for justice. Here is a most significant article published by 'La Patrie' yesterday:

Who will succeed Mr. Butler as deputy minister of Railways and president of the Intercolonial Railway Commission?

It is very likely that the government will avail themselves of the departure of Mr. Butler to appoint a French Canadian on the Intercolonial Commission.

A good part of that road runs through our province, and is handling the traffic on the south shore between Quebec and Montreal. It seems to us that it would be only just to appoint a French Canadian on that board of administration.

We are inclined to think that Mr. Graham, so well known as a broad-minded minister, will be glad to accede to the wishes of our population.

I think my request is a just one and in line with the feelings of Canadians of all nationalities desirous of securing peace and prosperity to their country by mutual respect for all.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec county). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to acknowledge that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) has exhibited much moderation in his requests; it is a good point, not only for himself, but also for the party to which he belongs, a party from which, generally, we cannot expect such broad-mindedness and such a sense of justice.

I do not take into account the few last sentences uttered by my hon. friend. He has allowed his patriotic passion to get the best of him and he probably went further than he intended to go. In criticising a simple act of administration he, unhappily, said more than what he had in his mind and he has given the impression that there is amongst the members of this side of the House a preconcerted intention of humbling a section of the population of this country.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) My hon. friend will allow me to tell him that my remarks were never intended to carry that impression.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) I accept the explanation given by my hon. friend; it does him credit, and I will drop the matter. As for the other remarks of the hon. member for L'Islet, I think they are entirely in line with the ideas of the majority in this House, a majority that also represents the majority of the electors of the country.

In his opening remarks, the hon. member urged the necessity of further extending our commercial relations with foreign countries and of organizing a thorough system of consuls and commercial agents. The thing exists already, and though it may not be as perfect as the same institutions in other great countries, we have good reasons to believe that before long Canada will have its own diplomatic service for administrative and commercial purposes, and that legislation to that end will be submitted to the sanction of the electors, through their representatives in parliament.

That question is not a new one; it has been discussed before. I remember that when it was proposed to have a Canadian attaché at the English embassy in the United States, to watch Canadian interests in that country, the right hon. Prime Minister stated that the time had not come yet for a change. I do not think it would be proper for me to go beyond that statement made by the man entrusted with the administration of this country.

The hon. member for L'Islet, speaking of the National Transcontinental, said it was a national, a necessary and an indispensable enterprise. That admission on his part may go a long way to atone for a lot of sins of a party that for years has assailed the policy of the government in this matter. To-day it is readily admitted that the construction of that road must be pushed to completion as rapidly as possible, and that, as a consequence, it is necessary to provide the means, that is to say, the large sums without which it is not possible to complete a work of such magnitude.

I am totally in accord with the hon. member for L'Islet when he states that the progress of the city of Quebec is essential to the progress, the expansion and the development of eastern Canada. It is indispensable that we should have a connecting link between the city of Quebec and eastern Canada, and the construction of the Quebec bridge is an absolute necessity for the commercial and industrial development of the country.

I admit that a serious accident has occurred, and I have even heard an hon. member on the other side jeering at the matter. But an accident can be overcome, and the more so with a government such as the one which presides over the destinies of the country. The greatest misfortune can then be overcome, and that is the reason why, at this very session, we have in the estimates a vote of one million dollars for the preliminary disbursements entailed by the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge. I have not the least doubt that the money will be

voted without discussion, as it is the first step in the improvement of our transportation system.

The honourable member for l'Islet has also criticised the management of the Intercolonial. I feel rather inclined to share his views; still, if there have been deficits, it is not owing to the Liberal government's policy, but to that of the preceding Conservative governments. Since many years, the tradition of deficits has been transmitted by the Conservative governments that consecutively managed this line. A known fact is, that much efforts are being done towards covering those deficits, and amending the management generally.

I do not pretend that the work of reform undertaken by the hon. Minister of Railways shall at once put an end to the deficits of the Intercolonial; but, what I believe, and what seems to be the prevailing opinion of the moment is, that the information of a special commission such as the one appointed, is bound to bring the railway on the basis of a financial business. I do not mean to say that this commission has given everybody satisfaction, not in the manner in which the line has been managed by its members—I do not pretend that perfection has crowned the first efforts—as perfection does not exist in the world—but I state that under the circumstances, the creation of a commission formed of four members to manage this line constitutes a remarkable progress compared to the old system; it shows how anxious this government is to put an end to a very bad management.

The complaints on the members of this commission were filed independently of the channel of the member for l'Islet, and that, long ago. It is possible that the government met with unavoidable obstacles in the pursuance of its policy. There is a favourable occasion to redress a mistake or do what has been, so far, forgotten, and we think, on this side of the House, that the government will rectify such mistake or do what had been forgotten. We trust the government to be very just, and we believe that if wrongs exist, they shall be promptly redressed, since a favourable occasion is presently at hand. As regards the formation of this commission, we are all of opinion—not only the French-speaking members, but the English members also—that this board of management for national railways should contain at least one French commissioner. This request was often made in my presence, and I know it is the government's intention to grant it.

As a member of an agricultural county, it seems to me, that when the times comes to furnish the government with the necessary sums to administer the affairs of the country for the coming fiscal year, it is not strictly urgent to study, to weigh all the theories concerning free trade and protection, or to go backward to see if the methods of the past were ahead of or worse than the present. The people, whose attributions are to decide about these matters every four or five years, determine to the best of their judgment what party is more fit to hold the power. Now, one party has the supremacy, then it is the other. In certain details the methods are somewhat different; practically, I believe that the fundamental principles of the administration are the same with either party in power. What is certain, since 1896, when the actual government took the reins, the people thought the public affairs well directed since the same men were elected three or four different times to attend to public interests. Nobody, I think, except those whose ambition is to see the power come to their side—nobody, I think, amongst the people, has complained that the management was bad or dishonest and contrary to the pubic interest.

In the objections filed by the members of the opposition, what is most remarkable is that they each have their sore spot, and think they have discovered something crooked in the management of this country or region. But, as regards the country generally as a nation, the depression which was talked about does not exist either in commerce or in the industries, and as far as the citizen's pride is concerned, nothing shows that the people is wrongly governed nor that he has reasons to complain of the administration. It is all the contrary, it seems that the commerce is taking much extension, that industry is more active and makes much progress and that the people is generally satisfied of its lot. I do not pretend that this state of affairs is totally and exclusively due to the government; I don't belong to the class of people who believe that the governments can make the people happy or unhappy, prosperous or not; but on the other hand, I believe that in a society such as ours, where aspirations are apt to cause frictions and sometimes much dissentions, much credit is due to those who hold the power to administer the business of this immense country without bringing conflict amongst these different aspirations, but on the contrary to help to the harmony which contributes to the general welfare. It is the state of affairs that we witness actually, and as far as the agricultural counties are concerned, those on which the government is supposed to bestow more attention, I feel satisfied that things are going altogether well.

I know very well that the supporters of the protection policy who sit on the other side of the House would like to see a higher tax put on foreign industrial products. They are of opinion that it would be an issue to develop our national indus-

try, and that, consequently the farmers would have the benefit of it. The interests of the greater number is to be taken into consideration would be the answer to that argument which seems to be somewhat catchy.

All the question would be to find out whether the producers are more numerous than the consumers. As the industrial class is limited, and the consumers account for nearly the entire population, a financial standing for this country should be such as to give satisfaction to the larger portion of the population and to prevent any complaint from the consumers. It is an unquestioned fact that when protection was in full swing, at the time when scandalous fortunes were accumulated by the owners of industries, it is exactly the time when the mass of consumers were most unhappy, it was at that time also that the farm products were sold at the lowest figure, this statement is supported by the statistics.

I therefore, believe that the government, while imposing taxes sufficient to cover the expenses of administration without favouring the manufacturer at the expense of the consumer acted wisely. The great powers of Europe have been spoken of ; it has been stated that they were surrounded by protection, and in spite of that, strange to say, the money obtained that way by their government has been spent at the expense of the welfare of the public. For instance—and I am going to deal now with the question of militarism, the plague of Europe—which will soon be put forward as a stepping stone to frighten the people of this country, is it not a fact that the largest part of those incomes levied in order to encourage industry, has been spent in huge armaments, for the maintenance of troops brought together by compulsory service laws leaving their country in a state of poverty, after spending foolishly to a certain extent the money paid in by the people.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Does not the honourable member believe that the militarism they intend to organize in Canada will come to a result similar to that of Europe?

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) I lay down the principle so as to come to a conclusion, and I will reply that the militarism which is in existence in old countries, and which is an evil, has been treated in this very House, by the hon. the Prime Minister, in the famous and historical sitting of the 24th March, 1909, as a plague, of which effects he would protect this country. That was an unofficial statement made under such peculiar conditions and at the very same moment when the question of the introduction of a new principle of administration was under public consideration, that it must live, not only in the memory of those who then heard it, but in everybody's mind as a solemn pledge on behalf of the government headed to-day by the hon. the Prime Minister. That is exactly what was heard here about that subject, and which at first sight resembles the policy followed in the old countries, but which is entirely different. In fact, nobody has called for a compulsory military service to be established for one, two or three years for certain terms. Even, as concerns our militia, although every man from 18 to 60 years is legally bound to military service, the government does not force anybody to join the army nor does it have any drawing lots except in case of war, when the voluntary recruit is insufficient.

As for the navy service, the obligation will not reach such an extent, because under the proposed law voluntary engagements shall be made, even during war, though, as I stated, it is certain that they will not make use of this to frighten our population.

The question of plebiscite which was brought out in order that the people might express an opinion on the subject, and they supposed they were doing much by asking that the people be heard on the matter. The people of this country are not in favour of a plebiscite; it does not derive from the principles of our representative government. The nation is represented in the House by members chosen by itself, and as long as the latter are entrusted with its mandate, they enjoy an unlimited freedom, as long as they remain within the limits of the constitution. Some years ago we had a plebiscite on the question of alcoholic beverage. People wanted prohibition. The people's verdict is known. It would seem that the people would be in favour of prohibition, and what was the result? Nothing, and who has complained because the government did not see their way clear in prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors?

It cannot be gainsaid that such an appeal to the people on a particular issue would not be strictly in harmony with the principles of responsible government. Such a procedure would, to my mind, be only a means of misleading public opinion.

What would likely be the result were we to have a plebiscite on this question of naval defence? Hon. members opposite would flock to their various constituencies anxious to win the people over to their views, that is to say, to prevent the establishment of a navy. They would repair to the various parishes and villages, however distant, there to work on the prejudices of the people and fill their hearts with the fear of conscription, of warfare, and of warfare not on land, but on sea. They would persuade them that a heavy expenditure would be necessary, and that accordingly bankruptcy and ruin would be inevitable. We all know what effect

such appeals are apt to have on people's minds. I am satisfied it would bring about a state of things more fraught with danger than any witnessed since confederation. And herein would lie the danger: Supposing that in answer to that plebiscite a great majority of the people should declare themselves opposed to the building of a navy, that would not deprive the representatives of the people, in parliament assembled, of the right to ignore the verdict of the people and to estabish a naval service despite the hostile attitude of the people. Such might be the possible outcome of a plebiscite. Even should the people take a stand against the establishment of a navy parliament would in no way be deprived of the right to make provision for such a service and carry out such a measure. As a result, there would be much excitement, and widespread uneasiness.

Let me now take up and deal briefly with another matter. There is much cause for rejoicing in going through the estimates for 1910-11. When submitting last year the budget to the consideration of the House, the Minister of Finance did so not without many misgivings: he was not satisfied with the outcome of the current year's finances, as the revenue had fallen short of his expectations. A financial depression was making itself felt at the time, not only here, but throughout the world, and in consequence, the customs receipts had fallen. This year such fears no longer exist, and it is with genuine pleasure that the House and country have learned of the great improvement noticeable in the business of the country. Accordingly the Minister of Finance has thought fit to appropriate larger sums to various purposes and to provide for certain unavoidable and urgent requirements.

The hon. member from L'Islet has referred to the Tanscontinental. Well, $7,000,000 more will be expended this year in this connection. Last year, $20,000,000 were expended on the Transcontinental; this year, $27.000,000 will be expended for the same purpose. Further, $1,000,000 will be expended on the Quebec bridge. Toward the incease of the militia force, $2,000,000 more are provided this year. Toward the establishment of a marine, $3,000,000 appear in the estimates. That makes a total of $13,000,000, over and above our previous expenditure.

It is contended that the National Transcontinental is an undertaking which cannot be dispensed with; but could the same be said of a navy? There is no possible mistake on that point, such an expenditure cannot be dispensed with. It will be effected, and I think that the people of Canada, and especially the farming community, realizing what our requirements are for the time being, will gladly contribute their share towards providing for the naval defence. And why? Because the necessity of such a service is asserted by those faithful trustees who have held office for a number of years and know what is required just now. The farming community will approve of the expenditure made for the purpose of naval defence as heartily as they have approved of the building of the Transcontinental. The House has not forgotten how strenuously hon. gentlemen opposite criticised the proposal of such an undertaking. At the time, in 1904, these hon. gentlemen stated that the country would be ruined on that account; that Canada was not in a position to spend such a large sum. To-day, not only are they all agreeable to it, but they even go so far as finding fault with the government for not spending enough in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be forgetful of the prestige gained by our statesmen during the many years they have been in office. The right hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have been administering their departments ever since 1896. They have shown themselves to be loyal servants of the people. They have creditable records to show, and that is good reason why the people should trust them whenever they decide on taking a course. That question of the naval defence of Canada did not spring into existence on that memorable day of the 29th March, 1909. It was brought before the meeting of the Colonial delegates, in London, in 1902, and later on, in 1907, a complete scheme was submitted. The only question left in abeyance was the manner of providing the necessary funds. While some were of opinion that a money contribution should be forthcoming, and while others favoured the gift of warships, a third party among whom the right hon. Prime Minister, in 1907, were satisfied that the matter of naval defence should be left in the hands of the various colonial governments in accordance with their means, and under their own responsibility. In other words, the fleets were to be made up of vessels built, if possible, in the various colonies, with the labour and material available to them, and equipped with sailors recruited locally.

That proposal, Mr. Speaker, was patriotic in its inspiration. The other day, I heard the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), state that the right hon. Prime Minister was inconsistent, having in 1907 informed Mr. Smart that he was opposed to the proposal of a contribution either of ships or money. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister stated that he was opposed to contributing either money or warships to be handed over to the imperial authorities, as he wished that the various self-governing nations of the empire should be left free to organize, control and manage

their various naval services as they thought fit. That is what we are doing to-day, and I see no inconsistency in such a course.

To my mind, the expenditure which we are about to incur towards the establishment of a Canadian navy is not only in accord with our best interests, but also with the aspirations of the Canadian people. For, say what you will, in the more or less distant future, the ties which bind us to the mother country will become more and more distended. And, inevitably, a time will come, twenty or fifty years hence, may be later, may be sooner, when these self governing nations having little by little become more independent at home, will as it were through necessity, break the feeble colonial tie binding them to the mother country.

Great changes are wrought on the face of the earth in the space of a quarter of a century and great countries even are parcelled up. Of late years, and since confederation, we have seen Spain, for example, deprived of important dominions; we have seen great countries like France lose part of their territory. And we would accept as a foregone conclusion an everlasting state of dependency in regard to another nation, whatever its policy and whatever its destiny? Such is not my belief; and without wishing that such changes should come to pass, we should legislate not for to-day nor for tomorrow, but in the interests of future generations.

When the fathers of confederation, through an effort of genius, evolved the constitution under which we have the privilege of living to-day, there was opposition forthcoming; but these men foresaw the future, though perhaps not realizing the fullness of the resources of Canada. But they had that deep insight with which superior men are endowed, and they knew that a day would come when Canada would increase its territory through the acquisition of the great expanse of the far west. And those things came about. At the time nobody suspected what great riches lay within Manitoba, the western prairies and British Columbia. Since 1867 those various territories have been incorporated in this great Dominion of Canada, and possibly to-day the main strength of Canada lies in its western provinces.

Such facts of recent occurrences in the history of the world should induce us to look ahead and unhesitatingly make all necessary sacrifices towards protecting ourselves against any encroachment on our national territory. I certainly am of the opinion that a vote of $3,000,000 to start the building of a navy is in no way extravagant. It is not proposed to build a large fleet. If I rightly grasp the scope of the estimates submitted to our consideration in regard to this matter, that amount of $3,000,000 is required to make provision for naval defence, that is to say, not only the purchase, building and maintenance of ships, but also the maintenance of the dock yards at Esquimalt and Halifax, the building and maintenance of training schools for sailors. Now, with only $3,000,000 at our disposal, it seems to me we would not be in a position to do very much, we would this year have barely an amount sufficient to improve the ports of Esquimalt and Halifax, and possibly purchase a training ship for the Pacific, as was stated, to make a beginning in naval instructions. Nothing of that should cause any uneasiness in this country.

Our revenue will aggregate over $100,000,000 this year; so it is only 3 per cent of our total revenue that we are appropriating for this service.

It has been contended that other services would be depleted on that account. Well, let me show as against that expenditure of 3 per cent what we propose to spend for the benefit of the farming community. The estimates for this year exceed by $165,500 the amount voted last year for the same purpose. In 1909, $948,500 were expended; this year $1,114,000 are asked for, which represents $165,500, or 17 per cent more than last year. It will be seen from this that the farming community are not lost sight of.

The hon. member for l'Islet felt rather uneasy over the experimental farms. By referring to page 42 of the estimates he would have found that the Minister of Agriculture has put in, as provision for new experimental farms, an amount of $110,000 and still another amount of $55,000.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.) Is that for an experimental farm in the vicinity of Quebec?

Mr. TURCOTTE (Translation.) I say that there are two amounts put in, in the first place, $110,000 for experimental farms; and, in the second place, $55,000 to make provision for the establishment and maintenance of additional farms.

Sir, this is an addition of $37,000 to the appropriation of last year, which only amounted to $128,000, whereas they aggregate $165,000 this year. This sum of $37,000 has not been put in the estimates without a purpose. I have even heard the Minister of Agriculture stating in this House that he approved of the establishment of an experimental farm in the province and district of Quebec. Though I am not aware of the program of the government—because these appropriations have not been voted and the minister will have to give explanations on that point—I think it is generally understood that a large sum will be placed at the disposal of the Department of Agri-

culture to enable them to establish this very year an experimental farm in the neighbourhood of Quebec. We do not know where it shall be located, but the government will let us know what their intentions are. We have always trusted the government statements and justly so because they have always kept their pledges.

In conclusion, three per cent of the revenue for the naval service and an increase of 17 per cent for agriculture; such an allotment showed that the government is well aware of the general interests of the country and know how to apportion the funds to serve public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time than I intended. To conclude I shall say a few words about another public service. I mean the Marine Department and specially the deepening of the St. Lawrence river from Montreal as far as Father Point. Large sums have been placed in the estimates to further that end. Firstly, there is an amount of $800,000, and then another amount of $250,000. The government have been blamed on account of the deepening of the river above Quebec. I frankly believe that the further ships can go into the interior of the country the better it is for trade in general and that if we could do so, we should make Montreal the terminal point of our big ocean liners. But I am one of those who think that we should in the first place render an efficient and as safe as possible the service of sea-going steamers beween Quebec and the ocean. Until now Quebec has been the terminal port of large ocean vessels. Never a man-of-war of large tonnage has ventured in the channel beween Quebec and Montreal. On the other hand, we know that there are dangerous spots below Quebec such as St. Roch's crossing. Works must be done there, and so long as there is not a depth of 30 or 40 feet at low tide, it is useless to dig the bottom of the river and to try and have a depth of 35 feet beween Quebec and Montreal. I hope that the government will yield to the desire that has been expressed and that part of the sums appropriated this year will be expended in the necessary deepening of that part of the river which extends from Quebec to the seaboard.

In concluding my remarks and while I ask the House to excuse me for having taken so much time, I must say that I think I have played my part, however unimportant it be, in the solution of one of the most vital problems of administrative machinery. Because when it comes to a matter of dollars and cents everybody is concerned. All are called upon to play their part.

The Minister of Finance and the ministry in general must be congratulated for having met the largest expenses we have incurred since confederation, amounting to 127 millions, without adding anything to the taxation. That is the best evidence that the present government are worthy of the mandate they received from the people at the last general elections.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound). Mr. Speaker, I regret that my imperfect knowledge of French prevents me from answering the speeches which have been delivered by the two hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec who have preceded me. There are, however, one or two matters which I wish to bring to the attention of the members of this House. Shortly before the Christmas holidays, the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton), made a very strong argument in this House in favour of an export duty on pulp wood. He demonstrated that this is one of the largest and growing industries of Canada, that we have practically the only large pulp wood areas in America, and that these should be preserved for our own Canadian people. The hon. member, however, is mistaken in the remedy he proposes, and I may say he is a very recent convert to the policy of manufacturing wood products in Canada.

The Conservative party at Toronto, then in opposition, tried for many years to have regulations made to have all logs cut on government lands manufactured in Ontario, and through their efforts the reform government were at last forced to adopt regulations to that effect. I believe that a regulation of the provincial government along the same lines should be made with regard to pulp wood, but I feel that any action by this government would be ill-advised, and might lead to tariff reprisals by other nations. In any event any action taken should apply to timber or pulp wood taken from government lands only. The settler who takes out a small quantity of pulp wood, or tan bark yearly, either in the course of clearing up land, or to add to his income, during the years he is engaged in making a home for himself, should have the chance to sell in any market, as otherwise the pulp mill or tannery near him can make prices to suit itself, and naturally these prices are lower than when there is outside competition.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an injustice suffered by the people of the county I have the honour to represent, and the people of northern Ontario generally. This part of Ontario is a large producer of hemlock bark and markets many thousands of cords annually. Some years ago, a tan bark buyers' association was formed and the price was fixed by them, as they supplied all the large tanneries in Canada, and in fact were the tanners themselves acting under another name. As Ontario bark could not be exported owing to an order in

council of the provincial government, these men had matters entirely in their own hands, and reduced prices accordingly, offering only a price which would ensure a sufficient supply. But they were not satisfied, and so came to this government in 1897 and secured the removal of the duty on Quebracho extract, or had this extract added to the list of free imports. This extract is manufactured or extracted in Mexico and South America by negro labour at a very low cost, and makes a cheap substitute for hemlock bark, but makes an inferior leather. At present some Canadian tanneries especially those manufacturing light upper leather use this extract only. The United States government has a duty of ½ cent per pound. This government had a duty which should never have been removed. There were about 19,000,000 pounds of this extract imported last year into Canada, the duty upon which would have amounted, at ½ cent per pound, to $95,000, or probably equal to about $2 per cord on the amount of bark used by Ontario tanneries. Through the increased use of this extract, the situation became so serious for the tan bark producers of Ontario, that representations were made to the provincial government showing that there were about 40,000 cords of bark unsaleable at that time in Ontario, and the Ontario government passed an order in council allowing tan bark to be exported for one year. This has since been extended for a second year, but the tanners are at present endeavouring to have the export prohibition renewed, and we have the spectacle of a tanner, who, according to his own statement, is thankful that he does not use a cord of bark, endeavouring as an officer of the Tanners Association to have this prohibition re-imposed.

However, while this concession of free export gave a measure of relief to bark owners, where the tan bark could be shipped by water to the United States, the shipper by rail is in almost as bad a position as before, as he is met by an almost prohibitory rate by rail to American points. From the point where I live, the rate to Niagara Falls is 8½ cents a hundred pounds, the distance being about 200 miles. The rate to Buffalo, 18 miles further, is 18½ cents, rather more than double and in addition there is a shunting charge at Buffalo of $5 a car or 50 cents a cord. In all, this railway discrimination is equal to a charge of $2.80 against export to the United States. I am not able to say whether or not our statutes permit the Railway Commission to regulate freight rates between Canada and foreign countries. If they do, this matter should be looked into by the Railway Commission. If the law as it at present stands does not permit them to oversee rates between Canada and the United States, the law should be amended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair that the lumberman or settler who produces this tan bark should be deprived of the protection to which he is entitled against negro or coolie labour which is employed in producing this substitute. Surely the tanner who has a large measure of protection on his leather, and is allowed to import hides free of duty, has no reason to complain, and can afford to allow the same measure of protection to the labour of others that he demands for his own. At presnt, thousands of cords of bark are being wasted annually, the lumberman simply leaving the bark in the woods to rot, and taking out hemlock logs for lumber. This is surely a poor way to conserve our natural resources, and I think it is the duty of the government to look fully into this matter and remedy it at an early date.

A great deal has been said during this debate about the increase of our revenue, and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no part of Canada that to-day is paying as much per capita to the revenue of Canada as Northern Ontario. That country affords a great market for Canadian manufacturers and there is no doubt that the mines of that portion of Canada are doing, and have done a great deal to make Canada known to the world, and have been a direct means of inducing many persons to emigrate to this country, and of bringing in capital. Yet, in spite of these facts, the government has done little or nothing to promote the interests of this part of the Dominion. Towns and villages in other parts of Canada having a postal revenue of $700 to $1,000, and a small and practically stationary population, get $30,000 to $40,000 post offices, while towns in Northern Ontario with a revenue ten times as great, and four or five times the population, rapidly growing, are left without a building of any kind.

We have seen wharfs built at $20,000 to $40,000 where there are perhaps one gasoline and one small steam launch, and no water, while the lakes and rivers of the section I have mentioned are left without any such accommodation or at most have small grants, though many have regular steamship lines.

The Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway should be extended to the Georgian bay or to Toronto, and branches built to open up new territory, but while this government can find millions for certain roads either to build or bonus, they have refused to make a contribution of any kind to the Ontario government to assist in building this railway, which is of so much benefit to Canada as a whole.

Then we have the Georgian Bay canal,

which would benefit the whole of Canada, and particularly that northern section. Hundreds of thousands have been spent on survey. The different ministers have frequently stated that they are convinced that it is feasible and should be built. The right hon. Prime Minister, in an address given a few days ago in Toronto, spoke of it as one of the great works of the future. But I can tell the government that the people are tired of such speeches. They want the description changed, so that we can speak of the Georgian Bay canal as one of the great works, not of the future, but of the present.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government spent millions to open up the Yukon country, and yet, the annual output of minerals in northern Ontario is greater than that of the Yukon ever was, and more men are employed. Millions of dollars worth of timber is being lost annually for want of railway facilities. Some of the finest land in Ontario is in the clay belt of northern Ontario. When is this government going to open up this section, and when will they give it the fair treatment it deserves? With a large and growing revenue no reasonable excuse can be offered, and the ministry should at once look fully into this matter and accord this portion of Canada the fair treatment it deserves.

Mr. C. J. THORNTON (Durham). Mr. Speaker, I intend that my remarks shall be brief in dealing with some of the questions which are pertinent to the present debate. There has been a disposition evinced on the part of hon. gentlemen, and indeed frankly expressed, that this session of parliament might be shorter than some of its predecessors, and while that is commendable, I believe it would be a great mistake that any action should be taken which might choke off discussion on the important subjects which we have to deal with. Let me say that I was pleased with that part of the address of the Minister of Finance in which he rejoiced in the prosperity of Canada, and that feeling is participated in, I am sure, by every member of the House and by every true Canadian. But, the cause of that prosperity ought not to be lost sight of. I believe that all wealth lies in the product of labour. While there may be wealth in the soil, wealth in our timber and mineral resources, wealth in our fisheries, yet these natural resources are valueless until labour is put into their development. It has been well said by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. McCall) that we must not forget the toilers who have produced the prosperity of this country, and for my part I believe that all legislation should point as much as possible in the direction of enabling the toilers of Canada to enjoy the fruits of their labour to the fullest extent. When the Liberals were in opposition they laid down a very excellent policy with respect to the lands and minerals of Canada, but unfortunately when they obtained power they did not put it into practice. Previous to the year 1896, the avowed policy of the Liberal party on the trade question was a policy of free trade, and the right hon the leader of the government in 1893 declared most emphatically that the Liberal policy was a policy of free trade which he qualified as 'free trade as they have it in England.' One cannot help but wonder what would have been the result to Canada had the Liberals when they came to power put their free trade policy into effect. Even the very preaching of it tended to breed annexationists in Canada and to make Canadians lose faith in their country. There was a time indeed when the Liberal party did look to Washington, as we were told by its former leader, the Hon. Edward Blake. If the Liberals meant what they said before they came to power, why did they not put their free trade policy into effect after 1896? Indeed the only fair conclusion is that during all these years the Liberal party and its leaders were deceiving the people. Do we not know that the right hon. the Prime Minister, before his party came to power, declared most emphatically that the taking of $36,000,000 in taxes from 5,000,000 of a population was robbery, and yet we have the Minister of Finance boasting now that he takes $97,000,000 in excise and customs duties from 7,000,000 people. To say the least of it, that is inconsistent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat amused by the remarks of the member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) and by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell), who both rejoiced at the tendency to free trade which they found in this country, but where they found it it is difficult to guess. These very gentlemen live in towns that have been built up and made prosperous and thriving by the protective policy which was inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878 and which continued in effect to 1896. The town of Oshawa has been built up and made prosperous by the national policy inaugurated by the leader of the Conservative government in 1878 and which he declared was the true policy for building up industries in towns and cities and creating large industrial centres of population in Canada. Not only that, but it meant the home consumption of large quantities of agricultural products. It meant that our producers and consumers were brought closely together, and it did effect the object which the leader of that government had in view. I am pleased to say that that policy to a large extent has not been interfered with by this government, for we may talk as we like on that question, but there are no free traders in Canada to-day. We are all protectionists without doubt. Go through the tariff

lists, and protection bristles on every page. In the case of the great majority of the articles, protection stands out as the leading feature.

Another question, which is of importance, is that of expenditure. Previous to 1896, hon. gentlemen then in opposition and now on the government side declared that $40,000,000 expenditure was excessive. In thirteen years, however, they have multiplied that expenditure by three, so that, under their administration, it is now 300 per cent greater than in 1896. Where does all the money go? No doubt there are large public expenditures necessary, but it is equally undoubted that a great deal of the money is wasted in such useless undertakings as the Newmarket canal and the Sawdust wharf. Just at this moment let me draw attention to a matter which was discussed here some two years ago. I refer to the expenditure in connection with Cobourg harbour. In the year 1906, because of the growing business of the Grand Trunk railway system, it became necessary for that company to have a coaling harbour on the north shore of Lake Ontario, and the company, at its annual meeting, decided to have such a harbour. The directors began to examine into the feasibility of instituting a ferry service, which would carry thirty or forty cars across from a port on the south shore to one on the north shore. The only port on the north shore which they saw suitable was the town of Port Hope, which has a safe harbour and which is the terminus of the Midland system of the Grand Trunk railway. But as soon as the politicians found there was to be a port selected on the north shore to accommodate the car ferry, they got busy. They interviewed the government and so did the Grand Trunk railway. The Grand Trunk railway wanted the government to make Port Hope the harbour for the car trade, but the politicians had the greater pull and the government decided on Cobourg. That decision was taken in the face of the evidence given by the expert brought by the Grand Trunk railway—a gentleman who had charge of the ferry between Milwaukee and Grand Haven on Lake Michigan. He made a close examination of both Cobourg and Port Hope, and decided that Port Hope was the better fitted of the two and that it could be made a safe harbour with much less expense. The government, however, decided on Cobourg, and they gave as a reason that the expenditure there would be much less. I can quote the words of the then acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) and also the words of the Finance Minister. They said that their decision was arrived at purely on the ground that it would cost much less to make a suitable harbour at Cobourg than at Port Hope. They said it would take $145,000 to make Port Hope suitable and only $67,000 to properly equip Cobourg. But what are the facts? The expert sent by the Grand Trunk railway to examine the two harbours decided in favour of Port Hope. He said it would cost less to make Port Hope suitable than it would Cobourg. The government, however, sent their own engineer, and he estimated that Port Hope would cost $145,000 and Cobourg only $67,000. But what has been the result? The result is that on Cobourg harbour they have already spent $195,000, and the probability is that over $200,000 will be required to make it suitable, and even then it will never compare with the harbour which Port Hope would have furnished at much less expenditure. That shows that the government have had something else in view besides the public interest. If time would permit, I could furnish the evidence that it was purely political pull which caused the government to decide as it did. That is what I object to in the administration of our public affairs. Were the true conditions of affairs known to the people, they would give a strong condemnation of this reckless extravagance. Expenditures should be made on the merits of the work required and not because of any political pull. The requirements of the people should be the first consideration, and if our public expenditures were made on that principle, they would be largely decreased. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion of these questions that have come up in connection with the budget debate will have a salutary effect on this government.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended making a speech in connection with the budget this year, and even had I undertaken to discuss the general subjects presented I fear I should only have had to repeat what has been already said. But I have a very important matter on which I wish to speak for a few moments, and, as you have always allowed such great latitude in the budget discussion, I take this opportunity of referring to the matter. The subject on which I wish to speak is the Hudson Bay railway and the navigation of Hudson bay and Hudson straits. The Department of Railways and Canals, a few days ago, laid on the table a report of this route. Now, the question of this railway is a very important one so far as Western Canada is concerned, in fact the opening up of the route by way of Hudson bay and straits means to western Canada, in many, many years, the difference between prosperity and failure. The report that has been issued by the Department of Railways and Canals of this government, I consider, is a long way from the facts of the case. In fact, there is no doubt in my mind that this report was inspired by the railway interests throughout Canada and it has been issued by the

Railway Department of this government. We, in western Canada have been looking toward this outlet for our products for the last thirty-five years. Two years ago, just before the last general election, this government sent forth a cry that they were going to build the Hudson Bay railway. In that year, you had in the estimates $100,000 for survey work on this route. Last year, we had another $100,000 in the estimates for further survey work. This year, we find an item of $180,000 for still more survey work. Just as we in western Canada were looking for the carrying out of this great project to completion, this report is issued which practically knocks the whole proposition on the head. The part of this report to which I wish particularly to refer is as follows:

I find considerable difficulty in deciding upon what basis to provide accommodation for a railway that, in the nature of things, cannot be operated to its capacity for more than two months in the year——

That means, if it means anything, that the navigation of Hudson bay and Hudson straits are not navigable for more than two months in the year. The report goes on:

—to a lessened extent for a possible three months, and for the remainder of the year still less.

I take it that it means that for three months the road can be operated for through traffic and the remainder of the year local traffic will give a certain amount of work. A little further on, the report says:

The route will pass to the north of Ireland, and the distance from Liverpool to Port Nelson is 3,200 miles.

I have looked up the reports and maps in connection with this matter, and I have found that not one of these reports gives this distance at more than 2,900 miles. The report also says:

I assume that ships can be secured wherever there is sufficient business offered. It is apparent that at least nine per day would need to be loaded, or say, 135 to 140, to do the business—allowing two trips to each ship. Any additional business taken to the bay would have to be stored until the following August—nine months.

And still further on—

It appears, therefore, to be a difficult proposition for independent operation, and would seem to require to be worked by one of the large corporations, so that the men and rolling stock could be utilized the whole year. . . . Capt. Bernier is of the opinion that it is unsafe to be caught in the vicinity of the Fox channel with a steamer of ordinary construction, any later than October 15.

I claim that this report is very misleading indeed. As I have said, it is not in accordance with the facts of the case as I see them. To show how important a matter this is to western Canada, let me say that the average wheat field in western Canada is just as near Port Nelson on the Hudson bay as it is to Fort William and Port Arthur on the great lakes, and Port Nelson is almost as near to Liverpool as is Montreal, the difference being only about one hundred miles. So, if it were possible to cut out the distance between Port Arthur and Fort William and Montreal, the two routes would be practically on a par so far as mileage is concerned. Now, I have not the figures for last year of the amount of grain we shipped between Fort William and Montreal, but I have the figures for 1907-8. We shipped in that year 62,107,513 bushels of grain. We shipped all rail 14,364,176 bushels, which cost us 12 cents a bushel, or $1,723,791.24. We shipped by lake and rail 49,743,336 bushels, on which we paid 8 cents per bushel, or $3,819,466.88. So the total amount of freight we paid on our grain between Fort William and Montreal, or the sea-board, was $5,543,258.12. This year I am satisfied that the freight we will pay on our grain between these two points will amount to over $7,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we in western Canada believe that if this Hudson Bay route is feasible, as we think it is, then this $7,000,000 we are paying on freight rates between these two points is, so far as we are concerned, absolutely burnt money.

Now I do not intend recounting the great advantage that this route will offer to western Canada, and I am not going to discuss the great natural resources of the country through which this road will run, any more than to say for 200 miles north of the present boundary of the province of Manitoba they are successfully growing wheat at the present time. I am going to confine myself chiefly to navigation on the Hudson bay and straits and showing that this report, issued by the Department of Railways and Canals is not true. Let us see how long Port Nelson will be open under ordinary conditions. I may say that no records have been kept at Fort Nelson, but the Hudson Bay Company's official here kept the records for the past 100 years at York Factory, a short distance away. It appears that the average date of the opening of navigation was May 19, and the average date of the closing of navigation was November 20, or six months. The earliest date of the opening of navigation at York Factory was May 7, in 1846; the earliest day of closing was November 3, in 1878. The latest date of opening was June 1, in 1828, and the latest date of closing was December 9, in 1851. The longest season that York Factory was open to navigation was six months and eighteen days, in 1846; the

shortest season was five months and thirteen days, in 1853. There has been no record kept of Port Nelson, but the Hudson bay officials there tell us that Port Nelson is open a month longer each year for navigation, so that would make Port Nelson open seven months in the year. There is no doubt in my mind that with an ice breaker at Port Nelson, that port could be kept open all the year round without any trouble. This report goes on to quote what Captain Bernier says:

He is of the opinion that it is unsafe to be caught in the vicinity of the Fox channel with a steamer of ordinary construction, any later than October 15.

That means, if this report is correct, that according to Captain Bernier, the 15th of August to the 15th of October are the only dates between which Hudson straits are open to navigation. Now I wish to read what Captain Bernier really did say in his report, I am quoting from the 'Cruise of the 'Arctic'' in 1906-7.

There is no doubt that the strait is navigable for four months in the year with suitable steamers, and that Hudson bay is navigable for one month longer.

So that report issued by the government is quoting Captain Bernier falsely. Let me give the evidence of other men who explored the straits and bay. Captain William Kennedy, who commanded an expedition in search of Sir John Franklin, and who had eight years experience on the straits, says that from June 1 to November, five months, the straits are perfectly safe. Mr. W. Archibald, for many years in the service of the Hudson Bay Company at Moose Factory says:

The bay and straits can be navigated from June to December, six months.

Captain John Macpherson, for twenty years in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company, made forty trips through the straits and across the bay. He says:

There is no reason why steamships could not make the passage through the straits and bay as early as the 15th of June, and return as late as the middle of November, five months.

Commander Wakeham, who visited the bay and straits in 1897, says the same. Commander Gordon spent a year there. and he says the straits and bay are open to navigation for at least four months. These men were sent out by this government, and their reports are quoted. Then I have another report here, that of the Select Committee appointed by the legislative assembly of the province of Manitoba in the year 1884. This committee took the evidence of a great many men who were in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company for many years, and of others who had a personal knowledge of this matter, and whose evidence can be relied on fully. Captain James Hackland was employed by the Hudson Bay Company for thirty-nine years, first navigated Hudson bay in 1843, and was in command of the Hudson Bay schooner for sixteen years from that time. He says:

The straits are open all year round, never freeze. There is no reason why steamships should not navigate the straits at any time. The navigation of Hudson bay and straits is not considered dangerous. There are no shoals, there are no fogs. During sixteen years, navigation of Hudson bay was never impeded by fog.

Walter Dickson was twenty years in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company. He says:

Have been requested to furnish information respecting Hudson bay to the Committee of the House of Commons at Ottawa. I have answered these questions substantially as follows: I lived for thirteen years on the coast of Hudson bay and for seven years in the interior between James bay and Lake Superior. I have had an opportunity of gaining information respecting Hudson straits from my long acquaintance with Esquimaux who reside about the straits, and from my personal observation of the bay itself. I have reason to believe that the Hudson straits and a great body of the bay proper are navigable at all seasons of the year and afford no particular difficulty to ordinary navigation.

The advantages to Canada generally of opening up communication via Hudson bay would be, first, gaining access to a mineral region which for richness, variety and extent is equal and perhaps superior to any other region on this continent; second, gaining access to whaling and sealing gounds that are already highly remunerative and are capable of great development; third, gaining access to salmon and other fisheries, to game in unlimited quantity and to the richest fur producing region in the Dominion. To Manitoba and the Northwest the route via Hudson bay is all important, giving them a shorter and cheaper route for both export and import than can possibly be had by any other route. . . . I believe that Hudson straits are never frozen over in winter. My reasons are, 1st, that the latitude is too high; 2nd, that the current and tide are too strong to allow of a general freezing over at any time and, 3rd, that the Esquimaux makes use of skin boats for ordinary hunting and travelling purposes in winter, and during a residence of thirteen years amongst them I never heard of any Esquimaux crossing the straits on the ice. Icebergs, properly so-called, are not formed in Hudson bay and straits, nor can they get there as far as I am aware. The nature of ice found in Hudson bay is shore ice, generally from two and a half to three feet thick, and in many places along the coast is porous at all seasons. . . . To my knowledge there have been fewer losses and disasters to shipping in Hudson bay and straits than on any route of travel during the past 250 years. I do not know the rate of insurance, but believe it to be less than the

average. I believe the Hudson Bay Company have ceased to insure their vessels, deeming the route so safe as not to call for it. . . . Hudson bay is less subject to storms than the Great Lakes. Hudson bay is from 1,000 to 1,200 miles in length and its greatest breadth from 600 to 700 miles. . . . From what I have observed of the movements of ice in Hudson bay during the summers I passed there, I am perfectly assured that an ordinary iron screw steamer would never have any difficulty in getting through or around that which is usually met with in the bay and straits. The chief reason why the old sailing vessels of the Hudson Bay Company often met with detention in the ice was and is that at the season when floe ice is met with there is generally very little wind, and sailing vessels are consequently as helpless amongst the ice as they would be in a dead calm in the centre of the Atlantic or elsewhere. Hudson bay has always been found of easy access to a good and careful navigator.

Mr. C. N. Bell, of the city of Winnipeg, gave the following evidence:

It is found on investigation that fully 750 vessels have passed through Hudson strait, and this does not cover, it is known, the whole number. The list includes British troop ships, emigrant ships, war vessels of the English and French (some of them carrying 74 guns), as well as ships bound on voyages of discovery, trade and whaling. As early as 1619, Capt. John Munck was sent by the King of Denmark, and he wintered at Churchill, a brass gun of his being taken out of the river some time about the date of the appearance of Fox in that harbour.

Dr. Bell obtained from the company's offices in London, a record, which, printed in his report, shows the date of arriving and sailing of their vessels at York Factory for 93 years, and at Moose Factory for 147 years. These lists show that in some years several vessels were sent in charge of British men-of-war, and there has been almost every year during the past two centuries, ships of various classes and sizes navigating the strait without loss, and it seems almost incredible that such a number of voyages could be made, extending over 274 years, without the loss of over one, or as is claimed by some writers, two small sailing vessels. . . . It is but a comparatively short time since it was claimed that it would be impossible to navigate the St. Lawrence with steamships, and, indeed, several steamers were lost in proving that it would be possible for an immense fleet to pass up to Montreal during each summer. . . . The lower St. Lawrence (notwithstanding its comparative narrowness) is partly open even in the middle of winter. But the difficulty, as in the case of Hudson bay, is the apparent impossibility of getting into harbours. Harbours such as Churchill or York on Hudson bay, would have the advantage over Quebec or Montreal of connecting directly with the open sea, and hence in autumn vessels would not be liable to be frozen in, as occasionally happens in the St. Lawrence, as for example in the autumn of 1880, also in the autumn of 1870, when the outward bound shipping got frozen in below Quebec, occasioning a loss, it was said, of over a million dollars.

Mr. C. S. Drummond, a financial agent and a man who was connected with the early project of building the Hudson's Bay railway, gave the following evidence:

Am interested in the carrying out of the Hudson Bay railway scheme, and during the time I was in England in January last I conversed with many persons in Liverpool and London as to the project. I also met in London some gentlemen from Berlin and conversed with them. The opinion of all with whom I conversed was that the straits and bay were navigable for powerful steamers the whole year round, except perhaps during the period from the 15th May to 15th July, and even then they supposed the navigation to be difficult, but not impossible. There is a strong syndicate formed in Liverpool in which are some of the largest steamship companies who are willing to furnish vessels for opening an ocean route between the ports on Hudson bay and Liverpool, on the assurance to them that a railway will be built. They have gone into the question very thoroughly, having had at their command the latest charts, log books, and information respecting the navigation of the northern seas, and have also obtained valuable information from the 'Département des Cartes de la Marine et Colonies.' The very fact of this syndicate being prepared to enter into this scheme at their own risk after having obtained such full information, proves the practicability of the route.

James Ward was in the employ of the company for a number of years and he gave the following evidence:

I am surprised how people can doubt the navigation of the straits or bay on account of ice. Not one man that has come over that route but believes in its practicability. Mansfield island will be a good place for a lighthouse station. There is a little lake of good water on that island.

I have here the report brought in by the committee who were appointed by the local legislature of Manitoba. The Hon. Mr. Brown was chairman and this is the report he gave:

Many of the gentlemen examined have had personal and extended experience as officers and servants of the Hudson Bay Company at their posts on Hudson and Ungava bays and the rivers entering into those bays.

No evidence has been given that goes to prove that the Hudson straits and bay proper ever freeze over, or that the ice met within those waters is sufficient to prevent navigation at any time of the year.

That consequently the period of navigation is defined by the time during which the ports, harbours, or roadsteads on the shores of the bay can be entered by vessels of a suitable description for such navigation.

That, from the evidence adduced, it appears that such ports or harbours are open on an average, from 4½ to 5 months in each year to ordinary vessels.

That Hudson bay and straits appear, from all the evidence taken, to be singularly free from obstruction to navigation in the shape of

shoals or reefs; and, during the period of open water, from storms or fogs.

This is the evidence given before the committee and these are the conclusions that these hon. gentlemen came to at that time.

But I have still another very important piece of evidence from which I wish to quote. I quote now from a book issued by the Minister of the Interior, 'Canada's Fertile Northland.' The evidence which I now quote was given by Dr. Bell, on March 12, 1907.

Dr. Bell explained that he had been through Hudson straits nine times. The first time was in 1880 in a ship called the 'Ocean Nymph,' a small sailing vessel, and the last time was in 1897 with Commander Wakeham. His trips were distributed over those 17 years between 1880 and 1887. All his trips were between June 22 and about October 10. In navigating the straits during the season between those dates with a steamship they never had any difficulty. . . . Witness never heard that the straits was frozen across in winter. There is ice there, but always more or less open water with it at all times. . . . Dr. Bell said that he did not know any more desirable piece of navigation in the world excepting the middle of the ocean, and even then a common sailor who could not take an astronomical observation could sail through the straits with perfect safety. That is what Henry Hudson's men did after putting him and part of the crew into an open boat and leaving them behind. . . . Neither the bay nor the straits are frozen up any more than the Atlantic ocean. . . . The sailing vessels that had been passing through the strait would all be in the neighbourhood of 300 tons. They were not always specially constructed for that service, but of late years a steamer 'The Eric' takes the place of sailing ships. Old sailing vessels could scarcely hold their own in a head wind, and if there were scattered ice in the strait, they could hardly get through at all, and then it would be reported that they were stopped by the ice.

These reports are all from reliable men who have been over the ground, who have navigated those straits and the bay from time to time and there is no doubt in my mind that with modern aids to navigation and a proper telephone system on the straits so that the ships could be informed where the floating ice was, they could navigate the straits at all times in the year.

Eastern members may naturally think that this proposition is one simply for western Canada. But I wish to assure you and the hon. members from eastern Canada that it is almost as important to them as it is to western Canada. Twenty-five years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway company, sent their first trains from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That country was then almost a barren plain, but during this past year we have grown 360,000,000 bushels of grain. The people of eastern Canada are stretching

out and wish to get hold of the trade in western Canada. It seems to me that they are trying to tie up western Canada to eastern Canada. They are afraid to let us get any other outlet, they are bound to tie us up and keep us coming this way just as long as possible. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they will make a great mistake in this because every dollar we pay in freight rates on our produce coming east between Fort William and Montreal is that much money thrown away so far as we are concerned. Had the Hudson Bay route been in operation this year the people of western Canada would have $7,000,000 more in their pockets to enable them to make their homes more comfortable and to pay for the manufactured goods they buy from eastern Canada. This proposition may not be altogether roseate so far as Ontario is concerned, but for Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island it is a different proposition altogether, because the ports of these provinces are accessible to the open sea; they are manufacturing goods which we are using every day, and their manufactured goods can be loaded into ocean going vessels and taken around by the Hudson bay and delivered right into the heart of western Canada at two-thirds the freight rates they are at present paying. Just take the province of Nova Scotia as an example. Her shipping and manufacturing amounted last year to $33,000,000, her coal output to $16,500,000, her manufacture of steel rails and steel structures to $11,000,000, and her product of pig iron to $5,500,000, making a total of $66,000,000 for these four articles alone, all of which we are using in the west and all of which could be consigned to us at cheap freight rates by the Hudson bay route. I have not referred to the great advantage which the Hudson bay route would be to our cattle trade, but it goes without saying that it would afford splendid facilities for the export trade in cattle. Now, this government has definitely promised to build a railroad to the Hudson bay, and although the people of the west have never seen the fruition of the many promises which the right hon. the Prime Minister has made to them, now that the word has gone out that he is pretty soon going to give up his office to a younger man, I would ask the right hon. gentleman before he takes off his robes of office to do at least one thing for the people of western Canada so that they may be able to thank God he has not lived in vain. I trust the right hon. gentleman and his government will revise this report and build this road and open up this route which means so much to the people of the west.

On motion of Mr. Paterson the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Paterson the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1909-1910.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., Northwest Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1789 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193, 7234 (iv).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5643 (iii).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Budget, The (remarks) 2080 (ii).

Census of 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigations Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7892 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 84) 1° m., 1587 (i); on M. for 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6360; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).

—— Consideration of Bill (remarks) 6140 (iv).

Conservation Com., Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

—— Names of Members (Ques.) 1196 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3293 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3918 (ii).

Electrical Measure Units B. 7 (Mr. Fielding) on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ques.) 1016 (i).

Free Mail Delivery, Closing of Post Office Distribution (Ques.) 1196 (i).
See 'Rural.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 183; on M. for 2°, 717 (i).

French Treaty, Similar Treatment to Germany (Ques.) 1196 (i).

German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3679 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Dairy Products (remarks) 3832 (ii).

German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

—— Similar Treatment *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 785 (i).

—— Value of Exports, &c. (Ques.) 261 (i).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1366 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions, &c. (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ques.) 4309 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5809 (iii).

Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Insects, Pests and Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 211 (i); in Com., 5628 (iii).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmt., 2812 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1196 (i).

—— Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1546 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5901 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4423 (iii); in Com., 7452 (v.)

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5293 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertisements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ques.) 267 (i).

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ques.) 5779 (iii).

Post Office Mail Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).

Printing outside of Govt. Printing Bureau, Payments *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 2713 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i); on M. for Com., 6492 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 4812, 5625 (iii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 4812, 5625 (iii).

R. M. College Buildings, Total Cost *re* Maintenance (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Boxes (Ques.) 1783 (i).

—— Locks furnished, &c. (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 1380 (i).

See 'Free.'

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5332, 5345 (iii), 6234, 6346, 6736 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7090 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2638 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376; (cold storage) 7383 (iv); (experimental farms) 227 (i), 5726; (exhibitions) 5728 (iii); (Patent Record) 7371 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3107; (Newmarket) 3109; Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (printing) 252 (i); Post Office salaries) 6650, 6683 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 249 (i).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 7863 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (Eastern Block) 572; (Museum) 570; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Que. immigration sheds) 961; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4761 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv.).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Lennox Island) 2694 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecœur) 3889; (Fort William) 3892; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Rivière) 3903; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Grosse Isle) 3906; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Ste. Croix) 4238; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3098; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5960, 5989 (iv).

'Toronto World,' Ownership by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Maclean) 5998 (iv).

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'German.'

Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7288 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6942 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Zinc Ores Smelting, Investigation, B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9 (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ques.) 445 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.Cs. *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for Copies, 3526 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Magnatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214, 6970 (iv).

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 920 (i).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

SUPPLY.

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).

Trent Canal Water Powers, Control by Govt. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution, Commutation, &c., on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

——— (correction) *re* Action of Crown, 2712 (ii).

B.C. Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c. (reply) to Mr. Borden, 11 (i).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice and National Trust Co. (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

Capital Cases and Action of the Crown, Correction (remarks) 2712 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

——— Instruction, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6391 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 147 (i).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 2°. 2163; in Com., 2166 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Customs and Fisheries Protection Act Amt. (B. 138) 1° m., 3290 (ii); 2° m., 6190 (iv).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Rep., 7650 (v).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c., *re* Dom. Election, 1907 (Ans.) 1007 (i).

Dubuc, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 1976 (ii).

———. (remarks) 2278 (ii).

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1268 (i).

Escheats to the Crown (B. 206) M. for Com. on Res., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974 (iv); in Com., 8384 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. accidents) Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 4996; in Com., 6182 (iv).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank (remarks) 7792 (v).

Georgian Bay Canal, and U. S. Privileges, *re* Waterways Treaty (Ans.) 3160 (ii).

Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track', &c.

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2043 (ii).

Judges, Defence of, 7163 (iv).

Judicial Business, Montreal District, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1797 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers, Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 852 (i).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ans.) 4847 (iii).

——— Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Quebec Judges, Superior Court (prop. res.) 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; in Com., 8383 (v).

National Battlefields Act Amt. (B. 188) 1° m., 5888; in Com., 6598 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7403 (v).

New York Canals, Use of by Canadian Vessels, Authority *re* (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5206 (iii).

North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1552 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Obscene Literature, Sale of, Skill and King, release from Central Prison, Political Pull, &c. (remarks) 7069 (iv).

—— (further explanation) 7183 (iv).

—— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8348 (v).

Offences against the Person, B. 71 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2040 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1309 (i).

Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. (Ans.) 3490 (ii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 7867; in Com., 8382 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Legal Work to Lawyers in Toronto, 8362 (v).

Quebec Superior Court at Montreal, Number of Cases standing (Ans.) 1370 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., 6541; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

—— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 6717 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 457 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. Graham) 6 m. h., 487 (i).

Railway Act (general) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8416 (v).

Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release of (remarks) 924 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7163 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard (Ans.) 1375 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 253 (i).

Victoria Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 5889 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3432 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2039 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6906 (iv).

De Mar., Edna Shibley Relief (B. 223) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5685 (iii).

Gaspereau River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1138; in Com., 1148 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Halifax Round-house Property, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7183 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5865 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7951 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5905 (iii).

N.T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2406 (ii).

—— Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

—— change in rep., &c., on M. for Sup., 5570 (iii).

—— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6041 (iv).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8305 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5676 (iii), 6963 (iv).

Nicholl, Emily Maud Relief (B. 222) 1°*, 8361 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1558 (i).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1365 (i).

Post Office, Outside Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 609 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 892 (i); on M. for Com., 6476 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7102 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7347 (iv).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (tool grinder) 3105 (ii)
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6675 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3454; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Richibucto) 3442; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3452; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3456; (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii).
Railways (board of commissioners) 3092 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (revenue) 3091; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946 (ii).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.. 5247 (iii).
Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).
Railways (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8092 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods, B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8012 (v).

Western Power Co's B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars *re* (Ques.) 5929 (iv).

Budget, The, 1673 (i).

Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c., (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Criminal Code (race-track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ques.) 1529 (i).

Dredging Inspection of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1017 (i).

——— Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 3170 (ii).

Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Conc. of Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8032 (v).

Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c. (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

——— Supply and Use of Field Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1790, 1799 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1259 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep of Com., 2920 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4182 (iii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236 (iii).

Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c. (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

Public Works, B. C., Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4279 (iii).

Public Works Engineers, Number of Resident, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Campbell) 4276; (Columbia river) 4277; (Nitinat Lake) 4715 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4775 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste Croix) 4236-4237 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4811 (iii).

Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

——— Number of Inmates, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

"William Joliffe," Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Banking Act, Expiration of, Issue of Currency, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6. (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1294 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6609 (iv).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1248 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4989 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8204 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Martin's Island) 3474 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. A., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 175) 1°m., 5620 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv., 7066 (iv).

I.C.R., Prosecutions *re* Damages by Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3683 (ii), 4568 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 2946 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ques.) 642 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4108 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1392 (i).

BEST, Mr., *Dufferin.*

House of Commons, Sessional and Temporary Employees, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4392 (iii).

Peace River Country, Portions opened for Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8588 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2655 (ii).

Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in January (Ques.) 4514, 5001 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5254 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Clean Currency, &c. (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 756 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5553, 5861 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6605 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6291 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8051, 8423, 8596 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 172) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5657 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1108 (i).

I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos. (prop. res.) 2299 (ii).

——— Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1303 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6293 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5407 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749; (hatcheries) 5752 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1393 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R. *Peel.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5646 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Light-keeper, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

Brownridge, James Thornton, Relief (B. 202) 1°*, 6802 (iv)

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6874; in Com., 6923 (iv); 7905 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources Commission, B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 5885 (iii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty, B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6997 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6624 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii); 5774 (iii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8694 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Ministers (remarks) 2490 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Employees, Crown Residences, Inquiry for Ret., 3058 (ii).
See 'Senate.'

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

House of Commons and Senate Officials, Estimated Cost of Occupancy of Living Rooms, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1023 (i).
See 'Senate.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5829 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 523, 811 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5646 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. King) to conc., 2425, 2887 (ii).

Lethbridge Post office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7435 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5675 (iii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821 (iii).

Newspapers, List *re* advertising Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1569 (i).

Patronage List and Tory Whip, Par. in Toronto 'World,' (personal explanation) 7070 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).

Post Office Patronage List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Post Office Regulations *re* Mails to Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6961 (iv).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (amt.) 612 (i).

Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Race-track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 455 (i).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7657 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5363 (iii), 6227, 6341 (iv).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 121 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809 (i).

Senate and H. of C. Residents in Parliament Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House.'

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7763 (v); (census) 7374; (farm bulletins) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122; Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Trent (damages) 3120; (Newmarket) 3119 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (clerks) 7764 (v); Finance (salaries) 335; Indian Affairs

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(salaries) 366, 414 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8195; (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6651 (iv); Public Works salaries) 333 (i).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1333; Inspectors (salaries) 1331 (i).

Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).

Militia (rifles, &c.) 8562 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Greenwood) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Bathurst) 580; (Grand Falls) 582; (Lunenburg) 576; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7503; (Kincardine) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 8170; (Uxbridge) 8178; (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 539 (i); (deptl., new) 7169 (iv); (military stores) 601; (museum) 569 (i); (National Art gallery) 6158 (iv); (parliament driveway) 8174; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Senate redecorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine, heating) 667; (Megantic) 700; (Plessisville) 704; (Roberval) 944; (St. Roch) 830; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, repairs, &c..) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4772 (iii); Man. (generally) 6138 (iv); Mar. Provs. (generally) 4782, 4805 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125 (iv); dredging (new plant) 4740, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1167, 1174; (Saw Pit) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101; (Victoria) 6123 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (Courtenay Bay) 6151; Ont. and Que. (Chapeau) 6150; (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 2873; P.E.I. (construction) 3102; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3096, 3128; (Quebec bridge) 3073 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 8487 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1396 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8187 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6378 (iv); in Com., 8399 (v).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

French Canadian Party in Parlt., Ques. of Priv., 8115 (v).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Grand Mere Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2598 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4453 (iii).

St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ques.) 5931 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 932; (Shawinigan Falls) 951 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Airships, Devlopment of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 1369 (i).

—— Govt. Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin (Ans.) 446 (i).

Armouries, Govt. Policy *re* Building (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Armouries and Drill Halls, on Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii).

Army Service Corps, Charges against two officers, &c (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

See 'DelaRonde.'

Artillery Horses *re* Petewawa Camp, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 786 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*
Artillery, Re-armament of, Reasons for (Ans.) 1372 (i).
See 'Garrison.'
Baby Farm Sale (B. 181) prop. Res., 2634 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5791 (iii); in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).
Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt (Ans.) 2146 (ii).
See 'Garrison.'
Cartwright, Sir R., Lease of Lands: *See* 'Frontenac.'
Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 636 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).
DelaRonde, Major and Capt., Charges *re* (Ans.) 135 (i).
—— Report of Justice Dept. (Ans.) 5500 (iii).
See 'Army Service,' 'Ottawa,' &c.
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 637 (i).
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ans.) 6801 (iv), 8837 (v).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1018 (i).
Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Imp. Conc. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
See 'Garrison,' 'Halifax,' &c.
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).
—— Request *re* Indemnity (Ans.) 5560 (iii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ans.) 133 (i).
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes (Ans.) 1371 (i).
—— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, &c. (Ans.) 262 (i).
Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).
—— on Question being put by another Member (remarks) 1791; (Ans.) 1800 (i).
—— Strength, &c. (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
See 'Esquimalt,' &c.
Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ans.) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) 1802 (i).
—— Observations of Sir Wm. White, Stmnt. (read) 1961 (ii).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes 843 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 783 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payments *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ans.) 1193 (i).
Lambton Barracks, Acquiring of Property (Ans.) 271 (i).
See 'Baby,' &c.
Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 275 (i).
Military Lands: *See* 'Baby,' &c.
Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Militia Active Service, Standards *re* Efficiency in Rifle Shooting (Ans.) 1596 (i).
Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examinations (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Militia Clothing, Life of, Purchase of New Material (Ans.) 1018 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 781 (i).
Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ans.) 1779 (i).
Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ans.) 1202 (i).
Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors (Ans.) 1535 (i).
Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers (Ans.) 1595 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. (B. 194) prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097, 1°*, 6098; 2° m. and in Com., 6190 (iv).
Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ans.) 1019 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1378 (i).
Militia Provisions *re* Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 842 (i).
Militia Stores Building, Ottawa, Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ans.) 838 (i).
—— Loss of Clothing by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 845 (i).
—— Value of Damage by Fire (Ans.) 386 (i).
Militia Tents, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).
Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System re (Ans.) 1200 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3296 (ii); in Com., 7440 (iv).
Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2798 (ii).
Naval Service, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Meaning of 'Upkeep,' &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Stores, Kingston, Repairs and Lease, &c., (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority *re* Emplymt. of Horses, &c., (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
See 'DelaRonde.'

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators (Ans.) 8837 (v).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Permanent Force, Average Cost per man, annually (Ans.) 1013 (i).

——— Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 1781 (i).

——— Increase in Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c. (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

——— Officers Entertaining Allowance (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Requirements *re* Instructions, &c., (Ans.) 1011 (i).

——— Scale of Payments, &c., (Ans.) 1012 (i).

——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c. (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Total Strength and Expenditure (Ans.) 266 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1790 (i).

Queen's Own Rifles at Aldershot, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Patterns, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practices, Facilities *re* (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 134, 273 (i).

——— on ques of priv. (Mr. Staples) 339 (i).

Ross Rifles, Mark I and Mark II**, Defects, Issue of, Contracts *re* &c., (Ans.) 1533; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Answer to Mr. Worthington (withdrawal) 1597 (i).

——— Number received, contracted for, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Submission to N. R. Association *re* Bisley Meet (Ans.) 4082 (iii).

——— Weight of (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

R. M. College Act Amt. (B. 180) Prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii); 2° m., 6098 (iv).

R. M. C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ans.) 5781 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

St. Johns, Que. Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5492 (iii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).

Savard, Lt.-Col., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot, &c. (Ans.) 8659 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment (Ans.) 6800 (iv).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment (Ans.) 8109 (v).

S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

S. A. Volunteer Scrip, Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

S. A. War, Reinstatement of Aud. Gen.'s Messenger (remarks) in Com of Sup., 8568 (v).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c. (Ans.) 2952 (ii).
See 'Baby.'

Subtarget Rifle Machines, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 1779 (i).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (armoury to 65th Reg.) 8570; (arms, rifles, &c.) 8556; (civil employees) 8574; (engineers) 8569; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (pay, &c.) 8559; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec barracks) 975; (citadel drill shed) 967; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted and delivered, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowances for 1907 (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1778 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 33 (i).

Address to Earl Grey, on Closing of Term of Office (seconded) 8740 (v).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Alien Labour Law, Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (iii).
Aud. Gen. Messenger, Re-instatement *re* S. A. War (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (vol. II) Inquiry for, 1445 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Inquiry for, 2061 (ii).
Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).
Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'
B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 531 (i).
Budget, The, Date of Delivery (remarks) 1002 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 2081; Ques. of Order, 2085 (ii).
Canadian Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S. (remarks) 8585 (v).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6806 (iv); in Com., 7890; on M. for 3°, 7995 (v).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. King) 7188 (iv).
Conservation of Natural Resources B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6359; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).
Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) in Com., 8730 (v).
Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6632 (iv).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3056 (ii).
—— Translators, Apptmt. of, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Dog-Fish Reduction Plant, Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c. (M. for ret*) 109 (i).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3916 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8689 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).
Fisheries Commission *re* Man., on Inquiry for Report, 1963 (ii).
—— Signing of Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7823 (v).
French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 707, 715; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).
French Treaty, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).
French Treaty (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).
—— Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3681 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3829 (ii).
Govt. Railways Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4403 (iii).
Government's Railway Pension Amendment B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on M. for 3°, 2637 (ii).
G. T. P. *See* 'Natl. Transcl.' &c.
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Condition of, Observations of Sir Wm. White (remarks) 1802 (i).
Halifax Harbour and Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 315, 323 (i).
Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track.'
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5523 (iii).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia, Papers (remarks), 207 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion, 119 (i).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. B. on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).
—— Board of Management, Rep. to Hse. (remarks) 2791 (ii).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1106, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°. 2214 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

——— and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Fund B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii).

——— Low Rates, Inquiry for Information (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill 8481 (v).

——— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) 332, 343 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6201 (iv).

Judges Act (Man. and Que.) Amt. (B. 207) in Com., 8383 (v).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

See 'B.C.'

Labour Hours on Public Works, on 1st Rep. of Com., 1586 (i); on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105, 8233 (v).

See 'Marine.'

Lumsden, Mr., Resignation, Letter to Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 622 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl.,' &c.

Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv.)

Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8160 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520; in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

See 'Lobster.'

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6191 (iv).

Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).

Motions to Adjn., Ruling of Mr. Speaker, on Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).

Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts., &c. (remarks) 1600 (i).

National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6599 (iv).

N.T.R. Commissioners' Rep., Printing of (remarks) 97 (i).

Nat. Transcl. Ry., Lumsden, Mr., Resignation as Chief Engineer (remarks) 97 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Resignation, Reps. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 258 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Additional letter to Prime Minister, (remarks) 448 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Printing Papers, 377, 1302 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2367, 2601 (ii).

——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report, 6055 (iv).

——— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).

——— Errors in Rep. of Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196, 5277 (iii).

——— on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5597 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).

N.T. Ry., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8326 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 8310 (v).

N.T. Ry., Counsel, &c. (remarks) 4516 (iii).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt. (remarks) 7291 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1738 (i); on M. for 2°, 2979, Amt., 2991 (ii); Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101 (iii); in Com., 7396; on M. for 3°, 7528 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* withdrawing stmnt., 4940 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Inquiry for, 520, 1100, 1600 (i).

Naval Defence Conference (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Further Documents, Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Naval Service, of Canada, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Upkeep, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B, 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4836, 5289 (iii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1560 (i).

N.S. Judges: *See* 'Judicial,' &c.

Ontario Legislation, Disallowance, Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Permanent Force, Number of re-enlistments, &c. (question) 3735 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) on Ques. of Order, 3744 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 6603; in Com., 7316 (iv).

P.E.I. Rys., Royal Junction, Surveys, Reps. &c., (M. for copies*) 3170 (ii).

Prison and Reformatories Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8382 (v).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6564, 7262 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep. of Special Com., 6399 (iv).

——— on Procedure in Com., 6558 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6170 (iv).

Returns, Careless Arrangement of (remarks) 522 (i).

Reynolds, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7741 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7630 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6196 (iv).

R.M.C. Servants' Quarters, Occupation, &c., (Ans.) 263 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res., (Mr. Lewis) 1538 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i).

——— in Com. on Rep., 8374 (v).

St. John Valley Railway, Legislation re Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5366 (iii), 6169, 6246, 6721 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7524 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 811 (i), on M. for 2°, 2637 (ii).

Select Standing Committees, Organization of (remarks) 343 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).

See 'Volunteer.'

SUPPLY—

Canals—Cornwall (lock 19, entrance) 3123 Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3105; Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Indian Affairs (salaries) 359; Labour (contingencies) 241; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248; (salaries) 247 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v).

Fisheries (oyster culture) 8545 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8567 (v).

Mines (ore deposits) 8553 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8498 (v).

N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).

Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8512; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 597 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6133 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Kouchibouguac) 3392 (ii); (St. John) 6112 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900 (ii); (Laprairie) 4224; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. Andre de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4235; (Ste. Croix) 4236 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127; (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., Stmnt. re (remarks) 5278 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Stmnt., 6100 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1076 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8742 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8722 (v).

Waterways Treaty with the U. S., Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copy) 109 (i).

——— on Order for Cor. (remarks) 1536 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6100 (iv).

Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).

——— Information *re*, 3481 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).

——— Printing of Papers (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Ways and Means, on M. *re* Procedure (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).

——— U.S. Trade Relations, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 8742 (v).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c., by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4238 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 4428 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Algoma Rural Mail Delivery, Application *re* (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewal (Ques.) 3735 (ii).

Budget, The, 2093, 2102 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5219 (iii).

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 104 (i).

——— Sault Ste Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 105 (i).

See 'Port Arthur,' 'Sault Ste Marie.'

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693, 8695 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Gifts.'

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Roads, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 635 (i).

Gifts to Ministers of the Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation (M. for cor.*) 171 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8631 (v).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 635 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2677; in Com., 3152 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1783, 1970 (i).

——— Expenditure (remarks) on the Budget, 2106 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c., Recommendation (Ques.) 3736 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2921 (ii).

McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 3829 (ii).

Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7437 (v).

Naval Policy, Support of (remarks) 1649 (i).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers purchased, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6972 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).

Obscene Literature, Skill and King, Release of from Central Prison, Par. in 'Can. Municipal Journal' *re* Political Pull (remarks) 7068 (iv).

——— Detention of Books, &c., (Ques.) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8345 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy (M. for pets.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).

——— (remarks) 5003 (iii).

See "Dry Docks."

Pulp and Pulp Wood Exports from Sault Ste Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 836 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6982 (iv).

Race Track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5765 (iii).

Rush-Bagot Treaty, Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 5762 (iii), 7520 (v).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief B. 158 (Mr. Nesbitt) on M. for 2°, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8427, 8594 (iv).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5476 (iii); (amt.) 6735 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 171 (i).

——— (remarks) 3833, 3945 (ii); 5278 (iii).

Sault Ste Marie Locks, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 837 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 106 (i).

Supply—

Excise (distilleries) 1331 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6116 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3463; (Kensington) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Rainy River) 3472; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Sibley) 3475 (ii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2666 (ii).

Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

U. S. Claims: *See* 'Adjudication.'

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: *See* 'Rush-Bagot.'

Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 77) 1° m., 1441 (i).

Census, Decennial, Date of Taking (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Sauve, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign (M. for cor.) 2032 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4490 (iii).

Quebec Fisheries, and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c. (Ques.) 6940 (iv).

Savings Bank Act Amt (B. 76) 1° m., 1440 (i).

Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*

C. P. R. Teulon Branch, Extension, Govt. Approval, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine (Ques.) 106 (i).

See 'Combines Bill.'

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7311 (iv).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7979 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8033, 8059 (v).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost (Ques.) 632 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

See 'Manitoba.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duty, &c., on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Location since Jan., 1910 (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5552 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fisheries, Letter from Mr. Wold (read) 6720 (iv).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2667, 2683 (ii).

——— Report, &c. (remarks) 3391 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 1963, 3480 (ii). 5894 (iii).

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6292 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4833, 5236, 5279 (iii).

Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7871, 8237 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ques.) 129 (iv).

——— Instructions sent to Agent *re* Surrender (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

——— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell (remarks) 1963, 2279, 2636 (ii).

——— Instruction to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents (M. for papers*) 1380 (i).

——— Investigation by Dept. *re* Surrender, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

——— Letter from Rainway missing from Ret., Inquiry for, 1802 (i).

——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Negotiations with Mr. Wm. Frank (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

——— Payments to E. Raynor, Ques. of Priv., 7520 (v).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7012 (iv).

——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey (M. for copies*) 1976 (ii).

——— Rep. of A. S. Williams, &c. (M. for copy*) 3494 (ii).

——— inquiry for, 5689, 5762 (iii).

——— Report *re* Investigation, on M. for Sup. (amt.) 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165 (iv).

——— Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

——— Treatment *re* Surrender of Lands (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Stone Industry Protection, on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7349 (iv), 7759 (v); (experimental farms) 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 348 (i).

Fisheries—(Marine fishways) 8534; salaries) 8537 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 592 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540; (museum) 569; (military stores) 601 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Man. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli) 4262; (Red River) 4266; (St. Laurent) 4259; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3864; (Gaspé) 3895 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8073 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8435 (v).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6905 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1281 (i).

Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, &c., on M. to adjn. debate, 5600 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, 7567 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6967 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8175 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8755 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A. *Dundas.*

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5511 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2813 (ii).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King, to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6308 (iv).

Morrisburg Ferry Dock Co.'s incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5759 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3822 (ii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5335, 5342 (iii), 6268 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5560 (iii).

Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8754 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

Arcand T., Dismissal as Light Keeper at Carousel (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. of Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Bait Freezers, Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Bait, Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Canadian Shipping Act (inspection) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for 2°, 513 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of (Ans.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant at Barrington, N.S. Govt. Assistance, Application *re* (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ans.) 1529 (i).

Deep Water Weirs, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance (Ans.) 633 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ans.) 266 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Completion of Rep. and Evidence (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302 (i).

Fisheries Commissions since 1896, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Fisheries, Revenue in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River, &c., Total Cost (Ans.) 633 (i).

Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid per ton (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ans.) 133 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ans.) 1004 (i).

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 2430 (ii).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ans.) 107, 108, 130 (i).

——— Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Copies, 302 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).

——— (presented) 1297 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 640 (i).

'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 788 (i).

Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ans.) 107 (i).

Light-house Keepers, Increase in Salaries (Ans.) 1589 (i).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns (Ans.) 259 (i).

——— Licenses, Number issued (Ans.) 1970 (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Naval Cadets, Instruction *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Service, Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost &c., (Ans.) 1972 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c., (Ans.) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

Public Wharfs leased under Act of 1909 (Ans.) 260 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Monk) 431 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners (Ans.) 129 (i.)

——— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ans.) 625 (i).

Seal Cove Life Boat, Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ans.) 2147 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).
See 'Can. Shipping.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (salaries) 250 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1034 (i).

Tonnage Tax imposed by U.S. on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes (Ans.) 1530 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 25) 1° m., 258; 2° m., 1299; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 1302 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals, on M. (Mr. Macdonell) to adjn. House, 1599 (i).

——— Stmnt. (read) 1684 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 444 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Cor., 644 (i).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7812 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries vote, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4546 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7266 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Justice—Administration of N.W. Ters. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799; Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings, Que. (Shawinigan Falls) 949 (i); Harbours and Rivers Que., (Becancour) 3870; (Doucet's Landing) 3890 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8004 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Agriculture Dept., Adminstration of, on M. for Sup., 7242 (iv).

Apples grown in B.C. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ques.) 5001 (iii).

B.C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 16 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 533 (i).

B.C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 529 (i).

Budget, The (remarks) 2067 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

——— Surveys, &c., (M. for field notes*) 4315 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7899 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5846 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 16 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 380 (i).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2900 (ii).

National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3245 (ii); in Com., 7472; on M. for 3°, 7540 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Nechaco and Stewart Rivers, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 380 (i).

Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Foster) 2484 (ii).

Pests to Vegetation Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 211 (i); in Com., 5630 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7322 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6584 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 1444 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5726 (iii), 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6681 (iv).

Ocean and River Service—B.C. (wrecking plant) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 425 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Fort George canyon) 4727; (new plant) 4775; (Queen Charlotte) 4718 (iii).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops-Fenelon) 6156 (iv).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1878 (i); 2° m., 2101 (iii); in Com., 4841 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8438, 8721 (v).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*

Agriculture, Criticisms of Deptl. Methods, Ques. of Priv.. 1364 (i).

Agriculture Dept.. Administration of. on M. for Sup.. 7204 (iv).

Arts. Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286 (iv).

Budget, The. 2259 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2091 (ii).

Buttonshaw, George Robert Relief (B. 117) 1°*. 2710 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts.. 8657 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7309 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 5000, 5560 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6914 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i); in Com., 7264 (iv).

Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Doukhobours, Comparison to hon. Member for Dauphin, Explanation *re*, 5532 (iii).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) *re* Bill, 6802 (iv).

Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Evidence and Rep., Completion of (Ques.) 276 (i).

Fisheries Investigation *re* Man. and N. W. Ter, Inquiry for Rep., 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 744 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7821 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3060 (ii).

G. T. P. Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 1783 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ques.) 1784 (i).

Horses exported from Ont. to N. W. Ters. disinfecting Stockyards (remarks) 4812 (iii).

—— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 4209 (iii).

House of Commons (B. 60) 1°*, 1102 (i).

See "Dual."

House of Commons Members, Names of (M. for ret.*) 1547 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5532; on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications &c. (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Ques. of Privilege *re* 'up to date,' 2151 (ii).

See "Fisheries."

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5175 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1573 (i).

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1324 (i).

—— Prime Minister's Resignation (remarks) 1446 (i).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1542 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115, Plans *re* (remarks) 5560 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts, &c. *re* Spawn (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286; (experimental farms) 7346 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) conc. (M.) to reduce vote, neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540; (legal expenses) 8544; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 686; (St. Lambert) 956; Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1178 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv); in Com., 8072 (v).

CARRIER, Mr. L. A., *Lévis*

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6390 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*

Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 215) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Criminal Code Act (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8732 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 896 (i); in Com., 6546 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3137 (ii).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2323 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 510 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2047; in Com., 2154 (ii).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 851 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3143 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2520 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5241, 5282 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 607 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s. B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) 2° m., 4842 (iii); in Com., 6169 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7650 (v).

——— Ques.* of Order, *re* stmnt. of Judgeship, 7676 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, 3847 (ii).

St. John River Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5319 (iii).

Scott, Elmer Walker, Relief (B. 165) 1°*, 5557 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5701 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8570 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663 (i).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5251 (iii).

Trent Canals, Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5216 (iii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1192 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 515 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 63) 1°*, 1192 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *East Huron.*

Airships, development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 446, 1369 (i).

Budget, The, 1858 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186; on M. for 2°, 725; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5807, 5839 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6306 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3697 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5240 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5727 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8396 (v).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907, 5911 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7327 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3202 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7352 (iv).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com on Res., 7005 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3915 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8062 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 164) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 218) 1°*, 7975; 2° m., 8055, 8380; in Com., 8618 (v).

Lillie, Clifford Buell Relief (B. 224) 1°*, 8361 (v).

N.T. Ry. Co., Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., (M.) to conc., 3985 (iii).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc in 4th Report of Com., 6037 (iv).

——— Changes in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5595 (iii).

St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2651 (ii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8006 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*

Budget, The, 1880 (i).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6862 (iv.)
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8847 (v).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8629 (v).
Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 6611 (iv.)
Labour, Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2912 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3269 (ii).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8426, 8598 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7147 (iv).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T., *Yukon Territory.*

Budget, The, 1903 (i).
Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6587 (iv).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7829 (v).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1122, in Com., (amt.) 1131 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3720, 3748 (ii); in Com. 7417 (iv).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8444, 8710 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com. 6912 (iv), 7939 (v).
Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2166 (ii).
Criminal Code Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7267 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. employees) Amt. (B. 109) 1° m., 2184 (ii).
Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5918 (iii); in Com., 8065 (v).
International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2329; 2° m., 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6964 (v).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Control by Americans, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2191 (ii).
——— Control by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 2490 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 108) 1°* 2184 (ii); in Com., 5765 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5326 (iii), 6269 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749 (iii).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7840 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6105 (iv); Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Sibley) 3475 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8097 (v).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver City.*

B.C. Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 118) 1°*, 2329, 2° m., 2671 (ii).
Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 879 (i); in Com., 7266 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1256 (i).
Kitsilano Reserve Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ques) 788 (i).
Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3962 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7543 (v).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5304 (iii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).
Excise (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 599 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4281; (Lockport) 4715; (new dredging plant) 4769, 4772; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Stewart) 4726 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4842 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Loggie,' 'Gaspereaux,' &c.

Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Charges *re* Inspectors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Dalhousie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, N.B., Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ques.) 6508 (iv).
See 'Loggie.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant to, 3060 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 188 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2489 (ii).

—— Total Payment to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* sub-letting, &c. (Ques.) 383 (i).

—— (M. for cor.*) 643 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. *re* Investigation, &c., on M. for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 318 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104; in Com., 1131 (i).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2915 (ii).

Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5622 (iii).

—— Total Payments to (Ques.) 2488 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' 'Dredging,' 'Gaspereaux.'

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ques.) 2928 (ii).
See 'Loggie.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B .N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2761 (ii).

Mayes Contracts, Charges *re* Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4873 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, Par. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3740 (ii).

—— Ques. of Priv, *re* 'Globe's' criticism, 3476 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7592, neg. (Y. 63 N. 111) 7746 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370 (v).

St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c. (M. for copies*) 154 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580 (v).

St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction (remarks) 122 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i).
Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 587; (Hillsborough) 587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575; (Parrsboro) 577; (Shelburne) 579 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542 (i);

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i), 7169 (iv); (Museum) 566; (Royal Mint) 559 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que.—(Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927 (i); (St. Roch) 831 (i).

Public Works—Dredging, Generally (plant) 4780; Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper) 3391; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Lorneville) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3396 (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3428; (Richibucto) 3428, 3439; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1163; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2947; (Halifax) 2884; (Indiantown) 2884; Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton-cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (Riviere du Loup) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5260 (iii).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3209 (ii).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5650 (iii).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co., &c. (Ques.) 6799 (iv.)

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6954 (iv.)

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7893 (v).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6560 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1289 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman, in Com., 8033, 8058 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1145 (i).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re* (Ques.) 3672 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2430 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c., (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1249 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2793 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejecting of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5804, 5538; Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5650 (iii).

I.C.R. Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8236 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6310 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6366 (iv).

Negro Clergymen: *See* 'House of Commons.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8698 (v).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2473 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Post Office Clerks Salaries (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 2429, 3292 (ii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8126 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Soulanges (leakages) 3106 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767 (v).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 8544, (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8547 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7778 (v).

Immigration (agents) 8206 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Rivere du Loup) 5712; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Militia (pay, &c.) 8560 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7866 (v).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8173 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 5612, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976: (Black Point) 977; (Burk's Head) 979; (Dover) 989; (Eastern passage) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1172; (West Dublin) 1190 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que.—(Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7766 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (new machinery) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (St. John) 2946 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5713 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1059 (i).

——— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remark) 3208 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv); in Com., 8100 (v).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *West Elgin*

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Budget, The, 1894 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 7293 (iv.)

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M. for Sup., 5574 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6060 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2587 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4583 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Speech of Minister of Militia, 4711 (iii.)

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1327 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. Bill 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Indian Affairs (salaries) 367; Labour (salaries) 238 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6796 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*

Trent Canal Damage Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5211 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*

Apples grown in Provs., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5640 (iii).

Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5942 (iv).

Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'

Budget, The, 1701 (i).

——— (remarks) 1806 (i), 2076 (ii).

Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lakes Shipyards, and Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ques.) 844 (i).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6880; in Com., 6911 (iv), 7882; on M. for 3°, 7985 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i); in Com., 7265 (iv).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6989 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6637 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8852 (v).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1688 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman), in Com. on Res., 5915 (iii); in Com., 8068 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Ret. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5681 (iii).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8773 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building (Ques.) 1004 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8621 (v).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139, 6753 (iv).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

House of Commons Classification, Discussion *re* (remarks) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5849 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5640 (iii).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 516 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7945, 8473 (v).

I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).

——— Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidy Bill, 8482 (v).

I.C.R. and N.T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8766 (v).

Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ques.) 7519 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).

Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 520 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 88) 1° m., 1689 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6284 (iv).

Military Lands: *See* 'Baby.'

N.T. Ry., Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ques.) 8835 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5042 (iii); in Com., 7400 (v). *See* 'Can. Navy.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6212 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8771 (v).

Petroleum: *See* 'Crude.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).

Pure Food Act (B. 131) 1° m., 2792 (ii).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).

Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ques.) 2926 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4533 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8408 (v).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. (B. 174) 1° m., 5621 (iii).

Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Que.) 8834 (v).

——— (remarks) 8586 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).

Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4526 (iii).

Rules of the House, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7527 (v).

——— in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6737; on M. for 3° (amt. 6 m. h.) 7256 (iv).

——— Plans, &c. (remarks) 5560 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1348 (i).

Canals, Ont.-Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; Sault Ste. Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124; Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5697; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5712 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 8566; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (rifle ranges) 8561 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8499 (v).

Ocean and River Service (steamers) 8511; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 561; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 969 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5736; (Victoria) 5747 (iii).

Railways—G. T. P. (director's remuneration) 3131 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5915, 5982 (iv).

Telegraph Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S. (Ques.) 1530 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii); in Com., 8091 (v).

War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i). *See* 'Can. Navy.'

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C. B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8458, 8706 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5936 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*

Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ques.) 3934 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6897 (iv).

Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop (Ques.) 3934 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4801 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7303 (iv).

Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders, &c., *re* Dredging (Ques.) 3156 (ii).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6621 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8036 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1146 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy (M. for copy) 290, 326 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1880 (i).

See 'Life,' &c.

'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Canada and Australia (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7942 (v).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).

I. C. R. Employees Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).

——— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).

Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ques.) 107 (i).

See 'Hestia,' 'Old Proprietor.'

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 2149 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106 (v).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2746 (ii).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).

Milledgevile, Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4367 (iii); in Com., 7434 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6968 (iv).

Old Proprietor Light Buoy, Defective Condition, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

See 'Hestia.'

Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4737 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6169 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 924 (i).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8120 (v).

See 'Courtenay.'

St. John River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).

Sailing Directions to Capt. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373, 7376; (Dom. exhibitions) 7388; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 237; Fisheries (contingencies) 253; (salaries) 251 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation), 8525; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811 (v).

Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8504 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, saving life) 8515; (patrol vessels) 8521 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Hartland) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (St. John) 591 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Parrsboro') 577 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Museum) 566, 572; (standarizing room) 573 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Quebec ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4776; Generally (new plant) 4738, 4760; (vessel repairs) 4737 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6136 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2698; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3453; (Cumming's Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Petit Rocher) 3596; (Richibucto) 3445 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Seal Cove) 3449 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3880 (ii); (Shigawake) 4227; (Three Rivers) 4248 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2941; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (St. John) 2945 (ii).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8019 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7517 (v).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*

Bank Act Amt. (B. 56) 1° m., 922 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3536 (ii)

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1258 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4197, 4316 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Quebec and Ungava Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 190) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6931 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6297 (iv).

Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund incorp. (B. 13) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4124, 4129 (iii); in Com., 7419 (v).

——— on Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6981 (iv).

Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 98) 1°*, 1878 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6385 (iv); in Com., 8086, 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8009, (amt.) 8025 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8437 (v).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *South Bruce.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 731 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4618 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 569 (i).

Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 380 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. (B. 89) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 2671 (ii).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1528 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8095 (v).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4611 (iii).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 22 (i).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*

Armouries and Drill Halls, Erection of, Cost of Site, Places for Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii), 8742 (v).

Budget, The, 2227 (ii).

——— Remarks, 1817 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 74) 1° m., 1362 (i); 2° m., 2158 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land *re* Timber, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).
See 'Frontenac.'

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Fish Fry Application Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 752 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7806 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Routes, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

——— Pets. *re* (Ques.) 7066 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'

Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 1371 (i).

——— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 262 (i), 2717 (ii).

Green, John, Relief (B. 201) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5528; in Com., 5536, 5831, 5879 (iii).

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1217 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2910 (ii).

Mail Contract with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 1379 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4064, 4083, 4937 (iii); in Com., 7481 (v).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Naval Defence Bill, Report of Speech in Toronto 'Globe' (personal explanation) 4533 (iii).

Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Post Offices in Frontenac County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
See 'Frontenac.'

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5788 (iii).

R. M. C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 381 (i).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

——— Completion, Total Cost, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid to for Public Works, Kingston (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757 (v); (census) 7374; (cold storage) 7363; (exhibitions) 7389; (seeds) 7390 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3118 (ii); Welland (surveys) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6654 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5696; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176; (Fergus) 7180 (iv); (Kingston) 7505; (Listowel) 7507; Ottawa (deplt., new) 7170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663; (Maisonneuve) 673; (Marieville) 697; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 703; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6111 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1171; (Shelburne) 1176; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Dale, Mr. Sydney) 6168; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (telephone memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; B.C. (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie) 7391 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships, Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

——— (M. or O.C.'s) 135 (i).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing (Ques.) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3494 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 7287 (iv).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3461 (ii), 6164 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Banking Act, Consideration of (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8635 (v).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Order for 2°, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°, 2191 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8403 (v).

I.C.R., Repairs to Car 37, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

——— Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4847 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5003 (iii).

——— Vote *re* Amt. (Mr. Northrup) Ques. of Priv., 5195 (iii).

Naval Service, Appointments, &c. (remarks) 8838 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6971 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4824, 5288 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8735 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8587 (v).

Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re* (Ques.) 630 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5337 (iii), 6255 (iv).

——— Original Report, Inquiry for, 5559 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3109 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4781; Generally (new plant) 4744, 4759 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Moncton) 3394; (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii); (St. John) 6108 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 4250 (iii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5255 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3055 (ii).

Montreal Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 515 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1192 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queens, N.S.*

Alien Labour Law Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (ii).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. I and III (presented) 7 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

——— Vol. II. (presented) 1730 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 6947 (iv).

——— Expiration of, Issue of Currency (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 2061 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 56 (Mr. Demers) on M. for 2°, 2038 (ii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ans.) 5001 (iii).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Barriefield Camp, Objections *re* Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 532 (i).

B. C. Public Works—Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii).

Budget, The (annual statement) 1446 (i).

——— (remarks) 1002 (i).

Canadian Associated Press Subsidy (B. 228), prop. Res., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8680 (v).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ans.) 1967 (ii).

See 'Currency.'

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justice, Apptmt. of by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Civil Govt., Increased Expenditures (remarks) on M. for Sup., 216 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) on Senate Amts., 8772 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6889 (iv); on M. for 3°, 7992 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Customs Laws, 8002 (v).

Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Congregational Union of Canada incorp. B. 142 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 4754 (iii).

Conservation of National Resources Commission, Names of Members (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Criminal Code B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on Order for Com. (remarks) 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (B. 195) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6620 (iv).

Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ans.) 8238 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. (B. 233) 1° m., 8763; 2° m., 8841, 8849 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053, 3914 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (B. 229) in Com. on Res., 8687; in Com., 8763 (v).

——— (M.) To discharge Order, 8003 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1286 (i).

Estimates, The (1909-10)—(presented) 154 (i).

——— Suppl. (1910)—(presented) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1911)—(presented) 7519, 8577 (v).

——— Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 1446 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).

Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).

——— Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie (read) 3295 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12, in Com. on Res., 172; 1°*, 200; 2° m., 705; agreed to (Y. 107; N. 33) 780; 3° m., 812, 816, 822 (i).

——— (clerical error) Amt. (B. 126) 1° m., 2486 (ii); 2° m., 6620 (iv).

French Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 6 (i).

——— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 8665 (v).

——— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (remarks) 1690 (i).

——— Provision *re* Termination (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— Ratification of (announcement) 2797 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment to Germany (Ans.) 1196 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3944 (ii).
See 'Race Track.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3573 (ii).

German Surtax, Error in Memorandum (remarks) 4712 (iii).

——— Explanation *re* Negotiations, &c., (remarks) 3679 (ii).
See 'French Treaty.'

German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3830 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment as France (Ans.) 785 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°*, 4922 (iii); 2° m., 6329; in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 7512 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

——— Precedence on Monday (M.) 3829 (ii).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Inquiry *re* Ret. (remarks) 3945 (ii).

Grain Trade from West, Tel. *re* Terminal Elevator Co. (remarks) 8240 (v).

G.T.P. Bonds guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

House of Commons Staff, Increases, &c. (M.) 8830 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 5617 (iii); 2° m., 7940; in Com., 7943, 8459 (v).

Insurance Bill, Consideration of (remarks) 5893 (iii).

——— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ans.) 787 (i).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1111 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 511 (i).

——— Laying Letters on Table (remarks) 502 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 231) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8764 (v.)

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., &c., with Mr. W. T. R. Preston, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 331 (i).

Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Loans, Temporary, since June 1, 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

——— since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Outstanding on March 1st, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ans.) 6391 (iv.)

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8230 (v).

Lumsden Charges: *See* 'N.T. Ry.,' &c.

Mail Delivery, Free, Closing of Distribution Offices (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Militia Stores, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt of (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Subsidy (B. 191) Prop. Res., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1° m., 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601 (iv).

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ans.) 3671 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com. 3985 (iii).

——— on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) Ques. of Order, 8309 (v).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

——— Payment of Fees, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).

Natural Resources: *See* 'Conservation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7467; on M. for 3°, 7535 (v).

Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5303 (iii).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2279 (ii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission (B. 230) (prop. res.) 6801; in Com. on Res., 8697; in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 8663 (v).

Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Pilots' Association, Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 3744 (ii).

Port Arthur Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Dock.'

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Preston, W. T. R., Claims *re* Libel Suits, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor. 656 (i).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 289 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 604 (i).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps. &c, (Ans.) 1208 (i).

Quebec Bridge Ry. Co., Payments to by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 628 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6569 (iv).

——— Reintroduction of Bill 6 (remarks) 7258, 7263 (iv).

See 'Gambling.'

Railway Men, Rules *re* Employment (remarks) 8587 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 8239 (v).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 654 (i).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Mint, Total Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).

See 'Currency.'

Rules of the House, on prop, Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1539 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7148 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7522 (v).

Saskatchewan Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Dock Subsidies (remarks) 3945 (ii).

See 'Dry Dock Bill.'

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded (Ans.) 630 (i).

Senate Bills, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. B. 87 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 2056 (ii).

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger *re* Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).

Supply (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

Supply B. 173 (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com., 5606; 1° m., 5626 (iii).

——— (B. 196) 1°*, 6398 (iv).

——— (B. 235) in Com., 8856 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Gordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

Charges of Management (foreign coin) 5607 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7768 (v); Finance (salaries) 335 (i); Interior (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767; Secretary of State (salaries) 7767; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 8808 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8805 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 1358 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1335 (i).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

House of Commons (library) 8802; (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Canada and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5692 (iii), 8810; (Can. and G. B.) 8809 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5690 (iii), 8809; (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte) 8809; (Rivière du Loup) 8810 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7866; (Naturalization Act) 7865; (royal mint) 7866; (royal society grant) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Shelburne) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7508 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 572; (museum) 567; (royal mint) 558 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 688; (Quebec customs) 827 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4783, 4805 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Coquitlam) 4293 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982; (Diligent) 989; (Piper's Cove) 1160; (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1170 (i).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

Senate (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (Chinese Immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1089 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* 'Loans.'

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'Cus. Tariff Bill,' 'German,' &c.

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4713, 5278, 5690, 5762, 5891 (iii).

——— (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5942; Resolution laid on Table, 5967 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

U. S. Tariff, Importations, &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).

——— Maximum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

——— Minimum Tariff, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

——— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5760 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

——— The Budget, 1446 (i).

——— Supply Bill (M.) *re* Procedure, 6397 (iv).

Ways and Means, Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (M.) for Com., 5942 (iv), 8705; in Com., 8762 (v).

FISHER, Hon. S. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7191 (iv).

Agricultural and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Agricultural Machinery Imported into Canada. 1909 (Ans.) 383 (i).

Alfalfa: *See* 'Seed Control Bill.'

Animal Feeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons (remarks) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov., (remarks) in Com., on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ans.) 642 (i).

Census for 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1371 (i), 2429 (ii).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) Prop. Res., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; in Com., 7295 (iv).

Conservation Commission, Committee, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 4845 (iii).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 185) Prop. Res., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5885; 1°*, 5885 (iii); 2° m., 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3° m., 6619 (iv).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 1°, 430, 806 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (Prop. Res.) 2632 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Diseases to Vegetation: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

—— Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).
See 'Poultry.'

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ans.) 1017 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c. (Ans.) 631 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 735 (i).
See 'Milk.'

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, Results, &c. (Ans.) 790 (i).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ans.) 4309 (iii).

Horses imported into N.W. from Ont., Examination of (remarks) 4210, 4813 (iii).

Insects Bill: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (cargoes, &c.) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 429 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (B. 51) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).
See 'Milk Glass.'

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ans.) 1374 (i).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 520 (i); in Com. on Res., 657; 1°*, 661 (i); on Order for 2°, 5674 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 5929 (iii); 2° m., 6279; in Com., 6279; 3° m., 6618 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, &c. (Ans.) 639 (i).

Milk Glass Inspection (B. 184) prop. Res. 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii); in Com., 6005-6 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse. adjourn, 2562 (ii).

Natural Resources: *See* "Conservation."

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Pests to Vegetation, Prevention (B. 20) Prop. Res., 200 (i); in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); in Com., 5627 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Population, Method of Estimating, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation Report *re* (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 4519 (iii).
See "Supply."

Quarantine Boat Service at Halifax, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ans.) 5561 (iii).

Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ans.) 2926 (ii).

—— Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, on Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 171 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5444 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).

Seed Control Act (alfalfa) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 204; M. to discharge order for 2°, 656 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. (B. 55), in Com. on Res., 808, 1°*, 811 (i); 2° m., 2637; in Com., 2638 (ii).

S. A. War, Expenditure by Canada for Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 632 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit), London) 7380; (census) 7373 (iv), 7763 (v); (Charlottetown exhibition) 7765 (v); (cold storage) 7362, 7383; (dairying and fruit) 7362; (Dom. exhibitions) 7385 (iv); (exhibitions) 5728 (iii), 7389; (experimental branch stations) 7392 (iv); (experimental farms) 5725 (iii), 7333 (iv), 7764 (v); (farm bulletins) 7377; (fumigating stations) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7748 (v); (Patent Record) 7371; (seeds) 7390; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (experimental farms) 227 (i); (extra clerks) 7764 (v); (salaries) 219 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (usn transportation) 5748 (iii).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Handicrafts guild) 7863 (v); (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160 (iv).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (immigration sheds) 960; (Rock Island) 948 (i).

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv); 7766 (v); (Tracadie 7391 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup. 2665 (ii).

Thornton, Dr., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 626 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Perley) 1432 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Ways and Means Com. (M.) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

FORGET, Mr. R. *Charlevoix.*

Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbiniere.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, The, 60 (i).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 521 (i).

Analytical Index to Hansard (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Adminstration, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 2142 (ii).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Budget, The (reply) 1474 (i).

—— Remarks, 1002 (i).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

—— Amount of U.S. Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

See 'Naval,' &c.

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Civil Government Expenditures, Increase of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 212 (i).

Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Coal Oil Lands, Areas sold, leased, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 277 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re* (M. for ret.) 1977 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1689 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re* Expenditure by Canada (M. for ret.*) 1977 (ii).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditures *re* Preparation, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund, Grant to (remarks) 3059 (ii).

French Treaty, B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).

French Treaty, Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 8664 (v).

—— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France, 1690 (i).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Question put by another member, Ques, of Order, 1791 (i).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

Govt. Business, and Unopposed Motions (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137 (i).

See 'Annuities.'

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2184 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry.. Lands Sale along the Lines (Ques.) 1966 (ii).

—— Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from the Throne (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

—— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per mile, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 129, 623 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl,' &c.

Hansard Analytical Index, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).

See 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land sold (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ques.) 128 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 206 (i).

—— Instruction to Canada's Representatives (remarks) 923 (i).

—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c. (M. for copy of cor.) 388 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-Keeping, Capital and Income (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).
——— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1113; in Com., 1131 (i).
——— Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay-Lists on Windsor Branch, &c. (M. for papers*) 801 (i).
——— inquiry for ret., 2634 (ii).
Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers (remarks) 853 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2424, 2891 (ii).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).
Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).
——— Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Lumsden Charges: '*See* 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ques.) 3678 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Accidents *re* Pintsch and Acetylene Gas (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).
N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2617 (ii).
——— (M.) to adjourn Hse., 2561 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1734 (i); on M. for 2°, 3344 (ii).
Naval Defence Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).
Naval Service, Further Cor., Inquiry for, 2931 (ii).
——— Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).
——— 'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).
———War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C's. *re* (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
N. B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit (Ques.) 168 (i).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'
Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, &c., Information *re*, 623 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 8662 (v).
Party Patronage System (prop. res.) 2432 (ii).
——— Patronage Distribution, Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion, 1792 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Party Patronage System, on Order being called (remarks) 2151 (ii).
Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'
Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Ry. (Ques.) 3295 (ii).
——— Right of Way, &c. (Ques.) 8661 (v).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 618 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907 (Ques.) 1969 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1205 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure re (Ques.) 3678 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8580 (v).
Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 170 (i).
Royal Mint, Loss in Operation (remarks) re Answer to Question, 784 (i).
——— Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).
Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).
Rush-Bagot Treaty: *See* 'U.S.'
Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).
S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can. (Ques.) 1204 (i).
S. A. Veterans, Scrip, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345, 415; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Labour (salaries) 235; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 416 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 539; (deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 675 (i); (Marieville) 679; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital 823; (Que. immigration sheds) 926; (Que. observatory) 823; (Quebec P.O.) 824; (Rock Island) 947; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawinigan Falls) 950 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3423; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3067 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (draw bars) 2882; (Indiantown 2884; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935; (original construction) 2943 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).
Railways—N. T. R. (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1030 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* "Loans."

Toronto sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadians entering U.S. (remarks) 1101 (i).

U. S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).

—— Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

—— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

—— Trade Relations with U. S. (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com., 8754 (v).

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes (M. for cor., &c.) 791 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).

War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2713 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1968 (ii).

Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909 (Ques.) 260 (i).

FOWKE, Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*

Budget, The, 1613 (i).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 379 (i).

Foreign Capital invested in Canadian Enterprises, Location, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3236 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1053 (i).

Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 116) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 6768 (iv).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *Kings, P.E.I.*

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6798 (iv).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2777 (ii).

P. E. I. Mail Service, Increased Facilities, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ques.) 7518 (v).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Reps. *re* Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 288 (i).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3197 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res., 2005 (ii).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P. E. I. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).

Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5728 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6714 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Canada and Cuba) 5705 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5754 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside) 580 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

I.C.R., Rivière du Loup Coal Shed, Erection of (Ques.) 4128 (iii).

—— Workshops at Rivière du Loup, Electrical Development, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Lighthouse-keepers Salaries, Increase in, &c. (Ques.) 1589 (i).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ques.) 8238 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ques.) 1778 (i).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

British North American Mining Co. (B. 27) 1°*, 379 (i).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 169) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4070 (iii).

—— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6056 (iv).

—— 6th Rep. of Com. (M.) 8737 (v).

—— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196 (iii).

—— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5575 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4444 (iii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Botterill, Roland James Relief (B. 225) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 1878 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6910 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6550 (iv).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3944 (ii).

Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion (remarks) 3986 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6667 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6110 (iv).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

'Canada Gazette,' French Edition (remarks) 8585 (v).

Chambly River Dam and Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6949 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6933 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 514 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2424; (M.) to conc., 3052 (ii).

——— Translator, Apptmt. of (M.) 3914 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Res., 6508 (iv).

House of Commons, Officials' Increases, Mr. Laplante (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller)on M. for 2°, 507 (i).

Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association incorp. (B. 210) 1°*, 7286; 2° m., 7287; in Com., 7868 (iv), 8043, 8422, 8587 (v).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (salaries) 8538 (v).
Labour (technical education) 8800 (v).
Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (polytechnic school) 8822 (v).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel (Ques.) 2288 (ii).

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

GIRARD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ques.) 6800 (iv), 8837 (v).

See 'Savard,' &c.

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 2792 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ques.) 8837 (v).

McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Oyamel Company, Payments *re* Tamarac Wood (Ques.) 7870, 8834 (v).

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators, &c. (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Booms (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Reg., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot (Ques.) 8658 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Natashquan) 3910 (ii).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowance for 1907 (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Tremblay, J., Payments *re* Wood (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Wurtele, Col., 18th Regiment, Resignation, Refund of Moneys, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

GLADU, Mr. J. E. C., *Yamaska.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4953 (iii).

Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5647 (iii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*

Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt. (Ques.) 1016 (i).

Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7306 (iv).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 379 (i).

Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (repairs) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6998 (iv).

Currency Acts Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5647 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2904 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3659 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4828, 5297 (iii).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii), 6348, 6727 (iv).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2005 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7349 (iv).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422, 548 (i); (grounds) 8192 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Arrow lakes) 5614 (iii).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6373 (iv), 8715 (v).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5800 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 123) 1°*, 2426 (ii).

Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 2426 (ii).

Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3860 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*

Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Criminal Code (silver ore thefts) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 1588 (i); 2° m., 2162 (ii).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).

Gowganda Junction Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands, Compensation *re* Names, &c. (Ques.) 2295 (ii).

Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ques.) 1014 (i).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 2189 (ii).

North Bay Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7863 (v).

Robinson, Mrs., Imprisonment of, Pets. *re* Release (remarks) 924 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (printing) 253 (i).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa mint) 7866 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7863 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval 940 (i).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3081 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Address, The, Ques. of Order, Denial *re* reported speech, 81 (i).

Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1194 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Bridges, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2299 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Operation by G. T. Ry Co., Remedy *re* (Ans.) 102 (i).

Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal by N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 3166, 3676 (ii).

Bout de L'Ile Bridge Repairs, &c. (remarks) 6396 (iv).

B.C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars re (Ans.) 5929 (iv).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Application re Removal (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 227) prop. Res., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483 (v).

Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3150 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8784 (v).

——— Control of other Ry. Co.'s, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1208 (i).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. German) in Com., 3150 (ii).

C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval, &c, (Ans.) 1974 (ii).

Canal Statistics, Report (presented) 5759 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5214 (iii).

——— Total Amount of Account with Dept. (Ans.) 5781 (iii),7516 (v).

See 'Trent.'

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty (B. 208) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

See 'Petroleum.'

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 2°, 1271, 1290 (i).

Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

——— Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ans.) 2928 (ii).

See 'Lachine.'

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Indemnity for Damages on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

Govt. Railways (claims) B. 151, 1° m., 4402 (iii).

See 'Rys.'

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. (B. 232) in Com. 8772 (v).

See 'I.C.R'.

Govt. Rys. Provident Fund Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 206, 2° m., 1136; in Com., 1139 (i); on Order for, 3°, 2637 (ii).

Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

G.T.P., Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance by Govt. (Ans.) 2137 (ii).

——— Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c. (Ans.) 1366 (i).

G.T.P. and N.T. Ry. Commissions, Investigation *re* Classification (Ans.) 260 (i).

G.T.P. Classifications, Letters from Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 387 (i).

——— Memorandum of Chairman to Prime Minister (Ans.) 2139 (ii).

——— submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ans) 262 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl.'

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits (Ans.) 388 (i).

——— N.B., Provisions *re* sub-letting (Ans.) 383 (i).

G.T.P., Cost of Winnipeg and Edmonton Sections, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Engineers' Complaints *re* Arbitrators (Ans.) 2141 (ii).

——— Entrance into Brandon, Res. re (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

——— Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of (Ans.) 1784 (i).

——— Progress Estimates, Amount claimed in District 'A' (Ans.) 2140 (ii).

——— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).

———Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per Mile, &c. (Ans.) 624 (i).

Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

Gulliver's Cove, Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 1206 (i).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N.T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services (Ans.) 7064 (iv.)

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 170, 626 (i).

———Corrected Answer, 1099 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Hudson Bay Ry. Estimates, Stmnt. (read) 3206 (ii).

——— Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Hungary Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-keeping, Charges to Capital and Income (stmnt. read) in Com. of Sup., 2937 (ii).

——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).

——— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ans.) 627 (i).

——— Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 99 (i).

——— French Representation (Ans.) 7519 (v).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease (B. 17) 1° m., 205; 2° m., 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3° m. 2191, 2206 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402

——— Agreement *re* Senate Amendments, 8828, 8854 (v).

I.C.R., Coal Shed at Rivière du Loup, Erection of (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

——— Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Dismissals by Commission, &c. (Ans.) 128, 164 (i).

——— Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908, to March, 1909 (Ans.) 1776 (i).

——— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ans.) 835 (i).

——— Employees' Passes, Number issued for Oct., Sept. and Nov. (Ans.) 2716 (ii).

——— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 1367 (i).

——— Facilities, Prosecutions *re* Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

——— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

——— Low Rates, on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).

——— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Passes alleged to be stolen, Prevention re (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2635 (ii); 4812 (iii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Benefit Fund (B. 19) on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii).
See ' Govt. Rys."

I. C. R., Purchasing Agency, Names, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

——— Repairs to Car No. 37 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

——— Riviere du Loup Workshops, Electrical Development (Ans.) 6182 (iv).
See " River du Loup."

——— Safety of Travel, (remarks) 2279 (ii).

——— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ans.) 4847, 5105 (iii).

——— Standard Pay for Machinists, (Ans.) 259 (i).

——— Water Supply on Passenger Trains (remarks) 1304 (i).

——— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 344 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 263 (i).

Krick, Mr. W. W., Date of Apptmt. as Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland (Ans.) 836 (i).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work done *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ans.) 1964 (ii).

——— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 627, 1006 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

——— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

——— Electrical Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damage to (Ans.) 5104 (iii).
See " Evers.'

——— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100, &c. (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ans.) 1194 (i).

Level Crossing Protection, Rep. of Mr. J. Murphy (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Little Nation River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Lumsden Charges: *See* ' N. T. Ry.'

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absences, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging coming Season (Ans.) 1194 (i).

N. T. Ry., Accidents, Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8263 (v).

——— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2358 (ii).

——— Classification, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse adjourn, 2563 (ii).

——— Commission, Board of Arbitrators, Contractor's Claims *re* Over-Classification (Ans.) 836 (i).

——— Commission, Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Payments to (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

N. T. R., Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).

——— Profits re Supplies (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

——— (M.) to print, 97 (i).

N. T. Ry., Construction Contracts, Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer, 447 (i).

——— Contract to O'Brien and Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantity, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2715 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

——— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Date of Contract for Winnipeg to Superior Junction, &c., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

——— Estimated Cost of Excavations on District 'F' (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug., 1907 (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

——— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 839 (i).

N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 6393 (iv).

N. T. Ry., Surveys by G. T. P., Change in Location, &c. (Ans.) 2283 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ans.) 8835 (v).

——— Tunnel East of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, Completion of (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Winnipeg to Superior Junction, Opening for Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

See 'G. T. P.'

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4816, 5235 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8612 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1364 (i).

Patronage Distribution, on Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill, prop. Res., 6608 (iv).

See 'Crude.'

Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Railway (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

——— Right of Way, &c. (Ans.) 8661 (v).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4840 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ans.) 7518 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c. (Ans.) 104 (i).

——— Consideration *re* Quebec Bridge Franchise (Ans.) 261 (i).

——— Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans (remarks) 3390 (ii).

——— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29, 1907 (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Payments to Company at time of Collapse (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

——— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1205 (i).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 451; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 451 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 1°, 95; on M. for 2°, 474 (amt.), 478; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 478 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 480, (amt.) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Papineau) on M. for 2°, 2034 (ii).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2° (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 2156 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Ry. Act (board of ry. commissioners) Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 3914 (ii); 2° m., 8405; in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Govt., Adjudication of Claims (B. 151) in Com., 6600 (iv).

See 'Govt. Rys.'

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 8733 (v).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Min., Apptmt., Duties. &c. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Ans.) 8834 (v).

Ry. Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death (Ans.) 131 (i).

Railway Statistics Rep. (presented) 1729 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ans.) 1778 (i).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 842 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6233, 6354, 6666, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Lock, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 837 (i).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

Sunday Traffic: *See* 'London,' &c.

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4519 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Cornwall (concrete wall) 3123; (levelling) 3123; (lock 17, entrance) 3123; (lock 19, entrance) 3123; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 3103; (wharfs and basins) 3103 (ii).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 3127 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3106; (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Soulanges (leakage) 3105; (tool grinder) 3105 (ii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3106; (damages) 3120; (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3107 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121; (lock 2, channel) 3122 (ii); (Port Colborne) 8821; (surveys) 8822 (v).

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247; (salaries) 246 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsborough) 578 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (board of commission) 3094; (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874, 2947; (Chaudiere junction) 2873; (draw bars) 2882; (facilities) 2946; (Halifax) 2883; (highways) 2882; (Indiantown) 2884; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2933; (new machinery) 2942; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (Riviere du Loup) 2945; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (St. John) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946; (side ladders on cars) 2945; (Sydney Mines) 2946 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 3127; (litigation expenses) 3131; (ry. commission) 3127; (remunerations) 3131; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (Quebec bridge construction) 3070 (ii), 8821 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (construction) 3102; (Georgetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke)in Com., 6768 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 6097 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

Trent Canal, Expenditures on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 (Ans.) 446 (i).

——— Floods in Township of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

——— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ans.) 170 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control of by Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

See Holland,' 'Newmarket.'

Vancouver, Victorian and Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Running through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 8660 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Fall and Spring 1909 (Ans.) 5777 (iii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, Running Rights of Dom. Atlantic Ry. (Ans.) 1370 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8621 (v); 3° m., 8652, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 26) 8652 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction incorp. (B. 110) M. to refund Fees, 7512 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21, (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1218 (i).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6301 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4820 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2450 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8417 (v).

Railway Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5324 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re* Investigation of Needs (prop. res.) 1023; Neg. (N. 78; Y. 56) 1098 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Technical Education, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2362 (ii).
—— Replies from Provl. Premiers (Ques.) 3160 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8096 (v).
Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8439, 8706 (v).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).
HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Address, The, 67 (i).
Congregational Union of Canada incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 3481 (ii); in Com., 4754 (iii).
Dubuc, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 2277 (ii).
—— Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of a Successor (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 751 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5549 (iii).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 8468 (v).
Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).
Manitoba Bench Vacancy, Delays, &c. (remarks) 5624 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; (amt.) 8141; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 661 (i).
Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Ruttan) in Com., 4817, 5240 (iii).
Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada (B. 33) 1°*, 380 (i); on order for 3°, 2279 (ii).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders (M for cor.*) 4315 (iii).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench (Ques.) 3489 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (construction) 3106 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 8185 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4261; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4263; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3099 (ii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1039 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays, &c. (Ques.) 3672 (ii).
—— Representations *re* (M. for cor.*) 4315
—— (remarks) 4134 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).
Budget, The, 2067 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2230 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6951; in Com., 7313 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5217 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6869 (iv); in Com., 7904 (v).
Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
Currency Act Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 6636 (iv).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com. 3920 (ii); 5772 (iii).
Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6975 (iv).
Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5906 (iii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7833 (v).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8619, 8636 (v).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6765 (iv).
Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5922, in Com., 5926 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on Prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 152 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt. (reply) 2840 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1103 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5598 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5900; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).
N.T. Ry., Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2582 (ii).
—— (remarks) 2417 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7454 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6202, 6970 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236, 5284 (iii).

New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8617 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7321 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6977 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6571 (iv).

—— Procedure *re* Discussion, 6559 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8407 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6197 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7100 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1999 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of, Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Canada and Mexico) 5690; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6107 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5231, 5249 (iii); 8359 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714 (iii).

Water Power in B. C. Ry. Belt, B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5888 (iii).

HARRIS, Mr. L., *Brantford.*

Co-operation (B. 50) 1° m., 705 (i).

Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt (B. 75) 1° m., 1363 (i); in Com., 8731 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association (B. 111) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 6139; 6739 (iv).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3929 (ii).

Toronto Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6783 (iv).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8468 (v).

Kingston, Smiths Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 4128 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; Que. (Aylmer) 3864 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agriculture, Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7224 (iv).

Agriculture, Machinery imported into Canada, 1909 (Ques.) 382 (i).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2229 (ii).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 277 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8486 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6995 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6622 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5912 (iii), 8071 (v).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Fisheries, Regulations *re* International Fishing, Inquiry for Rep., 1880 (i). *See* 'International.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°. 770 (i).

—— B. 126 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 6320 (iv).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreements, &c., *re* Rys. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6762 (iv).

Horse Races and Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593; on M. for 3°, 7270 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, asks for Names of Companies, 502 (i)

I. C. R. and N. T. R. Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109; in Com., 1136 (i).

International Fisheries Regulation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 381 (i).

—— (remarks) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair to conc., 8229 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3° 2280 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3985 (iii).

N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior Jct., Open for Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6966 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iv).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7313 (iv).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 466 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Rules of the House in Com. on Rep., 8367 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115, on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv); (live stock industry) 7751 (v); (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (cribwork) 3124; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macdamizing roads) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3112 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768 (v); Customs (salaries) 246; Indian Affairs, (salaries) 346; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 232 (i); Interior(salaries) 8194 (v); Justice (salaries) 253; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 250 (i); Militia (salaries) 7767 (v); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i); Secretary of State (salaries) 7767 (v).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7777 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8200 (v).

Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837; (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8565; (monuments) 8575 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally— (tobacco curing) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8183 ; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 584 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7179 (iv); (Guelph) 8169; (Waterloo) 8178, (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422; (deptl. buildings, new) 553 (i); (grounds) 8191 (v); (Royal Mint) 558 (i); (ventilation) 8172 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 669; (Marieville) 688 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3457 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3881; (Gaspe) 3892; (Godfroy) 3899 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127 (ii).

Senate (sesional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6769 (iv).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2098 (ii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8397 (v).

Ways and Means, on M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

Ways and Means—Tariff with U. S., in Com., 8757 (v).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7209 (iv).

Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5894 (iii).

Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iv).

Immigrants from U. S., Remarks of Mr. Bruce Walker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548, 5817, 5847 (iii).

Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 119 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8473 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6321 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4888 (iii).

Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal or Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1801 (i).

——— Open for Homesteading Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).

Pincher Creek Sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7326 (iv).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6200 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2641 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363; (experimental farms) 7348 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Macleod) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (North Saskatchewan river channel) 4273; B.C. (Chilliwack) 4299 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8202 (v).

Indians—Alberta (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5999, Res. *re* Farmers, 6000 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv); in Com., 8099, 8400 (v).

Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5801 (iii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6825 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3539 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1366 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5793 (iii); in Com., 6005 (iv).

Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3057 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 2069 (ii).

Can. Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Champlain, Samuel de, Monument, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7304 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number Passing Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

—— Apptmts. under the C. S. Act, Temporarily, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7885, 7900; on Amt. (Mr. King) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 150 (i).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5897 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 897 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6993 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8688 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ques.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, and Political Literature &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ques.) 133 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com., 1139 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); in Com., 5810, 5834 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8031 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canada's Rights (remarks) 5761 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1236 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr Martin) in Com. 3140 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 660 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 105 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3760 (ii); in Com., 7399; on M. for 3°, 7562 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1572 (i).

North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2711 (ii).

Ochre River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8699 (v).

Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2137 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).

Ross Rifle, Ques. of Privilege, 338 (i).

—— Regulations of National Rifle Association re (M.) to adjn. Hse., 4519 (iii).

R.M.C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Fredrick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8122 (v).

St. Johns, Que., Govt. Land, Occupation by Militia (Ques.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5336 (ii), 6226, 6343, 6663, 6724 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7084 (iv).

S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue (Ques.) 133 (i).

—— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8580 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (experimental farms) 7348; (farm bulletins) 7378 (iv).

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337, Finance (salaries) 336; Indian Affairs (salaries) 356; Mines (salaries) 336; Public Works (salaries) 333 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armouries) 8570; (gratuities) 8571; (instructions) 8573; (pay, &c.) 8559; (rifles, &c.) 8563; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7497; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8171 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (Joliette) 663; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Levis) 669; (Maisonneuve) 674; (Marieville) 679; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 702; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (New Mills) 3395 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (South Cove) 1177; (Tusket Wedge) 1179 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; (Haileybury) 3469; (Juniper Island) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin's Island) 3474; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Rainy River) 3472; (Rondeau) 3474 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles) 6102 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069; I. C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3074 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5944 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1090 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).

U.S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Number, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4996 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6379 (iv); in Com., 8096 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying (Ques.) 130 (i).

Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5937 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5655 (iii).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ques.) 1536 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. from Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ques.) 1014 (i).

Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of new Office (Ques.) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Centreville Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Conservation Committee, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 4845 (iii).

——— Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

See 'Natural.'

Customs Act Amt. (B. 200) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Herring.'

Digby Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 4811 (iii).

Fishing Vessels Licenses (B. 199) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ques.) 133 (i).

Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Deep,' &c.

Herring Fisheries Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5513; in Com., 5805, 5821 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5655 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1134 (i).

——— Employees, Payments to, Names, Apptmts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1021 (i).

———Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 3059 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3149 (ii).

Lobster Canning Licenses, Number issued (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with, &c. (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2779 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6363 (iv).

Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1762 (i); in Com., 7489 (v).

Naval Service in Can., Number of Applicants, Policy of such Appointments, &c. (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1973 (ii).

N. S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. in B. N. A. Act (Ques.) 1965 (ii).
See 'Mar. Provs.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8703 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Divisions, Decision of Prime Minister (remarks) 413 (i).

Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to N. B. and N. S. (Ques.) 3166 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5341 (iii).

Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, Cor. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2798 (ii).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

Senate Vacancies in N. S., Names of Appointees, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v).

Fisheries (customs bureau) 8547 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamers) 8528; (salaries) 8524; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8572 (v).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 573; (Halifax) 575; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4788, 5717 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6134 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Brooklyn) 978 (i); (Centreville, &c.) 8817 (v); (David's Cove) 985; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Habitant River) 992; (Little River) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Nyanza) 1000; (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1169; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E.I. (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Westport Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

Weymouth Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE (Minister of Labour), *North Waterloo.*

Aliens Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 272 (i).

——— Violations *re* (remarks) 4814 (iii).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination (Ans.) 2297 (ii).
See 'Combines Bill.'

Combines Investigation Act (M.) for Com. on Res., 2489 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act (B. 101) 1° m., 2056 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 6802; 2°, m. and in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881; 3° m., 7977, 7981; on Senate Amts., 8777 (v).

———(amt.) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Combines Bill, Rep. of Speech (personal explanation) 7188 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i).

Extension B. C., Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. (B. 198) Prop. Res., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603 (iv); in Com., 8027 (v).

Industrial Disputes, Increase in Wages, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1590 (i).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration from U. S., entering B. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1229 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1586 (i).
—— Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 2424, 2887; conc. in (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 8830 (v).
Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Priv., Res. read by Minister of Militia (explanation) 4710 (iii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5446 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Labour (contingencies) 243; (salaries) 235 (i).
Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1061; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1076, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1097 (i).
—— Letters to Premiers, &c. (read) 2666 (ii).
—— Replies of Provl. Premiers (Ans.) 3160 (ii).
Technical Education, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remarks) 3208 (ii).
Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2662 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*

Fleming, Helena Mellor Relief (B. 179) 1°*, 5759 (iii).
Hudson Bay Insurance Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 515 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* Amt. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond, N. S.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (i).
Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. re B.N.A. Act (prop. Res.) 2718 (iii)

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4848 (ii).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6526 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7359; (tobacco) 7381 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).
Budget, The, 1828 (i).
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c. (Ques.) 5001 (iii).
Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
Dom. Land Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3290 (ii).
Fisheries Revenue in Alberta and Sask., &c. (Ques.) 1021 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re* (Ques.) 5931 (iv).
Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908 (Ques.) 847 (i).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ques.) 275 (i).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Alberta and Sask., Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).
Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).
See 'Warwick.'
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ques.) 3671 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1737 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5158 (iii).
Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-30-9, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 1686 (i).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Prime Minister Speech at Toronto, Rep. of 'Globe,' 2430 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3167 (ii).
School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 5930 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid Additional Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1002 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution to Homestead Holders Quarter Sections 24 (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 251 (i).

Dom. Lands (salaries) 8490 (v).

Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8497 (v).

Post Office (P. O. guide index) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain) 4272 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8819 (v).

Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ques.) 2289 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8394 (v).

Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).

See 'Mudie.'

Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50 (Ques.) 4079 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2079 (ii).

Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).

Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 1009 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 721 (i).

German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations, (remarks) 3680 (ii).

German Tariff and U. S. Rates, &c. (remarks) 3833 (ii).

Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt. (Ques.) 835 (i).

Long Sault Rapids, Deputations *re* Building of a Dam (remarks) 2061 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5031 (iii).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv); Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3837 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2016 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6925 (iv).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8731 (v).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8763 (v).

Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 172; on M. for 2°, 739 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).

Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8618 (v).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6748 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5554, 5844 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2812 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Senate Amts., 8404 (v).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4844 (iii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 125 (Mr. Oliver) on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8235 (v).

Lumsden Charges, N.T. Ry. Classification, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6094 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5016 (iii); in Com., 7418 (v).

Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8600 (v).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6400; on M. for

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Com., 6407; in Com., 6503, 6548; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 413, 448 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 94; 2° m., 452, 462; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 95; 2° m., 467; Neg. (Y. 87; N. 53) 479 (i).

Railway Act (appeals) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6601 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).

Ry. Committee (M.) to reduce Number, 8734 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5767 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8596 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370.

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8124 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5465 (iii), 6355, 6735 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

Senate, Abolition, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, Prop. Address to His Majesty, 1977, Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1332; (translation) 1343 (i).

Fisheries (legal expenses) 8543; (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8540 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8206 (v).

Justice—Administration of—N. W. T. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro') 578 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (military stores) 597; (museum) 568 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 928; (St. Roch) 830; (Shawenegan Falls) 949 (i).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8391 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8005, 8436, 8706 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*

Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs (Ques.) 8889 (iii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

I. C. Ry., Board of Control, French Representation (Ques.) 7519 (v).

——— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4547 (iii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID, G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*

Address, The, 40 (i).

——— (M.) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on Closing of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4618 (iii).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 522 (i).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1020 (i).

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3210 (ii).

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2489 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2636 (ii).

All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Annuities Act. Expenditure *re* Administration, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).

——— Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 385 (i).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 3057 (ii).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).

Barrie and Allandale, Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ans.) 169 (i).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Maintenance, &c., Cost (Ans.) 2426 (ii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2014 (ii).

Boundaries: *See* 'Manitoba,' 'Provincial.'

B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c. (remarks) 6, 8 (i).

B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 527 (i).

—— Recommendations *re* from Political Organizations (Ans.) 382 (i).

Business of the House, Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Camborne Postmaster, Pet., *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1016 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1583 (i).

—— Agent at Washington (remarks) 4710 (iii).

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications for Positions (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

—— Pet. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ans). 5782 (iii).

—— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ans.) 2931 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 2°, 2161 (ii).

Canadian Shipbuilding, Tenders from Ship Yards on Great Lakes, Conflict with Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 844 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657 (v).

Chartered Banks, Shareholders' Rep. (presented) 5759 (iii).

Chinamen, Paying Capitation Tax (Ans.) 7870 (v).

Christmas Adjournment (M.) 923, 1298 (i).

Claims Adjudication Treaty, Ratification, &c. (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7937 (v).

—— (remarks) 1363 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5, 22 (i).

—— Lists (presented) 155 (i).

—— (M.) to add Names, 1001 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1977 (ii).

Conservation Commission, Meeting of Com. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 854 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

—— Consideration of (remarks) 2711, 3206 (ii).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt .B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).

Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8733 (v).

See "Motor."

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 921 (i).

Currency, Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in Report of Com., 3053 (ii).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3166 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (prop. res.) 6276 (iv), 8113 (v).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 6802 (iv).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

'Earl Grey' Str., Names of Crew, Wages, (Ans.) 3467 (ii).

Easter Adjournment (M.) 5688 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6186 (iv).

Fenian Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers,' &c.

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5921 (iii).

Fisheries in Man. and N. W. Ter., on Inquiry (Mr. Campbell) for Rep., 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Fish Fry, Applications for Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 4812 (iii).

French, Sir John: *See* 'Petawawa.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 765 (i).

German Trade Relations *re* Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2221 (ii), 4315 (iii).

Govt. Business for Session, &c. (remarks) 5893 (iii), 6100 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Govt. Ry. Bills, Conference with Senate (M.) 8834 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1138, 1142 (i).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Governor General, Address to on Close of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Grain shipped and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ans.) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Port Arthur and Fort William, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
G.T.P., Winnipeg to Lake Superior Div., Opening of, Ref to in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 3677 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ans.) 2427 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8380; in Com., 8623 (v).
Halifax Harbour and Big Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
Harland & Wolff, Rep. *re* Shipbuilding (remarks) 1363 (i).
Horse-Racing Regulations (remarks) 6617 (iv).
See 'Criminal,' 'Race Track.'
House of Commons, Reorganization of Staff (M.) 6389 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7071 (iv).
——— (M.) to disch. Order, 7872 (v).
See 'Sessional, &c.
House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Conversion of Cost into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).
——— Distribution of French Edition (Ans.) 276 (i).
——— Instructions to Canada's Representative (remarks) 923 (i).
——— New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).
——— Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 413 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Can. and Australia (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 96 (i).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 3490 (ii).
——— Report re (remarks) 2153, 3059 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Iron and Steel Bounties (prop. res.) 8362 (v).
Japan-United States Treaty, Safe-guarding Canada's rights (remarks) 5762 (iii).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ans.) 7519 (v).
Labelle Settlers Grievances, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 8782 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2426, 2890 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7065 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8142 (v).
——— Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. Roche) for Copies, 644 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 131 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Report, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Campbell) 2152 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 3480 (ii).
See "Fisheries."
Manitoba Grain Act Amt B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2788 (ii).
Minister of the Crown, Gifts to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8789 (v).
Morning Sittings (M.) 6099 (iv).
Motions to Adjn, Rulings of Mr. Speaker (personal explanation) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts. (remarks.) 1601 (i).
Motor Vehicles, Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).
See "Criminal Code.'
National Anthem, Singing of during Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).
National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6600 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden (M.) for Special Com., 2330, 2609, 2949 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
N. T. Ry. Classification, on Order being called for Com. (remarks) 2198 (ii).
——— Letter to Prime Minister, on Inquiry for, 448, 622 (i).
——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5197 (iii).
——— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5584 (iii).
——— Changes in Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5567 (iii).
——— Error in Res. of Com. (remarks) 5278 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6017 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Printing, 377 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Imp Govt. *re* (remarks) 7292 (iv).
Naval Defence (B. 95) 1° m., 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952 (ii); Agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193 (prop. res.) 5195 (iii); in Com., 7393 (v); 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7591 (v).
Naval B. 95, Notice for prop. Res., Naval Dept., 6509 (iv).
——— in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv).
Naval Defence, Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).
Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 521, 1100, 1600 (i).
——— On Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Cor., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Pensions, prop. Res. (M.) to discharge from Order Paper, 8742 (v).
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8839 (v).
See 'Can. Navy,' 'Warships.'
N. B. Coal and Ry., Disputed Accounts, Settlements of (remarks) 169 (i).
New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).
'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act (Ans.) 1965 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 3 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
——— (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
Ottawa and Quebec Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1315 (i).
——— Resignation, 1689 (i).
LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers (Ans.) 167 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 4129 (iii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated (Ans.) 447 (i).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ans.) 268 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Post Offices opened in Can., 1909, Weekly Mail Service in N.S., &c. (Ans.) 626 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 8364, 8380 (v).
——— (M.) to extend time, 1597 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lake) *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Speech, 2431 (ii).
Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 138 (i).
——— (M.) for Com., 429 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Extension Res. Notice to N.B. and N.S. (Ans.) 3167 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 614 (i).
Quebec Fisheries, Special Regulations, Licences granted, &c. (Ans.) 6940 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) (M.) to consider Rept. of Special Com., 6398; on Order for Com., 6510; in Com., 6567 (iv).
Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 452 (i).
Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).
Railway Committee, Rules re (remarks) 8833 (v).
Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 7873 (v).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).
Representation: *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Proportional.'
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 8580 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Ass'cn, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).
R.N.W.M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 843 (i).
——— Report (presented) 1730 (i).
Rules of the House, Report, laid on Table, 7867 (v).
——— (M.) *re* Special Com., 1299, 1441 (i).
——— Progress *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii), 5894 (iv), 7528 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Rules of the House, (M.) for Com. *re* consideration of Rep., 8365 (v).

—— on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1537 (i).

Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).

—— Locks furnished (Ans.) 784 (i).

Rural Free Mail Deliveries, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 259 (i).

—— East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).

Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of, &c. (remarks) 5762 (iii).

—— Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 7520 (v).
See 'U.S.'

St. John Valley Ry., Legislation *re* Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6138, 6227, 6722 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 3169 (ii).

Saturday Sittings of House (M.) 8110 (v).

Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1993 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2006 (ii).

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P.E.I. (Ans.) 1376 (i).

—— Names of Appointees (Ans.) 386 (i).

Sessional Employees, H. of C. under Pay in January (Ans.) 4514, 5001 (iii).

Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ans.) 7065 (iv).

Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3293 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stenographers for Committees of H. of C., Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8677 (v).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 415 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance, &c.) 8495 (v).

Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

R. N.W.M.P. (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).

Suzerainty to King of England, Report of Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ans.) 2289 (ii).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5993 (iv).

—— (remarks) 5932 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Tourists Post Office, Number temporarily established (Ans.) 170 (i).

Trade and Commerce Deptl. Rep. (presented) 621 (i).

U.S. Claims: *See* 'Claims.'

U.S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships, Number on Great Lakes, &c. (Ans.) 133 (i).

—— Passage through Canals, Consultation of Depts., &c. (Ans.) 108 (i).

—— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 103 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Can. Canals, on M. (Mr. Edwards) for O. C.'s (amt.) 135 (i).

——on Great Lakes, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 800 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'

Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

War Ships on Great Lakes, Reps. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building (Ans.) 1367 (i).
See 'U.S.'

War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2714 (ii).

War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C.'s *re* &c., (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
See 'Naval.'

Waterways Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).

—— Rep. (presented) 209 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii).

—— Cor., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copy, 109 (i).

—— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).

Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3136 (ii).
See 'Supply.'

Year-Book, Expenditure *re* French Distribution (Ans.) 1020 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Arthabaska 'Gazette,' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges (M. for copies*) 2149 (ii).

Eastern Townships Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 379 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51, on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1095 (i).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ans.) 7871 (v).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c. (Ans.) 5779 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4313 (iii).

Cable Rates Bills: *See* 'Ry. Act Amt. B. 104,' 'Ocean.'

Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).

Central Park, B. C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing, &c. (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).

——— Discontinuance of Mail Service (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Civil Service Act (P. O. inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) prop. Res., 6100 (iv).
See 'P. O. Inspectors.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6955; in Com., 7310 (iv).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756, 5895 (iii).

Dauphin Post Office Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Delisle, Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3293 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re* (Ans.) 4312 (iii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenues per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7800 (v).

Frontenac Mail Contracts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 7066 (iv).

——— Routes, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Frontenac County Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iv).

Gowganda Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Great Northwestern Tel. Co. and Night Letter *re* French Language (remarks) 8241 (v).

Grenville and Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions from (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holland Post Office Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Kilmant and Shackleton Post Office, Application *re* Opening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Lachute Post Office, Opening of (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Lethbridge Post Office Facilities, on Inquiry for Ret., 3683 (ii).

——— on M. for Sup., 7782 (v).

——— Total Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Mails addressed to Streets, Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 8119 (v).

——— (Ans.) 7869 (v).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs. (remarks) 8582 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery at Sydney (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Mail Privileges of Members *re* Postal Regulations (Ans.) 2146 (ii).

Markham Post Office, Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Jean Gauthier, Removal of, &c. (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Milledgeville-Holderville, N. B., Mail Route, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3023 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4978 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Application *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

North Bay P. O. Inspector(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Ocean Cables Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 8388 (v).
See 'Cables.'

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Postal Regulations during Parliamentary Recess (Ans.) 2486 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° m., 6389; in Com., 7313 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. Bill (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service B., 6955 (iv).

Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Statmt. *re* (Ans.) 2932, 3673 (ii).

See 'Winnipeg.'

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increases, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ans.) 5780 (iii).

Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examination, 1908, Accepted answer to question 4 (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ans.) 109 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6979 (iv).

Quebec-Levis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6941 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2136 (ii); 2° m., 6007; in Com., 6010 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

—— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ans.) 5106 (iii).

—— Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1380 (i).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 2930 (ii).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Sunday Postal Office, Winnipeg, Closing of (remarks) 2932 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv). Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (contingencies) 5607 (iii); Outside Service (contingencies) 8818 (v); (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 5752 (iii), 7863 (v); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865; (Bic) 3872; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3882; (Gaspe) 3893; (Godfroy) 3899; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Riviere) 3903 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Malbaie) 3907 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (St. Andre de Kamouraska) 4230; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste. Croix) 4241 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Telegraphs Act Amt. (B. 105) 1° m., 2138 (ii); in Com., 6011 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8389 (v).

—— (B. 234) 1° m., 8776; in Com., 8777 (v).

See 'Ocean.'

Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Owner of Buildings, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Windygate Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ans). 2930 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8118 (v).

—— (remarks) 8364 (v).

Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays (remarks) 3135, 3673 (ii).

—— (remarks) *re* Answer, 3484 (ii).

See 'Sunday,' &c.

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7202 (iv).

Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ques.) 169 (i).

Barrie Post Office Square (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c. (Ques.) 3166, 3676 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7301 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Flood Damages, on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

—— Instructions, Payments, &c., as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

—— Payments to *re* Trent Canal Damages (Ques.) 7516 (v).

—— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5885 (iii).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. (B. 41) 1° m., 430; 2° m., 805; on Order for Com., 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6632 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3482, 3872 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8696 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth)in Com., 6184 (iv).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 176 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ques.) 3294 (ii).

G. T. P., Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits, &c. (Ques.) 387 (i).

—— Eastern Div., Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1687 (i).

—— Engineers' Complaint against Arbitrators (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

—— and N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl..'

—— Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N. T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services, &c. (Ques.) 7064 (iv).

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 170, 626 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5534, 5819, 5840 (iii).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7865 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1112 (i).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2889 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Marieville Post Office, Que. of Order in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Adjustment of disputed Item in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 3495 (ii).

—— Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of, &c. (Ques.) 2137 (ii).

—— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2335; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 109) 2629 (ii).

—— Changes in Rep. of Com., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

—— Changes in Rep., on M. for Sup., 5585 (iii).

—— Classification submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ques.) 261 (i).

—— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

—— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

—— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion, &c. (Ques.) 839 (i).

—— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

—— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister (Ques.) 2139 (ii).

—— Objections *re* Classification, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 2297 (ii).

—— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to consider, 5820 (iii).

—— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6015 (iv).

N.T.Ry., Lumsden Charges, Appmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (amt.) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).

—— Royal Commission (prop. res.) on M. for Sup., 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).

N. T. Ry. Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificates, Cor. (M. for copies*) 1686 (i).

—— Promotion of, (Ques.) 839 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

—— Names of Contracts, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2297 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2715 (ii).

—— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

—— Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F' (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

—— Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907 (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

—— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

——— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 2283 (ii).

——— and Quebec Bridge, Expenditures *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 6392 (iv).

——— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

——— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4752, 4814, 4819, 5235, 5281 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5723 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commisison B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt., in Com., 1365 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Directors at time of Collapse (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

——— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 628 (i).

——— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ques.) 840 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c. (M. for ret.*), 277 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s B. 115, in Com., 5841 (iii), 6138, 6672, 6721; (amt.) 6725; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv).

SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of by Officials (remarks) 7976 (iv).

——— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 8477 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1348 (i).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl., new) 7169 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 929; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 954 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4755 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Lawrence River Channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Matane) 3907; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3911 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (drawbars) 2882; (Halifax) 2884; (highways) 2882; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (side ladders) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5232 (iii), 5249 (iv), 8360 (v).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3078 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Ques. of Priv., 5759 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Intermediate Tariff, &c.(remarks) 5892 (iii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

——— Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry, &c., on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 4714 (iii), 6096 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

——— Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Address, The, 82 (i).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 380 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2013 (ii).

Capital Offences and Offensive Weapons (B. 14) 1°*, 204 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington (prop. res.) 1582 (i).

Canadian Business Agent at Washington (remarks) 4708 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6861 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ques.) 5104 (iii).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 853 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (assaults, &c.) Amt. (B. 71) 1°*, 1360 (i).
Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt. (B. 13) 1° m., 201 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii); in Com., 8729 (v).
Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ques.) 8238 (v).
—— Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7188 (iv).
Daylight Saving (B. 72) 1°*, 1361 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 3133 (ii).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910 (Ques.) 7872 (v).
Inspection of Vessels (B. 47) 1° m., 515 (i).
Load Lines on Ships (B. 10) 1° m., 162 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 2nd Rep. 3133 (ii).
Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).
Motor Vehicles Injuries (B. 13) 2° m., 2035 (ii).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4403 (iii).
Oaths, Administration of (B. 100) 1° m., 1878 (i).
Offences against the Person (B. 71) 2° m., 2040 (ii).
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to (remarks) 4712-3 (iii).
Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1297 (i).
Rules of the House, Amt. to (prop. res.) 1536, 1545 (i).
—— Progress of Committee (remarks) 4307, 5893 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 5891 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3135 (ii).
—— on Ships (B. 11) 1° m., 163 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

LOGGIE ,W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The, 2178, 2215, 2222 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6972 (iv).
Selkirk Dock, Collections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Dredging (new plant) 4767 (iii).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5069 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *South Renfrew.*

Budget, The, 1864 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. Cs., &c., 3531 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6917 (iv), 7882 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2854 (ii).
—— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ques.) 627 (i).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1117 (i); on M. for 3°, 2209 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).
N. T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2414 (ii).
—— Lumsden Charges, Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse (remarks) 5197 (iii); Ques. of Order, 5199 (iii).
—— on Ques of Priv. (remarks) 5570 (iii).
—— Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5572 (iii).
—— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Prop. Res. *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8302 (v).
—— Lumsden Charges, Payment of Counsel Fees (M.) 8832 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3386, 3575 (ii); in Com., 7474 (v).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., *re* Change of Route, on M. (Mr. Warburton for Copies, 3191 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7357 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6384 (iv); in Com., 8084 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8011 (v).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8718 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 271 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5941, 6004 (iv).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Wreck on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (M.) to adjn House, 1597 (i).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Dominion Bank (B. 171) 1°*, 5617 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 256 (i).
Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., &c., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ques.) 2925 (ii).
Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 2° m., 1268, 1270 (i).
Extension, B. C. Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6739 (iv).
Immigrants Treatment *re* Deportations, &c. (remarks) 6945 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 257; 2° m., 1296 (i).
——— Consideration of (remarks) 6941 (iv).
——— (personal explanation) 8116 (v).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1213 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2890 (ii).
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).
Ottawa Buildings Design, Competition, &c. (Ques.) 6180 (iv).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ques.) 2924 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 515 (i).
Ry. Act (cheap rates) Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 257 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, Positions, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment by Govt. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5485 (iii).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Quantity imported into Can., Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).
S. A. Veterans Association, Military Reserve, (M. for cor.*) 2149 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4223 ; (Three Rivers) 4247 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1048 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6771 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*

Address, The, 52 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Fred. Borden) in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).
Budget, The, 1626 (i).
Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7998 (v).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173 (i).
Imperial Conference Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 403 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8032 (v).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1102; in Com., 1133 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8766 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6283 (iv).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 5687 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6335 (iv).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5142 (iii); in Com., 7397 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Special Rep. of Com., 6399 (iv).
——— on M. for Com., 6468 (iv).
——— on order for Com., 6509; in Com., 6501, 6510 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8736 (v).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c., Ques. of Priv., 378 (i).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048 (v).
Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5457 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5951, 5977 (iv), 8755 (v).

——— (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

'Toronto World', Ownership by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5998 (iv)

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5091 (iii).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H., *King's and Albert*

I.C.R. Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2308 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4879 (iii).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*

Budget, The, 1655 (i).

Port Dover Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5489 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3453 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6160; (Ottawa, water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland Relief (B. 134) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenue per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

Grain Shipment from the West (M. for papers*) 1687 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2675 (ii).

Petroleum Locations on Athabaska River, Reports *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3493 (ii).

R.N.W. M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Applications *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ques.) 1206 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreements with Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1686 (i).

Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of duty, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3492 (ii).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6990 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).

Rondeau Park Forest, Removal of by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6944 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1174 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 875 (i); on M. for Com., 6431; in Com., 6500, (amt.) 6501; in Com., 6524; 6578, (amt.) 6580, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 77) 6587; in Com., 7265 (iv).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal (B. 136) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*

Committee on Standing Orders, 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6605 (iv).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2756 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7149 (iv).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Pardee) on M. for 2°, 7868 (v).

Mond Nickel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1099 (i); in Com., 2258 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 380; in Com., 1364 (i).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 380 (i); in Com., 2098 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton, North.*

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8775 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1245 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5925 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2317 (ii).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2773 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M for 2°, 4343 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5679 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps. *re* Libel Suits (M. for copy) 656 (i).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 979; (Pictou Island) 1000 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens.*
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3798 (ii); in Com., 7443 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *South Huron.*
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6872 (iv); in Com., 7905 (v).
Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4413 (iii).
—— (remarks) 4928 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare, *re* Speech on Naval Bill, 5200 (iii).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7269 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *South Cape Breton.*
Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 882 (i); in Com., 6495, 6573 (iv).
Fisherman's Bait Association, Amounts paid per ton, &c. (Ques.) 1015 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c., (Ques.) 6799 (iv).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ques.) 6798 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5844 (iii).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2864 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1237 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).
Ottawa and Quebec East Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, &c., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3193 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 1014 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3137 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Alberta Coal Areas, Estimated Total Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).
Blackfoot Indian Reserve, Proposed Lease (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).
—— Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7853 (v).
Budget, The, 1920 (i).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (licenses) Amt. (B. 143) 1° m., 3670 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).
Homestead pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5516 (iii).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2908 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representation re (Ques.) 641 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
—— Cor. Reps, &c., with Depts. (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
—— Improved Facilities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7781 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).
—— (personal explanation) 8855 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 941 (i).
—— Total Revenue for ten months, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).
N.T. Ry., prop, Res., *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) on M. for Sup., 8285 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurer) on M. for 2°, 4328 (iii).
Population, Method of estimating (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii).
Section 29, Tp. 9, Range 22, Application *re* Right of Way (M. for reps.*) 643 (i).
SUPPLY—
Indians—Man. (general expenses) 7853 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 582 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rock Island) 947; (St. Roch) 829 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4276 (iii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4245 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4273 (iii).

Waterways Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U. S. (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Labelle Settlers Grievances (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).

Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation (remarks) 1600 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4910 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ques.) 264 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Port Stanley Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).

SUPPLY.

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 695 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *North Wellington.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5661 (iii).

Ry Act (labourer's pay) Amt. (B. 39) 1° m., 386 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina*

Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus Relief (B 162) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Brockville, Ottawa and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 160) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Budget, The, 1662 (i).

Edmonton, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 219) 1°*, 7975 (v).

Forster, James Alexander Hurst Relief (B. 221) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 3139 (ii)

Naval Defence B. 95, Rep. in Toronto 'World' *re* 'Round Robin,' Ques. of Priv., 4305 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertising in (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6147 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 885 (i); in Com., 6460 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8432 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1543 (i).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 4753 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6386 (iv).

MAYRAND, Mr. H., *Maskinonge.*

Saint Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s (B.59) 1°*, 1099 (i).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie*

Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i)

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7807 (v).

Homestead Patent for S.W. ¼ 18-19-20, 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against (Ques.) 8109 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2049 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1231; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1266 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., 2908 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2548 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep of Com., 6087 (iv).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5087 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6970 (iv).

Norris, T. C., Payments to for 1908-9 (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Negatived (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).

——— Disposal of Protest, &c. (ques. of priv.) 802 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6552 (iv).

Ry. Act (liability) Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6600 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7722 (v).

——— Ques. asked Min. of Public Works, 7695 (v).

Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7369 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427, 537 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3400 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5966 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8081 (v.)

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup. 8343 (iv).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2039 (ii); 3°*, 8731 (v).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5352 (iii)

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 19 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 535 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ques.) 7514 (v).

Civil Service, Outside Service, Legislation *re* Reorganization (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7001 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7798 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 733 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1123 (i).

International Waterways Canal Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2679 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2495 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5593 (iii).

——— on M. to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3210 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7545 (v).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5291 (iii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5333 (iii), 6138, 6242, 6351 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7107 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 574 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 543; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (museum) 567 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging (new plant) 4769 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5954 (iv).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Budget, The, 1507 (i).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ques.) 1378 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111, (M.) to ref. back to Committee of the Whole, 4025 (iii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7805 (v).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, Ques. of Priv., 3937 (ii).

See "Race Track."

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Insect Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5639 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8460 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 126; 2° m., 499; (M.) to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

——— (B. 73) 1° m., 1362 (i); 2° m., 2040; in Com., 2153 (ii).

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Militia Stores, Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (M.) 8361 (v).

Race Track Gambling (B. 6) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 856, 914(i); on M. for Com., 6400, 6514, 6572, 7258; 3° m., 7270 (iv).

Race Track—Gambling Bill: Ques. of Priv. *re* Letter of Min. of Justice, 6715 (iv).

Senate, Abolition, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1992 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7755 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7779 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1416 (i).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c. (M. for copy*) 4315 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4913 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7126 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8094 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, The, (remarks) 47 (i).

All-Red Route, Rep. re Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Artillery Horses to Petawawa Camp, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent (M. for copy) 2298 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).

——— Lease to Messrs McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Canadian Navy. Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

——— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ques.) 2930 (ii).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation of, Pension, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of (prop. res.) 142 (i).

Co-Operative Credit Societies Act (B. 26) 1° m., 340 (i); order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

——— Consideration of (remarks) 2710, 3205 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i).

Dom. Lands (licenses) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Magrath) on M. for 1°, 3671 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173; on M. for 2°, 757 (i).

French Treaty, Provision *re* Termination, (Ques.) 276 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3941 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., &c., 3555 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Hay, &c. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 1363 (i).

'Hestia' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ques.) 130 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5505 (iii).

Immigration Agents in France, Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Paul Wiallard (Ques.) 790 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, Expenditure by Can. Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Statement of Cost, Conversion into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ques.) 639, 783 (i).

Insurance Bill, Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 506 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., Rep., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston (M. for copies) 328 (i).

Judicial Business, Montreal District (M.) for Ret., 1792 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Additions to Board of Engineers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals, &c. (Ques.) 430 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 640 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3142 (ii).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 641 (i).

Mails between G.B| and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1587 (i); in Com., 2714 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, and Postal Stations, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 1581 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for ret.) 1580 (i).

National Battlefields Commission, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

—— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1769 (i); on M. for 2°, 2991, Amt., 3022 (ii); Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095 (iii).

Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for, 1100 (i).

Naval Ships, Purchase of by Govt., Details of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).
See 'Can. Navy.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor. &c. (M. for copies) 1547 (i).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

—— Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons (M. for sel. com.) 136 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 605 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Public Works in the Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets. Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 114 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Ques. of Order *re* Answer, 1534 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1541 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

—— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ques.) 625 (i).

St. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets. &c., *re* Repairs (M. for copy) 110 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Speaker Blanchet (M. for copies*) 2298 (ii).

Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal (remarks) 332 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 832 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865, 3875 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES (Secretary of State) *Russell.*

Analytical Index to Hansard, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2138 (ii).

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. *re* Naturalization Commissioner (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ans.) 7515 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 209) 1° m., 7181 (iv); in Com., 8381 (v).

Civil Service (census) Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7302 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number passing Examinations, &c. (Ans.) 2287 (ii).

Civil Service List (presented) 1730 (i).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887, 910 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re* (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction (Ans.) 6938 (iv).

International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 381 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES—*Con.*

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ans.) 849 (i).

Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ans.) 7516 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7287 (iv).,

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (remarks) 3486 (ii).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ans.) 7514 (v).

Reynolds, Conductor, Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award (read) 4208 (iii).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337; Marine and Fisheries (printing) 252; Sec. of State (salaries) 337 (i).

Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Voters' Lists, Total Cost of Revision for Thunder Bay, &c. (Ans.) 629 (i).

Winding-up Act, Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 732 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1577 (i).

Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of (Ques.) 787 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Maisonneuve) 678; (Marieville) 679; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

National Park, Sask., Establishment of, Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4931 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821, 5292 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1360 (i); in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8047, 8427, 8588 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5412 (iii).

Sunday Postal Service at Winnipeg, Closing of P.O. (remarks) 2931 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*

Budget, The, 2246 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657, (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6916 (iv), 7892 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3873, 3919 (ii).

Green, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946, 8465 (v).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1124 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2052 (ii).

Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to ref, back to Sel. Com., 5235 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Order *re* quoting King's Speech, 5100 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4832, 5309 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7268 (iv).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 2° m, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8053 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5355 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 380 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging (new plant) 4768 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv); in Com., 8095 (v).

Western Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 380 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy *re* (Ques.) 102 (i).

See 'Ry. B. 5.'

Bow River Coal Lands, &c. (M. for cor.*), 3170 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 180 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8625 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6055 (iv).

Ministers of the Crown and Public Gifts (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2° (amt.), 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191 (iii); in Com., 7396 (v).

—— Notice of Amt., 5102 (iii).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 615 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6595 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 480; Neg. (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii); 6236 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5963 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Alberta Coal Areas, Total Tonnage of, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Becher, Chas. D. T., Homestead Patent, &c. (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ans.) 6182 (iv).

B. C. Ry. Belt, Govt. Title to Beds of Streams, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

See 'Water Power.'

Buffaloes: *See* 'National.'

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage (Ans.) 5000, 5561 (iii).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund of Money *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Dom. Lands, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ans.) 2925 (ii).

See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,'

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875, 3916 (ii).

Doukhobors, Comparison with h. m. for Dauphin (remarks) 5532 (iii).

Emigration to U. S. from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston (Ans.) 432 (i).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ans.) 268 (i).

See Immigration, &c.

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Construction of Roads (Ans.) 636 (i).

Gervais, Mrs. C. Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

Grain Trade: *See* "Western."

G. T. R. Ry. and Land Sales along the Line (Ans.) 1966 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Commission *re* (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

—— Location since Jan. 1910 (Ans.) 6937 (iv).

Half Sections in Man., N. ½, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amounts collected (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

See "Wood."

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ans.) 1784 (i).

Homestead Fees, Amount collected in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 848 (i).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Homestead Patent for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20 W. 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ans.) 6936 (iv).

Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

—— Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ans.) 275 (i).

—— Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties (Ans.) 4080 (iii).

Homesteads for Women (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8489 (v).

Hudson Bay Ry., Land Sales, Number of Acres (Ans.) 2144 (ii).

Hydrographic Survey, Irrigation Rep. (presented) 5103 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 2133 (ii); 2° m., 5502; in Com., 5532, 5802, 5822 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8400 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Immigration Act Amt.—*Con.*

——— in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).

Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 102 (i).

——— Rep. of Mr. Wiallard (Ans.) 790 (i).

Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ans.) 128 (i).

Immigrants deported, Number of (Ans.) 1374 (i).

Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910 (Ans.) 7872 (v).

Immigrants and S.S. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).

——— Letter from Supt. (read) 8579 (v).

Immigrants located on Bay of Quinté Ry., Number, &c. (Ans.) 7872 (v).

Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations (remarks) 6946 (iv).

——— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).

Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 638 (i).

Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing (Ans.) 2294 (ii).

Immigration Official Dr. Lavoie, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8109 (v).

Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6610 (iv).

Indian Act Amt. (B. 141) 1° m., 3390 (ii); 2° m., 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).

Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ans.) 6179 (iv).

See 'School,' &c.

Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, Disposal of by Govt., on M. (Mr. Herron) to adjn., 120 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Terms, &c., of Sale (Ans.) 635 (i).

Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).

Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

Interior and Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 186) 1° m., 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).

La Butte Indian School, Payments to (Ans.) 6179 (iv).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 125) 1° m., 2485 (ii); 2° m., 5921 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Leech, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Lilly, Wm., Homestead Preemption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ans.) 6936 (iv).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office, &c. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).

Manitoba Federal Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ans.) 4310 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ans.) 4309 (iii).

National Park, Sask., Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ans.) 790 (i).

Naval Defence, Lands available for defraying Cost (Ans.) 1367 (i).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835, 5294 (iii).

New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations (Ans.) 3169 (ii).

Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 851 (i), 2718 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Damages, Fiat, &c. (Ans.) 640 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1563 (i).

Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53, 54, Terms of Sale (Ans.) 1374 (i).

Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).

Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Land Grant (Ans.) 1376 (i).

——— Disposal of Lands by Govt. (Ans.) 1535 (i).

Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement (Ans.) 4313 (iii).

——— Total Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ans.) 2925 (ii).

Peigan Indian Agency, Winding up Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).

Peigan Reserve, Sale of Lands (Ans.) 6936 (iv).

Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).

Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re* (Ans.) 3493 (ii).

Pincher Creek sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).

Pitt Meadows, Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c. (Ans.) 274 (i).

Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest (Ans.) 432 (i).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ans.) 1369 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations, prop. Res., 3057 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6194, 6372 (iv).

R.N.W.M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ans.) 1206 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation *re* Charges, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).

——— Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. Bradbury) 5762 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Surrender, &c. (Ans.) 2296 (ii).

——— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell, on Inquiry for Ret., 2636 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor (explanation) 1963 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Mr. W. Frank (Ans.) 7065 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7527 (v).

——— Surrender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 433 (i).

School Lands, Sale of, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 5930 (iii).

See 'Indians.'

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid, Additional Cost (Ans.) 1003 (i).

——— Distribution to Homestead Holders in Quarter Section 24 (Ans.) 1196 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ans.) 3732 (ii).

——— Amt. *re* Issue of (Ans.) 133 (i).

——— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

——— Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i), 2144 (ii).

See 'Volunteers.'

SS. Passengers: *See* 'Immigrants.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 344, 415 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8194; (salaries) 8194 (v).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493; (salaries) 8489; (timber protection) 8492 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207; (salaries) 8494 (v).

Indians—Alta. (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7837; (schools) 7861 (v).

Indians—Man. (annuities, &c.) 7848; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (general expenses) 7853; (grist mills) 7853; (live stock) 7848;

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(medical attendance) 7849; (Sioux) 7853; (supplies) 7849 (v).

Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys)) 7837 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox Island wharf) 7847; (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii); (adminstration salaries) 8487 (v).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2291 (ii).

Surveys in Township Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3391 (ii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, Expenditure re (Ans.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6943 (iv).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

See 'S. A.'

Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 4996 (iii) 2°., 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072 8389 (v).

Wakefield, A. G., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Walton, Geo., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Warwick, Thos. G., Value of Improvements on Entry (Ans.) 275 (i).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C. (B. 187) 1° m., 5887 (iii); in Com., 6373 (iv); 8135, 8706 (v).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber Lands, &s. (Ans.) 844 (i).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2488 (ii).

Western Grain Trade, Deputations *re* (remarks) 8584 (v).

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8344 (v).

——— Over-classification of Grades (remarks) 8363 (v).

Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mill and Trading Co. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Whitford, James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel in Twp. 50, &c. (Ans.) 4079 (iii).

See 'Hay.'

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2904 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2246 (ii).

Campbellford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5079 (iii).

Parcel Post Delivery, Signing for, &c. (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6588 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3850 (ii).

Trent Canal, Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).

PAPINEAU, Mr. L. J., *Beauharnois.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Request *re* Indemnity (Ques.) 5560 (iii).

Ry. Act (fires) Amt. (B. 48) 1° m., 621 (i); 2° m., 2032 (ii).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7282 (iv).

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ques.) 1019 (i).

Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Budget, The, 1929 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 742 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Historial Manuscripts Commission, Members, Results, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5823 (iii).

Immigration Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re* (M. for papers*) 1022 (i).

Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 101 (i).

Immigration Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan. 1908 (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).

Imperial Naval Conference, Distribution of French Edition (Ques.) 276 (i).

I. C. R. Board of Commissioners, Names, Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

——— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 128, 164 (i).

——— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ques.) 835 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4678 (iii).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6529 (iv).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1425 (i).

Year Book, Expenditure *re*, French Distribution (Ques.) 1020 (i).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) 2° m., 7868 (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6877 (iv); in Com., 7912 (v).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Haggart) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7263 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 5317' 5334 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251; on Senate Amts., 8653 (v).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 8000 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm., (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*

Budget, The, 2061 (ii).

Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6953 (iv).

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ans.) 812 (i).

Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10 &c. (Ans.) 8109 (v).

Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7828 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 190; on M. for 2°, 776 (i).

German Trade Relations, Value of Exports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Grain Exports from Montreal for past Ten Years, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).

Herring Fish transported to U.S., &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i.

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Machinery, Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Mahone, Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).

Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c., (Ans.) 836 (i).

School Slates and Lead Pencils imported into Canada, Quantity, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v); (salaries) 1359 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 826 (i).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8753 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8100 (v).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1378 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6643 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Grenville Station to Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for (Ques.) 131 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7959 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3151 (ii).

Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 3183 (ii); (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5689 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4863 (iii).

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for (Ques.) 4123 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens, &c. (read) 5625 (iii).

Ottawa, Govt. Buildings (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ques.) 1009 (i).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. (B. 178) 1°*, 5759 (iii); in Com., 8599 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4842 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4233; Ste. Croix) 4237; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c. (prop. res.) 1380 (i).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2313 (ii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5841 (iii).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4639 (iii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5771 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (cold storage) 7363, 7384 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

PRICE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co's. incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5082 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6532 (iv).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Green, James Albert Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3195 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Public Works) St. John City and County, N.B.

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ans.) 1019 (i).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, re Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ans.) 1596 (i).

——(corrected answer) 1730 (i).

Armouries in Can., on Inquiry (Mr. Edwards) for Ret., 8742 (v).

Armouries and Drill Halls in Man., Purchase and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, &c. (Ans.) 1017 (i).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).

See 'Dredging.'

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to Date (Ans.) 1179 (i), 3676 (ii).

Boivin, Elzéar, Payment re Telegraph Construction (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Brandon Drill Hall, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i).

Budget, The, Ques. of Order re Kensington Wharf, 2109 (ii).

See 'Kensington.'

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments re (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co's. incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease *re* Lands and Timber, &c. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Dalhousie Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ans.) 631 (i).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3873, 3925 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ans.) 6508 (iv).

See 'Bathurst.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4253 (iii).

See 'Govt. Dredges.'

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 105 (i).

Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 106 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Papers, 2029 (ii).

Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Appmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Fraser River Channel, Depth of Dredging, &c (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Protection *re* Inundations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Gasperaux River Dredging, Payments to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2490 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3569 (ii).

—— Papers laid on Table, 8734 (v).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, &c., Reply to Mr. German, 3986 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of struction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contracts *re* Kaministiquia River (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 929 (i), 8816 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3672 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction of (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Heating and Lighting Contracts *re* Public Buildings (Ans.) 1203 (i).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ans.) 1967 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1132 (i); on M. for 3°, 2210 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 4514 (iii).

'J. G Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (Ans.) 1783, 1970 (i).

—— Recommendations re (Ans.) 3469, 3737 (ii).

King, Mr., Astronomer's Residence: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works—Buildings—Ottawa.'

Labour Dept., Rent of Y.M.C.A. Building (Ans.) 627 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

Lachute Public Building, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5690 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Lake Nipissing flooded Lands, Compensation *re*, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ans.) 850 (i).

Lambton Barracks, Appropriations *re* (Ans.) 271 (i).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ans.) 8838 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 641 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 583 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3148 (ii).

Loggie, Messrs. A. & R., Total Payments to (Ans.) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).
See 'Dredging.'

Long Sault Rapids, Deputation *re* Building of Dams (remarks) 2060 (ii).

McLean, A., Payments for Sale of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2690 (ii).

Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

—— Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).
See 'Gaspereaux.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2768 (ii).

Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of (Ans.) 99 (i).

Mayes Contract, Charges *re* Graft (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Michipicoten Dock, Preparation of Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 783 (i).

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ans.) 386 (i).

—— Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Mud Lake Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 3294 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1156 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 103) 1° m., 2135 (ii); in Com., 5674 (iii), 6202, 6963 (iv).

Nechaco River, &c., Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4753, 4820, 5279, 5291 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., &c., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

—— List *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 8825 (v).

New Westminster Dom. Land, Expiration of Lease, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting (Ans.) 4078 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*
—— Names of Employees, &c., Total Expenses (Ans.) 4079 (iii).
Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4810 (iii), 6149 (iv).
Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, *re* speaking in Committee, 4798 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Design Competition (Ans.) 6180 (iv).
—— Canadian Stone *re* Construction (Ans.) 5107 (iii).
—— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).
See 'Labour,' 'Militia,' 'Rideau Hall.'
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8614 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarac Wood (Ans.) 7871, 8834 (v).
Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ans.) 1975 (ii).
Pender Island Canal, Depth, Length, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2427 (ii).
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 3489 (ii).
Pink Rock Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i), 3397 (ii), 4734 (iii).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).
—— Par. in 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 3739 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order, 3743 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur Dry Dock, Subsidy Grant, &c. (remarks) 5003 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).
See 'Dry Docks.'
Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ans.) 264 (i).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6127 (iv).
Port Dover Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
Port Dufferin Wharf, N.S., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4082 (iii).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4513 (iii).
Port Stanley Life Saving Station(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*
Public Works Advertising, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).
See 'Newspapers.'
Public Works, Deptl. Rep (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Employees, and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).
Public Works Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Pulp Co., Payment of Tolls *re* passing through Booms (Ans.) 7871 (v).
See 'Oyamel.'
Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ans.) 4309, 4846 (iii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7872, 8238 (v).
Residents in H. of C and Senate., on Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Committee (M.) 376 (i).
Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8428, 8588 (v).
Return, on Inquiry for (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7692 (v).
See 'Pink Rock,' &c.
Rideau Hall Furniture, on Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).
Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputations *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ans.) 1777 (i).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cors., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 117 (i).
Rondeau Harbour, Removal of Forest by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6945 (iv).
Ross Rifles Mark II**, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4311 (iii).
R.M.C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 381 (i).
—— Servants' Quarters, Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 263 (i).
Royal Mint, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 103 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery Boxes, Changes in Design (Ans.) 1783 (i).
St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Construction, Division of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8239 (v).
St. Clair River Sand, Lease to Detroit Co. by Ont. Govt. (remarks) 5821 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 112 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

St. John Harbour, N.B., Wharfs and Buildings (B. 204) 1° m., 6934 (iv); in Com., 8120 (v).

—— Courtenay Bay and G. T. P. Terminals, Contract, &c. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 3156 (ii).

St. John River Channel Survey, on Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580, 8737 (v).

St. John Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Johns, Que. Govt. Land occupied by Militia (Ans.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan (Ans.) 841 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5377 (iii); 6231, 6342, 6665; on M. for 3°, 7252 (iv).

—— Compliance with Act of Incorporation (Ans.) 7869, 8108, 8659 (v).

—— Rep. of Engineers laid on Table, 5557, 5617 (iii).

St. Maurice Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

Ste Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of Property, &c. (Ans.) 787 (i).

Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Decision *re* Subsidy (remarks) 3833 (ii), 5278 (iii).
See " Dry Docks."

Sawdust Wharf: *See* ' Richibucto.'

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 106 (i).

Selkirk Wharf, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5698 (iii).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Macleod) 8189; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; (Chilliwack) 8190; (Greenwood); 8191; (Vancouver) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 8193; (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings Mar. Provs. (renewals) 596 (i).

Public Works — Buildings — N.B. (Bathurst) 580; (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 583; (Hillsborough) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (Tracadie) 596 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Lunenburg) 576; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Dresden) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Gananoque) 7495; (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7496; (Guelph armouries) 8169; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Kingston) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8169; (Parkhill) 8177; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177; (Toronto) 8178; (Uxbridge) 8178, 8185 (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 536 (i); (deptl. buildings, new) 548 (i), 7166 (iv); (Eastern Block) 571 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (military stores) 597; (museum) 566 (i); (National Art Gallery) 6158 (iv); (Parliament Driveway) 8173; (peat testing) 8177; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8193 (v); (Royal Mint) 557 (i); (Senate re-decorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 580 (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Quebec— (Arthabaska) 661; (Aylmer) 661; (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (generally, repairs) 662; (Grosse Isle) 662, 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 670; (Marieville) 679; (Mégantic) 700; (Montreal P.O.) 700; (Montreal, postal station) 704; (Plessisville) 704; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital) 823; (Quebec immigration sheds) 823, 926, 959; (Quebec observatory) 823; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967; (Quebec P. O.) 823 (i); (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 927; (Rock Island) 946; (St. Henri) 952; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 952; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawenegan Falls) 948; (Three Rivers) 959; (Westmount) 963 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c.) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (generally) 6138 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4738, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Man. (generally) 6137 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Sask. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta — (Athabaska channel) 4272; (North Saskatchewan River channel) 4273 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Athalmer) 4276; (Bamfield) 4276; (Campbell) 4276; (Chilliwack) 4299; (Columbia river) 4277; (Coquitlam)

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

4291; (Fort George Canyon) 4727; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Lockport) 4715; (Masset) 4715; (Nitinat lake) 4715; (Nootka) 4716; (Porcher island) 4716; (Port Moody) 4728; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Serpentine river) 4305; (Skeena river) 5608; (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Stewart wharf) 4726 (iii); (Vancouver) 6122; (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Yakoun river) 4728 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731; (surveys) 5719 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4254; (Gimli) 4263; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4262; (Red River) 4266 (iii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv); (St. Andrew's Rapid Lock) 8819 (v); (St. Laurent) 5255; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5608 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v); (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3452; (Cummings Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper harbour) 3391; (Dorchester) 3391; (generally) 3392; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Leonardville) 3393; (Lorneville) 3393; (Mace's bay) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3450; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3397; (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428, 3438; (St. Andrews) 3450 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John harbour) 3450; (St. John tributaries) 3446; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Sackville) 3448; (Seal Cove) 3449; (Shediac) 3449; (Shippigan) 3450; (Sibley) 3475; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W. Ters. (generally) 4276 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Blue Rocks Island) 977; (Bluff Head) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Broad Cove) 995; (Brooklyn) 978; (Brule) 979; (Burk's Head) 979 (i); (Centreville) 8817 (v); (Chapel Cove) 985; (David's Cove) 985; (Deep Brook) 986; (Delap's Cove) 986; (Delorey's Beach) 986; (Devil's Island) 986; (Digby) 986; (Diligent) 986; (Dover) 989; (Dublin) 990; (Duncan Cove) 990; (Eastern passage) 990; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Gulf shore) 991; (Habitant River) 992; (Hampton) 992; (Joggin's Mines) 995; (Judique) 995; (Kingsport) 995; (LaHave) 995; (Lake Ainslie) 995; (Leitche's Creek) 995; (Liscombe) 995; (Litchfield) 995; (Little Anse) 995; (Little River) 996; (Little Tancook) 996; (Lower Argyle) 996; (McNair's Cove) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Middle Island) 999; (Mira River) 999; (New Harbour) 999; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 999; (Owl's Head) 1000; (Parker's Cove) 1000; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Pinckney)

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

1158 (i); (Pine Brook) 8816 (v); (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Joli) 1164; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Saw Pit) 1176; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Spanish Bay) 1177; (Swim's Point) 1178; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (Tenecape) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (Three-Fathom) 1179; (Toney River) 1179; (Tusket Wedge) 1179; (Upper Prospect) 1179; (Upper Washabuck) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Baccaro) 1180; (West Dublin) 1180; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont.—(Blanche river) 3458; (Brockville) 3455; (Burlington) 3456; (Byng inlet) 3459; (Christian island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; Gravenhurst) 3468; (Haileybury) 3468; (Juniper island) 3469; (Kensington wharf) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (Lion's Head) 3470; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin island) 3474; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Picnic islands) 3457 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101 (iv); (Port Burwel) 3471; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Providence bay) 3457; (Rainy river dam) 3472; (Rondeau harbour 3474; (St. Lawrence river channel) 3833; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv); (Toronto improvements) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v); (Wiarton) 3475 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Belfast pier) 2693; (Belle river) 2693; (Brudenell) 2693; (China Point) 2694; (Cove Head) 2694; (generally) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Lennox Island) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (New London) 2695; (Port Selkirk) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3862; (Becancour) 3865, 3875; (Bic) 3871; (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3892; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Riviere) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3904; Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Isle Verte) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Le Petit Debarquement) 3907; (Les Eboulements) 3907 (ii); (Lévis) 6102 (iv); (Malbaie) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Montebello) 3908; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (New Carlisle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Pointe aux Trembles) 4210; (Richelieu river) 4212; (Rimouski) 4210; (Rivière du

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Loup) 4227; (Riviére Ouelle) 4211; (Rivière aux Vases) 4210; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. André de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232 (iii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234; (Ste. Croix) 4235; (St. Denis) 4235; (St. Joseph de Sorel) 4246; (Saguenay) 4221; (Shigawake) 4227; (Sorel wharf) 4246; (Tadousac) 4246; (Three Rivers) 4247; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720, 5724 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4272 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4730 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Dale, Sydney J.) 6167; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163 (iv); (engineering branch, salaries) 5720 (iii); (International Commission, N.B.) 6163; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Ottawa, water-storage dams) 6162; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—(Dom., generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N. B. (Courtenay Bay Marsh road) 6151; (St. John-St. Leonard) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. (Chapeau) 6150 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 6149; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; (Limerick Gravelburg) 6154 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B. C. (Arrow Lakes) 5614 (iii); (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alberta (generally) 5614 (iii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2881 (ii).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (iv).

Toney River: *See* 'Boat,' &c.

Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4251 (iii).

Toronto Harbour Extension, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

Tremblay, Payments *re* Purchase of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Trent Canal: *See* 'Couchiching.' 'Lakefield.'

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).

Victoria Immigration Building, Total Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1369 (i).

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8446 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment *re* Purifying (Ans.) 131 (i).

Weymouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4789, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

Wharfs transferred to P. W. Dept., Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4239 (iii).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

Wolfe Island Wharf, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3462 (ii), 6164 (iv).

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *North Perth.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3542 (ii).

Grain Exports from Montreal, for ten years, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8641 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i).

See 'Labour.'

Immigration Act Amt. B 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537, 5826 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 5541 (iii).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 209 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

——— (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 205 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8765 (v).
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5764 (iii).
Kemptville Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).
See 'Hours.'
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).
Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ques.) 1194 (i).
—— Deputation *re* Building a Dam (remarks) 2060 (ii).
—— Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 5933 (iv).
See 'St. Lawrence B. 115.'
Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6281 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint Com., 2950 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4947 (iii); in Com., 7442 (v).
Naval Defence Bill (remarks) 855 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1577 (i).
Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7675 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5329 (iii); 6230, 6354 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).
—— Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529, (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (Contingencies) 8804 (v).
Justice—Administration of (N.W. stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).
Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7496 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 428; Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Maisonneuve) 674 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provinces (dredging) 5608 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alta. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2938 (ii).
R.N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802 (v).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5956, 6000 (iv).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ques.) 3735 (ii).
—— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Restigouche Boom Co. (B. 150) 1°*, 4402 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4310 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6929 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8732 (v).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6627 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8774 (v).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1125; in Com. (amt.) 1130 (i).
I.C. Ry., Dismissals by Board of Management, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
—— Passes alleged to be Stolen, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
—— Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, Date of leaving and arrival (M. for ret.*) 3171 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2907 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1223 (i).
Machinery Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ques.) 1015 (i).
N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names and Payments, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Names of Employees, Total Expenses in operating, &c. (Ques.) 4078 (iii).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. and N.T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1380 (i).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3292 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Naval Service (maintenance) 8503 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Broad Cove) 995; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Burk's Head) 983; (Diligent) 986; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Gulf shore) 991; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 1000 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 2877; (highways) 2882; (Moncton shops) 2936; (new machinery) 2942; (Pintsch gas) 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c. (Ques.) 1370 (i).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2767 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., West Shore, Memorials, &c., *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5501 (iii).

P.E.I. Tunnel Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 285 (i).

—— Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3199 (ii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Budget, The, 1842 (i).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 845 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., 3563 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4036 (iii).

Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 183) 1°*, 5886 (iii).

Royal Guardians Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 7256 (iv).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*

Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

N. T. Ry., Accidents *re* Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5362 (iii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, Prices paid for Sites, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7297; 7308 (iv).

Clear Lake, Application to raise the Water Level (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874 (ii).

Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).

Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c. (M. for cor.) 5502 (iii).

G. T. P. Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re* (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Homesteads for Women, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Man. Govt. (M. for copies) 644 (i).

—— Legislation *re* (Ques.) 131 (i).

Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3619 (ii).

Railway Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death, Filling of (Ques.) 131 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8043; in Com., 8424 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).

—— Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6198 (iv).

Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Number of Warrants issued, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Interior (salaries) 7767 (v).

Dom. Lands (salaries) 8488; (timber protection) 8491 (v).

Indians, Man., (annuities, &c.) 7848; (hospitals) 7850; (live stock) 7848; (supplies, &c.) 7849 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558; (properties) 8571 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry commission) 3128 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res (Mr. Perley) 1400 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6382 (iv); in Com., 8073 (v).

Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny*

Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 51) 1°*, 782 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4570 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6580 (iv).

ROY. Mr. E., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 1678 (i).

Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates, and French Language (remarks) 8240 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 507 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4667 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii) .

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8419 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service Bill, 6958 (iv).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (experimental farms) 7350 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6678 (iv).

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7177 (iv); (Guelph) 7500; (Mitchell) 7507 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert*

Naval Defence B., Ques. of Priv., 5502 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 782 (i); in Com., 4752, 4814, 4818, 4834, 5235, 5279 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Alien Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6004 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Canadians entering U.S., Action of U.S. Immigration Agents, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 1101 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7299 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7917; on M. for 3°, 7980 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3917 (ii).

Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William and Port Arthur, Charges *re* (remarks) 5933 (iv).

Grain Trade, Terminal Elevator Co., Tel. (read) 8240 (v).

See 'Western.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5547, 5838 (iii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5924; in Com., 5926 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7952, 8465 (v).

Jones, Hon. L. M. and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts. *re* Senate (Ques.) 2189 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep .of Com., 2906 (ii).

Manitoba Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ques.) 4310 (iii).

N.T.Ry. Commisison, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 630 (i).

N.T.Ry., Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4012 (iii).

Naval Defence, Lands available for Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7320 (iv).

Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).

S. A. War, Expenditures for Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 632 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7756 (v); (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7341 (iv), 7765 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 (i).

Dom. Lands (timber protection) 8492 (v).

Indians—Man. (Sioux) 7853 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 541 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 935 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1169 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I C. R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3072 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Act) 5715 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5967 (iv).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3390 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 1409 (i).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).

——— Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, &c. (Ques.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

Walton, Mr. Geo., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Western Grain Trade, Letter from Mr. R. McKenzie (read) 8577 (v).

See 'Grain.'

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7274 (iv).

Budget, The, 1804 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 767 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5658 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7890 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3649 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5408 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6394 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4991 (iii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1868 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6305 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2615 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (analysis) 1354 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (cold storage) 7383; (experimental branch farms) 7392; (experimental farms) 7333 (iv), 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (seeds) 7389 (iv).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7770 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 568 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 693; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1376 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*

Bank Act (stock) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 205 (i).

——— M. to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 57) 1° m., 923 (i).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* illegal combination, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

Central Experimental Farm, Number of Horses, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7000 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1154 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5837 (iii).

I. C. R. Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908 to March, 1909 (Ques.) 1776 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Board of Arbitrators, Names Contractors Claims *re* Over-classification (Ques.) 836 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) 6370 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4475 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5245, 5307 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ques.) 4309, 4846 (iii).

Rules of House, in Com. on Rep., 8377 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5317 (iii); 6270, 6664; 6723 (amt.) 6724; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7251, neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 7254 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with the Act. of Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).

See "Volunteers," &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v).

Civil Govt.—Public Works—(salaries) 334 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (civil employees) 8573; (engineers' services) 8569; (pay, &c.) 8559 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (deptl. new) 7167 (iv); (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (Museum) 567; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3458; (Byng Inlet) 3461; (Christian Island) 3467; (Juniper Island) 3469 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (Ste Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Croix) 4241; (Riviere Ouelle) 4211 (iii).

Tourists Post Offices, Number temporarily established (Ques.) 170 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).

Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ques.) 2188 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 8077 (v).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7213, 7244, 7270 (iv).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4618 (iii).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

Budget, The, 1952 (i).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ques.) 4616 (iii).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).

Half-Sections in Man., N. half, &c., Sale of (Ques.) 5889 (iii).

Hay Permits, from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected for Wood Cutting, &c. (Ques.) 3678 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5544 (iii).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ques.) 4309

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6367 (iv).

N.E. Quarter Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4519 (iii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

—— Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ques.) 5561 (iii).

—— Apptmts. of (M. for cor., &c.*) 4315 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8054, 8422 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757; (experimental farms) 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v).

Indians—Man. (clothing, &c.) 7851; (live stock) 7848 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7767 (v).

Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 626 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8398 (v).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909 (Ques.) 5777 (iii).

Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ques.) 2930, 3168 (ii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. (B. 213) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6333; in Com., 6340, 6363 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6485 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough*

Budget, The, 1690 (i).

Canada Shiping Act (inspection) Amt. (B. 15) 1° m., 204; 2° m., 512 (i).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7897 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5908 (iii); in Com., 8034 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1536 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Com., Report (presented) 7867 (v).

——— (M.) to conc. in Report of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Com., 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 3133 (ii).

——— M. to conc. in 5th Rep., 3986 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries Sel. Com. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7324 (iv).

Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S. (Ques.) 625 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6518; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6581 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Method, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ques.) 3168 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6701 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1046 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8004 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *North Middlesex.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6317 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Annuities, Can. Govt., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 385 (i).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Control of other Rys., Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

——— Subsidies *re* main and branch lines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Cirkle, Mr. F., Unprofessional Conduct, Charge, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5502 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1192 (i).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contract *re* Kaministiqua River (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1251 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2902 (ii).

Mines and Minerals Committee (M.) *re* Sittings, 6276 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3982 (ii), 3987 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048, 8423, 8593 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1040 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 1731 (i).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1587 (i).

SMITH, Mr. ROBT., *Stormont.*

Budget, The, 2269 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5323, 5348 (iii); on M. for 3°, 7253 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *East Algoma.*

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c. *re* Election of 1909 (Ques.) 1007 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3430 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4975 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5424 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Picnic Islands) 3457; (Providence Bay) 3457 (ii); Que (Roberval) 940 (i).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges, N.B. (St. John) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. (Maurice) 6150; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. Charles Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Bellechasse Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re* (notification) 3476 (ii).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s sec. (read) 922 (i), 6606 (iv).
See 'Senate.'

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs Members remarks checked, 6396 (iv).

Budget, The, Interruptions, &c. (ruling) 2084 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 2109 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Controverted Elections Petitions, Certificate of Judges (presented) 1, 21 (i).

——— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges (presented) 256 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Dauphin Post Office, Opening of, Members' remarks checked, 3136 (ii).

Distribution Office, Recommendation *re* Salary Increases, 620 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce (remarks) 1688 (i).

Drill Halls, and Armouries, &c. (remarks) 1535 (i).

Dufferin, Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1731 (i).

——— Vacancy (notification) 620 (i).

Escheats to the Crown, B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Essex Electoral District Certificate (presented) 620 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7822 (v).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Ques. (Mr. Barnard) ruling *re* Question asked by another Member, 1791, 1799 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, demand for Papers (r-e marks) 2490 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Crocket) for papers to be laid on Table (ruling) 2632 (ii).

Glover, Robert, Pet. ruled out of Order, 1586 (i).

Govt. Railway Bill, Conference with Senate, Mess. from the Senate, 8834 (v).

Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Members remarks checked, 8241 (v).

House of Commons Staff, Re-organization of, withdrawn, 7977 (v).

Indian Lands, Sale in Alberta, Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).

Industrial Disputes Bill, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8117 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie to introduce (ruling) 518 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (ruling) 620 (i).

I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, Members remarks checked, 1126 (i).

——— on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

——— Res. from Senate re Amendments, 8828, 8855 (v).

I.C.R., Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii)

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on Ques. of Order re laying Letters on Table (ruling) 502 (i).

International Waterways Canal, &c. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, Members' Remarks checked, 2679 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to con. in 2nd Rep. of Com., Members remarks checked, 2893 (ii).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 5 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).

Lumsden Charges, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 5199 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv., Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 5570 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Committee, 6016 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, Vote of Sol. Gen., on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, Reading Documents (remarks) 2685 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex., Assent to Bills (read) 5557, 5628 (iii).

——— Estimates for 1909-10 (read) 154, 377 (i).

——— Estimates, Suppl, 1910 (read) 377 (i); 2949 (ii); 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 7519 (v).

——— Internal Economy Com. (read) 97 (i).

——— Opening (read) 1 (i).

N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Committee (remarks) 4517 (iii).

Naval Service Appointments, Members remarks checked, 8839 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) re King's speech (ruling) 5100 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 3983 (ii).

Naval Defence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) (remarks) 5003 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ruling *re* interrupting h. m. (Mr. Clare) 4929, 4937 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7563 (v).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Members remarks checked, 2191 (ii).

Nickel Mines in Can., Control by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2493 (ii).

Ottawa City and Quebec City Representation in H. of C., Ques. (Mr. Meighen) *re* Disposal of Protests, 802 (i).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted in ref. to Ruling, 833 (i).

——— Vacancy (notification) 1729 (i).

——— Certificate of Election (notice) 3476 (ii).

Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 3744 (ii).

Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to, Members remarks checked, 4712 (iii).

Private Bills: *See* 'Senate.'

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 8833 (v).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).

Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re* (ruling) 1799 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller), on Ques. of Order (Mr. Wilson) *re* Translation of Evidence (ruling) 6404 (iv).

——— Members Remarks checked, 6720 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, remarks checked, 462 (i).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* (remarks) 8833 (v).

Railway Passenger Service, Ques. of Order, 379 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6172 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Interruptions of Members (remarks) 7600 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 7676 (v).

——— (ruling) *re* Question of Mr. Meighen, 7695 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 7691 (v).

Ross Rifles, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Answer of Minister of Militia (ruling) 1586 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co.'s Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529 (i).

——— Members remarks checked, 8108 (v).

——— on Senate Amts. (ruling) 8655 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 7072 (iv), 7522 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 7148 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Members remarks checked, 1445 (i).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule, &c. (read) 5776 (iii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Sunday Postal Service, Closing of P. O. at Winnipeg, Members Remarks checked, 2931 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (Mr. Lewis) Members Remarks checked, 5892 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Toronto 'World,' Ownership, Member asked to withdraw stmnt., 5998 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

West Middlesex Electoral District, Certificate of Election of Mr. D. C. Ross (notification) 413 (i).

Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes, Members remarks checked, 3135 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) *South Perth.*

B. C. Public Works, Govt. Expenditures, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4290 (iii)

Budget, The, Members Remarks checked, 2229 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 2267 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) Members Remarks checked, 7895 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Customs Laws, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Conservation Bill, Members Remarks checked, 6141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crosby) 5539 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 5535 (iii).

Manufacturers Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Mayes Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Members Remarks checked, 589 (i).

N.T. Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission (ruling) *re* Points of Order, 8310 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ref. to Governor General or Sovereign not permissible (ruling) 4204 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6143 (iv).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com. (ruling) 4798 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin), Amt. (read) 1364 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4736 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 7316 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., Procedure *re* Discussion (ruling) 6558 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. McColl) 6579 (iv).

Restigouche Log Driving, &c., B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6171 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Charges against Ministers (ruling) 7630 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Owen) *re* Discussion (ruling) 3845 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Members asked to withdraw offensive language, 5399 (iii).

——— Members Remarks checked, 6231 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6723 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Neely) 5412 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 6352 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Tobin) 5434 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, &c. (cold storage) on Ques. of Order, 7365 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Richibucto) Members remarks checked, 3439 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Meteghan) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) 997 (i).

Pubic Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7509 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) Denials must be accepted (ruling) 546 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (Marieville) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox)—(ruling) 686 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonell) 6778 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) 8077 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Address, The 73 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193 (iv).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir F. Borden) in Com., 6003 (iv).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sen-Sentence (remarks) 2712 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2012 (ii).

Budget, The, 1601 (i).

——— (remarks) 2065 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 6950 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges re Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5225 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6845, 6887 (iv); in Com., 7895; on M. for 3°, 7977 (v).

——— Ques. of Order re Customs Law, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1363 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Committee on Standing Orders, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6606 (iv).

Conservation: *See* 'Natural.'

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5896 (iii).

——— Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) 8818 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6988 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3053 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874, 3916 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

——— Representation of: (notice) 521 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272, 1284 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv); in Com., 8885 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6183 (iv).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5910 (iii).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199; on M. for 2°, 747; on M. for 3°, 817 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).

See 'Race Track.'

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. ,(Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3574 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Measures for Session (remarks) on Easter Adjournment, 5893 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8056, 8380; in Com., 8625 (v).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6760 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803, 5841 (iii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5923 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8030 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7949, 8460, 8461 (v).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Black) 2302 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 508; on laying letters on Table, 502 (i).

——— B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2674 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Guthrie) to refund fees, 7512 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8764 (v).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106, 8229 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6016 (iv).

See 'N. T. Ry.'

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2688 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2785 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6280; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2714 (ii).

Militia Clothing, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6015; in Com., 6192 (iv).

Militia Stores Building, Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Mines and Minerals Committee, on M. (Mr. R. Smith) *re* sittings, 6276 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).

Motor Vehicle Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).

National Battlefields Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 5889 (iii), in Com., 6599 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
See 'Lumsden.'

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6336; in Com., 6364 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3281 (ii); in Com., 7396, 7485 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ques. of Order, 3983 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4205 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6142 (iv).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (Mr. Perley) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1365 (i).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto 'World,' 521 (i).

——— Disposal of Protests (remarks) 803 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3747 (ii).

Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 610 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

Quebec Judges, Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., on Procedure *re* discussion, 6558 (iv).
See 'Gambling.'

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 456; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6010 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 493 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Ry. Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Railway Passenger Service, Delays, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 379 (i).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6176 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 3847 (ii).

——— on Ques of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7632 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6373 (iv).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 7867 (v).

——— in Com., on Rep. of Com., 8366 (v).

St. Andrew's Dam Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8123 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5340 (iii), 6235, 6347, 6663, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7093 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv (Mr. Bradbury) 7523 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2647 (ii).

——— B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on M. to dschg. order for 2°, 656 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster 2000 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2007 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Skill and King, Release of, &c. (remarks) 7070 (iv).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sunday Postal Service, Closing at Winnipeg, &c. (remarks) 2932 (ii).

SUPPLY

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 5728; (experimental farms) 5725 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194; Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6696 (iv).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5748; (hatcheries) 5750 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).

House of Commons (Library) 8802 (v).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii); (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5703 (iii), 8810 (v); (Can. and G. B.) 8808 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809 (v); (Rivière du Loup) 5712 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (patrol vessels) 8521; (salaries) 8510; (schools of navigation) 8518; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176 (iv); (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Listowel) 7507; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8170; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537 (i); (deptl., new) 7167 (iv); (military stores) 597; (museum) 569 (i); (Parliament driveway) 8173; (Printing Bureau) 8170 (v); (Royal Mint) 557; (standardizing room) 573 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (Grosse Isle) 663; (immigration sheds) 962; (Joliette) 663; (Marieville) 693; (Montreal P. O.) 700; Montreal postal station) 703; (Quebec barracks) 976; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (St. Lambert) 956 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (new plant) 4740; (vessel repairs) 4732 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6130 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4290 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258; (Winnipeg beach) 4270 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3422; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3457; (Brockville) 3455; (Byng Inlet) 3459; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; (Goderich) 3468; (Lion's Head) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6122 (iv); (Toronto) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747, 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I., (Brudenell) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Gaspé) 3894; (Grand Mechin) 3902; (Grand Rivière) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3905; (Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Le Petit Debarquement) 3907 (ii); (Levis) 6102 (iv); (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3910; (New Carlisle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3913; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (Three Rivers) 4247; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5724 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (International Commission, N.B.) 6164; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160; (Ottawa water-storage dams) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (St. John) 6151; Ont. (Chapeau) 6150; Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151; Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Beresford subway) 2872 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. Quebec Bridge (construction) 8821 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5946, 5974 (iv).

—— Information *re* (remarks) 5278, 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1092 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6011 (iv).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6792 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1429 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6376 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8007 (v).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6374 (iv); 8458 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3438 (ii).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5795 (iii); in Com., 5938; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2426 (ii).

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to date, &c. (Ques.) 3676 (ii).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Number, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

—— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 164 (i).

—— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

—— Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 276 (i).

—— inquiry for ret., 4812 (iii).

—— Purchasing Agent, Names, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

—— Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Bill, 8483 (v).

—— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

—— Standard Pay for Machinists (Ques.) 259 (i).

Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re* (Ques.) 1198 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

Magdalen Islands and Pictou SS. Services, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Leave of Absence to Crew to vote (Ques.) 4077 (iii).

Pictou Post Office Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3489 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Cordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1165 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2882; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (highways) 2882; (Loggieville) 2886; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 1355; (inspection) 1355 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7204 (iv).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, Applications *re* Purchase (Ques.) 1017 (i).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Budget, The (remarks) 1616 (i).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7902 (v).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Holland Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

—— Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Homesteading on Section 34, Tp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4080 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5539 (iii).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 122) 1° m., 2329 (ii).

Kilmant and Shackleton, Application for Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M. for Sup., 5573 (iii).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 658 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6304 (iv).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5133 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4306 (iii).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7325 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 477 (i).

Ross Rifles, Distribution of, Ques. of Priv., 339 (i).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2648 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7759 (v); (archives) 7284; (cold storage) 7364; (Dom. exhibitions) 7384; (experimental farms) 7336 (iv), 7765 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Laurent wharf) 4254 (iii).

Indians—Alberta (agricultural implements) 7857; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (medical attendance) 7849 (v).

Post Office—Miscellaneous (Holland) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 600; (museum) 570 (i).

Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Welland Canal run through Lot 50, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 8660 (v).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 909 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Post Office (salaries) 6693 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1636 (i).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1731 (i)

STRATTON, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*

Cirkle, Fritz., Emplymt. by Dept of Mines (Ques.) 5497 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5806 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6319 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6519 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8052 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E. *Bellechasse.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 3389 (ii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii); in Com., 8042 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1151 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5535 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. (Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109 (i).

I. C. R. Derailments during 1909 (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Laurentian Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 5687 (iii).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2282 (ii).

Naval B. 95, on M. for 2° (remarks) 4108 (iii)

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6590 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7689 (v).

Ross Rifles, Weight of, &c. (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rules *re* (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (translation) 1343 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 937 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 8856 (v).

—— Vol. II., on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

Budget, The, (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846; in Com., 6904 (iv).

Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6631 (iv).

Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).

Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ques.) 631 (i).

Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to (Ques.) 849 (i).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7832 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 779 (i).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders re (Ques.) 4617 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds, Total Amount guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ques.) 8237 (v).

House of Commons, Steps and Walks to, Matting Coverings (remarks) 448 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537 (iii).

Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ques.) 6179 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (warehouse) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).

'J. G. Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).

Labour Dept., Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2901 (ii).

La Butte Indian School, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 6179 (iv).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep. on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105 (v).

Lumsden Charges, &c. (M.) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt., Ques. of Order re Sol. Gen.'s Vote, 8167 (v).

Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 849 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Res., 6098 (iv).

Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 3294 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7441 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).

Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).

Public Works Employees and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).

Questions standing as Notices of Motion (remarks) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6501 (iv).

Retail Merchants Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8239 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5320 5396 (iii), 6670 (iv); Reps. of Engineers (remarks) 5560 (iii).

Saturday Sitting of Hse (remarks) 8110 (v).

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5530 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors) 1346 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit, London) 7380; (census) 7373; (cold storage) 7362; (dairy and fruit) 7362 (iv); (experimental farms) 5724 (iii); (experimental farms) 7764 (v); (farm bulletins) 7377; (Patent Record) 7371; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7769 (v).

Customs Outside service (salaries) 1358 (i).

Excise (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7774 (v).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).

Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848; (Sioux) 7853 (v).

Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox Island wharf) 7847 (v).

Indians—Sask. (Elkhorn schools) 7861 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Can. and Mexico) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809; (Riviere du Loup) 8810 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Can. Handicrafts guild) 7866; (Naturalization Act) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa(astronomical observatory) 421, 541 (i); (grounds) 8192; (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 825 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5614 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3863; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii);

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356 (i).

Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c. (Ques.) 8237 (v).

U S., Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Counsel at Kingston (Ques.) 431

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8090, 8389 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts (M. for cor.) 644 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Barge, W. R., Application *re* License, Extension of Time, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).

B. C. Lt.-Governorship, Appmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 523 (i).

——— Recommendations from Political Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C. (Ques.) 382 (i).

B. C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

Central Park, New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing (Ques.) 2188, 2293 (ii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 3169 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7883 (v).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8035, 8059 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Justice Dept. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

——— Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen. on M. for Sup., 7784; (amt.) 7799; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).

Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).

——— Inundations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).

International Fisheries Commission, Regulations *re*, Legislation by Parlt., &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

Japanese Immigration from U.S. entering B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1264 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2894 (ii).

Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address (Ques.) 7869 (v).

——— (remarks) 8118 (v).

N.T.Ry. Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7563 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4307 (iii).

New Westminster, Dom. Land, Lease, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i), 3160 (ii).

——— Penitentiary, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ques.) 7516 (v).

——— Post Office Apptmts., Application to, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Lands on special Terms, &c. (Ques.) 274 (i).

Port Moody Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii.)

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to question 4 (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces (prop. res.) 2003 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 369, Labour (salaries) 239 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (v).

Public Works — Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Chilliwack) 4298; (Columbia river) 4280; (Coquitlam) 4291; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Port Moody) 4728; (Serpentine river) 4304 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bic) 3871; (Carleton) 3885 (ii), (Laprairie) 4221 (Richelieu river) 4212; (Ste. Croix) 4244; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1093 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8445 (v).

——— Govt. Title to beds of Streams, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Westminster District, Land Leased to B. C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co., (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Western Power Co.'s (B. 86) in Com., 3432 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Comox-Atlin.*

Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost (Ans.) 4310 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints re (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount collected for 1907-9 (Ans.) 7872 (v).

B.C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported (Ans.) 631 (i).
See 'Inland.'

Cirkle, Mr. Fritz., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7310 (iv).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers (remarks) 8585 (v).

——— (stmnt. read) 8831 (v).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7886 (v).

Conservation Commission, Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Electrical Measure Units (B. 7) 1°*, 96 (i); on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8520 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (prop. res.) 4708 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5906, 1°*, 5921 (iii); in Com., 8032, 8058 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims *re* Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations *re* Manitoba, on Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5894 (iii).
See 'Man.' 'Lobsters.'

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6798 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 3056 (ii); in Com., 5680 (iii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance agent, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 9) prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; in Com., 522; 3° m., 811 (i).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).

Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer (Ans.) 4844 (iii).

Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman Roy, Charges re (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Liquor Compounding, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).

Lobster Canning Plant, Connection of Fishery Officers *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Report, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104, 8234 (v).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. in Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ans.) 5678) (ii).

Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmnt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'

Military Articles for Uniforms, Free Importation of (Ans.) 2927 (ii).

Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers, Purchase, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Nickel Mines, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2190 (ii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ans.) 8239 (v).

Pure Food Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. J. A. Currie) on M. for 1°, 2796 (ii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Rescue Stations in Coal Mining Districts, Establishment of (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Sailing Directions to Capts. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 5891 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Mines (salaries) 336 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336; (inspectors salaries) 1331; (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (tobacco stamps) 1342; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).

Fisheries (B. C. claims) 8552; (Canadian exhibit) 8544; (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8546; (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5747 (iii); (fishways) 8534 (v); (hatcheries) 5751 (iii); (legal expenses) 8543; (oyster culture) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769; (books, &c.) 8556; (maps, &c.) 8556; (specimens) 8556; (surveys) 8555 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamer) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709; (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523; (piers, Lake St. Peter) 8523; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8521; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mines, &c. (explosives) 8556; (ore deposits) 8553; (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (icebreakers) 8514; (patrol vessels) 8521; (schools of navigation) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Chilliwack) 4303; (Columbia river) 4281; (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356; (gas inspection) 1355; (inspectors) 1355; (travelling expenses) 1356 (i).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe, Imports, Duties collected, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Reps. of Messrs. Costello and Clarke (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

Yukon Territory, Goods imported free, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3492 (ii).

Zinc Ores, &c., Smelting (B. 182) Prop. Res., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°*, 5801 (iii); in Com., 5935; 3° m., 6617 (iv).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *North Lanark.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7234 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Infraction *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding (remarks) 4813 (iii).

Budget, The, (remarks) 1621 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (iv).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5097 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5310 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6562 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8212 (v).

[illegible]nical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1088 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7278 (iv).

Budget, The, 1817, 1949 (i).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1372 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2658 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5422 (ii).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance of Light, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 321 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 6120 (iv).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

H. of C., Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to (Ques.) 8677 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3430 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1878 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4622 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que (Godfroy) 3893 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Budget, The, 1935 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).

Chambers of Commerce incorp. (B. 220) 1°*, 8213 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 740 (i).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction, &c (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr Verville) on M. for 2°, 1221 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4893 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ques.) 7513 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, Ques. of Order, 7691 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1542 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5478 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 833 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5613 (iii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4161 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

Budget, The, 2127 (ii).

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6372 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) 1° m., 1731 (i).

—— M. to Introduce, 1688 (i).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 127) 1°*, 2631 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5545 (iii).

I. C. R., Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies B., 8482 (v).

—— Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2325 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 659 (i).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2730 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4830 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt. in Com., 1365 (i).

Pioneers Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 211) 1°*, 7512 (v).

Protectorate Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593 (iv).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* Bills (remarks) 8833 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 103 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434, 8598 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1540 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5352 (iii), 6259 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 1687 (i); 2° m., 2056 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7178 (iv); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 417, 538; (Royal Mint) 563 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 5073 (v).

Weyburn Security Bank incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Evers, T., Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ques.) 2428, 2927 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works (B. 21) 1° m., 256; 2° m., 1209; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1263 (i).

Independent Order of Rechabites incorp., (B. 112) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

Labour, Hours of Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ques.) 1964 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).

—— Carpenter Shop, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1006 (i).

—— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c., (M. for copy*) 1547 (i).

—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to (Ques.) 5103 (iii).

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100 (Ques.) 2428 (ii).

—— Supply of Douglas Fir, Quantity on hand, &c. (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4383 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 671 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1052 (i).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Centre York, Ont.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, (M. for papers) 2009 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance Agent, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).

Horse-Racing Regulation (B. 81) 1° m., 1529 (i).

—— (remarks) 6617 (iv).

Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island (remarks) 8586 (v).

McArthur, F. J. Gustin Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 3290 (ii).

Markham Post Office Site, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

—— Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ques.) 849 (i).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014; in Com., 6193 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5149 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost in 1909 Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

North Toronto, Free Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).

Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1373 (i).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* &c. (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3107 (ii)

Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7864 (v).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duty collected &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c. (M. for memorials, &c.) 2019 (ii).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B. N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2735 (ii).

See 'Representation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3946 (ii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London. Memorials, &c. *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, Surveys *re* Construction (M. for copies) 277 (i)

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Changes in Routes, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 3171 (ii).

Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c. (M. for copy)—(amt.) 644 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ques.) 842 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.C.'s &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3495 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6616 (iv).

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2815 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6216 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., on Amt., 1365 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 4129; (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Petawawa Wharf, Protection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).

Return, Inquiry for, 8585 (v).

St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6060 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7750 (v).

Waterways Committee, Meeting, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Pine Pass Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7366 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4275 (iii).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*

Budget, The, 2168 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6999 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).

I.C.R. Wire Fencing, Tenders, Prices quoted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

——— Tenders for 1909, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6448 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Outside ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Walkerville, Post Office, Appropriation for (Ques.) 1373 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6396 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, 3544 (ii).

Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Mail Privileges *re* Postal Regulations, Members Privileges, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4457 (iii).

Postal Regulations, Duration of Recess of Parlt. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i); on M. for Com., Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence before Special Com., Appeal from Speaker's Decision, Neg. (Y. 55; N. 99) 6406 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1352 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846 (iv).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ques.) 268 (i).

Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c. (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5519; in Com., 5545 (iii); 5802, 5830, 5880 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2222, 2797 (ii).

Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107, 8230 (v).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Napanee River Dredging (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Napanee River, Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1194 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co. Claims for Moneys, Fiat granted, &c. (Ques.) 640 (i).

——— Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 644 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Rideau Hall Furniture, Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (Salaries) 6696 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 8195 (v): (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Indians — Generally (land management fund) 7838; Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 ; Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837 (v).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8192 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec P. O.) 824 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monuments) 6158; (Ottawa river water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6155 (iv).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c. (Ques.) 2288 (ii).
See 'de la Ronde.'

Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c. (M. for cor*.) 5501 (iii).

De la Rondes, Major and Capt., Charges *re* Malfeasance in Army Service Corps (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

——— (Ques.) 135 (i).

——— Rep. of Justice Dept. (Ques.) 5500 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Drill Halls and Armouries, &c., Contribution to Cost of (Ques.) 1534 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Contract to C. A. Barnett, &c. (Ques.) 4312 (iii).

Eastern Cavalry Bridage, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of 12-pounder B. L. Guns (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Import of Military Clothing (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes (Ques). 843 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ques.) 637 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1360; in Com., 3137 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).

Militia Active Service, Requirements *re* Standard Rifle Shooting, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Military Articles for Uniforms, &c., Free Importation of (Ques.) 2927 (ii).

Militia Clerks, Apptmts. without Examination, &c. (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Amounts deducted from Allowances for Deficiencies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— Life of, Purchases of New Articles (Ques.) 1018 (i).

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).

Militia Expenditure re Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ques.) 1778 (i).

Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Militia, Govt. Policy *re* Armouries, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Militia Harness and Saddlery Tenders, &c. for 1909 (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1780 (i).

Militia Inspection Pay, Rates to Inspectors (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Money Allowance for married Officers (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ques.) 1019 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1377 (i).

Militia Provisions re Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 842 (i).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c. (Ques.) 639 (i).

Militia Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1779 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditure re (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re* (Ques.) 1200 (i).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Militia Stores Buildings, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ques.) 837 (i).

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
See 'de la Ronde.'

Permanent Militia Corps, Increase of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

——— Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1781 (i).

——— Officers, Entertaining Allowance (Ques.) 1530 (i).

——— Requirements re Instructions, &c. (Ques.) 1011 (i).

——— Schools of Instruction, Number, Certificates issued, &c. (Ques.) 1531 (i).

——— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

Permanent Officers, Annual Cost per man (Ques.) 1013 (i).

——— Payments re Scale, &c. (Ques.) 1012 (i).

Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practice, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

——— Schools of Instruction at St. John (Ques.) 1776 (i).

Ross Rifles, Answer of Minister to Question: Ques. of Order, 1597 (i).

——— Dates of Issue of Special Marks (M. for ret.*) 154 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re (Ques.) 1532; on Ques. of Order, 1534 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c. (Ques.) 273 (i).

——— Contract *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

——— Number received and contracted for, &c. (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).

——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c. (Ques.) 134 (i).

——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn *re* Bisley Meet (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. &c. (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

R. N. W. M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 843; (i).

St. Johns Que., Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1780 (i).
See 'Militia.'

Sub-target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c .(Ques.) 1535 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (generally, renewals, &c.) 662; (Grosse Isle) 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Levis) 668; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

U. S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Woollen Industry, Rep. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Beaumarais Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Combines Investigation (B. 101) on M. for Com. on Res., 6892 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5526; in Com., 5832 (iii).

Insects, Pests Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5152 (iii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4839 (iii).

Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2653 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3118 (ii).

Indians — Generally (land management (fund) 7837 (v).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys) 7337 (v).

Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox Island Wharf) 7847 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5703; (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 579 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Royal Mint) 564 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 683; (Rock Island) 947; (Roberval) 931; (St. Henri) 952 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 4784 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6132 (iv); Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5732 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Paspebiac) 3912 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste Croix) 4236; (Three Rivers) 4250; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii);

Railways—Miscellaneous (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6012 (iv).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Wharfs under P. W. Dept, Collection of Dues (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Accidents on Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. Ecrement) 22; Seconded (Mr. Kyte) 27.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 33; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Monk) 47; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 52; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. A. Haggart) 67; (Mr. Sproule) 73; (Mr. Lewis) 82; (Mr. Graham) Denial *re* reported Speech, 81 (i).

——— M. *re* Precedence (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

——— M. to Present (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on close of Term of Office: Moved (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8737; Seconded (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8740 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).

Administration of Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Adulteration of Food, Inspectors, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).

Aid to C. N. Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Air-Brakes to Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).

'Air-Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1369 (i).

——— Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture Bulletins, Number distributed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 789 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Administration: Statement (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Sup., 7351, 7191, 7270 (iv).

——— Criticism of Methods: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Campbell) 1364 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 5724 (iii), 7764 (v).

Agriculture and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4618 (iii).

Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) &c., in Com. on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products: in Co. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

——— Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).

Experimental Farms, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).

——— Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).

Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).

Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Swine Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).
Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Alberta Coal Areas, Total Estimated Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 1010 (i).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'
Alcoholism International Conference, Canadian Representation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 521 (i).
Alfalfa Seed: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
—— Violation of *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 4813 (iii).
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3057, 3209 (ii).
Allard and Prevost, Govt. Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crothers) 2488 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 2635 (ii).
All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 269 (i).
Analytical Index to Hansard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3165 (ii).
Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).
Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).
Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).
—— Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 385 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 5635 (iii).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iv).
—— Protection *re* Fire: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1019 (i).
Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1596 (i).
——Corrected Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 1730 (i).
'Arctic' Str., Official Rep. *re* Cruise: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1014 (i).
Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Armouries, Drill Halls, Construction, Conribution *re* Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii), 8742 (v)
See 'Militia,' 'Drill Halls.'
Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2288 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Arrow Lake Telephone System: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Arthabaska 'Gazette' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavergne) 2149 (ii).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Assault: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Assay Office, Vancouver, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7769 (v).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).
Associated Press Despatches from England Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'

Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
——— Additional Buildings, Dr. King's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Atlantic Ports to Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1193 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8856 (v).
——— Vols. I. and III: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).
——— Vol. II: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1445 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (v).
Automobiles injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Automobiles, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Aylmer Post Office, Addition: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Baby Farm, Sale by Militia Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
See 'Militia.'
Baie St. Paul, Loss of Title of Lot 73: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1017 (i).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 18, 56, 57.'
Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).
Banking Act, Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Bank Bills: *See* 'Currency.'
Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).
Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).
Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5002 (iii).
Barr, Dr., M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 380 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).
Bathurst Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux,' 'Loggie,' &c.
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
Bathurst Pubic Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).
Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).
——— Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).
Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
Becancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2716 (ii).
Belfast Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 102 (i).
See 'B. No. 5.'
Beresford Subway, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Str., Wreck of on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
——— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
See 'Marine.'

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).

Bills of Lading on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 25.'

Bills, Royal Assent. Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 922 (i); 5628 (iii); 6606 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6177 (iv).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act,—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 93; 2°, 413, 448 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 94; 2°, 452 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 95; 2°, 467 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Northrup).
1°, 96; 2°, 480 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 96; 2°, 856 (i); M. for Com., 6398; in Com., 6500, 6510, 7258; 3°, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Units of Electrical Measure.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°*, 96 (i); wthdn., 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 126; 2°, 499; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; 1°* of B., 154; 2° and in Com., 522; 3°, 811 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 162 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 163 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting a certain Supplementary Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 172; in Com. on Res., 173; 1°* of B., 199; 2°, 705, 744; in Com., 781; 3°, 812 (i).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting Injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 201 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii), 8729; in Com., 8729; 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive Weapons and Capital Offences.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 204 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Sinclair)
1°, 204; 2°, 512 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 204; wthdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, lines of Railway connected with the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 205; 2°, 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3°, 2191 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8402, 8828, 8854, 8855 (v).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 205; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 206; 2°, 1136; in Com., 1138 (i); 3°, 2637 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) To prevent the introduction or spreading of Insects, Pests and Diseases destructive to Vegetation.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 200; in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5627, 5630; 3°*, 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 256; 2°, 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 22) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 256; 2°, 1268 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°, 1296 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Water Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 258; 2°, 1299 (i); in Com., 8004; 3°*, 8027 (v).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 340 (i); 2° m., 2156; 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the British North American Mining Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 1920 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); 3°, 2279, 2373 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., 1364; 3°*, 1366 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., 2098; in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 380 (i); 2°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 429; withdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 41) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 430; 2°, 805; in Com., 807 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company.—(Mr. Knowles.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3181 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ethier)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Victoria, Alberta).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 47) To provide for Inspection of Vessels not now inspected.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 515 (i).

Bill (No. 48) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Papineau).
1°, 621 (i); 2°, 2032 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 520; in Com. on Res., 657; 1°* of B., 661 (i); withdn., 5674 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 705 (i); 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Roy, Montmagny).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 2279; 3°, 2280 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 4752, 4814, 5235 5279; 3°*, 5317 (iii).

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1° 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 807; 1°* of B., 808 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 808; 1°* of B., 811 (i); 2°, 2637; in Com., 2638; 3°*, 2661 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 822 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 57 To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 923 (i).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., 2258; 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mayrand).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 60) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 1102 (i).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3151 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 1193 (i); 2°, 2039 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Neely).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 4753, 4839; 3°*, 4922 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Toronto Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting Assault and Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1360 (i); 2°, 2040 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1361 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2040; in Com., 2054, 2153 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2158 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 1363 (i); 2°*, 2056 (ii); M. for Com., 8731; in Com., 8732; 3°*, 8733 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 77) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1441 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1528; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2259 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 6139, 6169, 6739; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate l'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3139; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) To regulate Horse Racing.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°, 1529 (i).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2714; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Armstrong).
1°, 1587 (i).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).
1°, 1588 (i); 2°, 2162; in Com., 2166; 3°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 1687; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3432; 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend an Act to authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Turriff).
1° m., 1688 (i); 2°, 2056 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 1689 (i).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Stratton).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3929; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting a Patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1731 (i); 2°*, 1964; in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Dominion Lands Act—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 1731 (i).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the Naval Service of Canada.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952, 3210, 3296, 3575, 3683, 3747, 3945 (ii), 3987, 4025, 4083, 4129, 4316, 4403, 4535, 4618, 4848, 4922, 5003; Amt. (Mr. Monk) neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; Amt. (Mr. Borden) neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; on M. for 2°, 5107; Amt. (Mr. Northrup) neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5194; Res. prop., 5195 (iii), 6509; M. for Com., 6948; in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv); in Com. on B. 7393; 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; Res. *re* withdn., 8742 (v).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2259 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°, 2101 (ii); in Com., 4841; 3°*, 4842 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting Oaths.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1878 (i).

Bill (No. 101) To provide for the Investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers.—(Mr. King).
1°, 2056; Res. prop., 2489 (ii), 6802, 6886; in Com. on Res., 6904; 2°, 6904; in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881, 7977; 3°, 8003; Sen. Amts., 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2133 (ii); 2°, 5502; in Com., 5529, 5532, 5802, 5821, 5851 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8400 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.— (Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 2135 (ii); 2°, 5674 (iii); M. for Com., 6202; in Com., 6209, 6963; 3°*, 7071 (iv).

Bill (No. 104) To control the rates and facilities of Ocean Cable Companies, and to amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2136 (ii); 2°, 6007; in Com., 6010; 3°*, 6011 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Telegraphs Act. —(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2138 (ii); 2° and in Com., 6011; 3°*, 6012 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8389 (v).

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Gladu).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5765; 3°*, 5772 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 2184 (ii).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii), 4025, 5772; 3°*, 5776 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3430; 3°*, 3432 (ii).

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Forget).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 115) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 5317, 5722 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8653 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 116) To incorporate the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 6768; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 117) For the Relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 2710; 2°*, 2840; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2671 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2329; 2°, 2672, 3151 (ii); wthdn., 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 120) Respecting the Royal Guardians.—(Mr. Rivet).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 7256; 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 121) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 4753; 3°*, 4754 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).
1°, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8657 (v).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 125) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2485 (ii); 2°, 5921; in Com., and 3°*, 5922 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8401 (v).

Bill (No. 126) To correct a clerical Error in the French Convention Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 2486 (ii); 2°, 6620; in Com., and 3°*, 6620 (iv).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 2631; 2°*, 3090 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4755 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) To incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) To incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Low).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 130) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 2792 (ii).

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 3056 (ii); 2°, 5680; 3°*, 5687 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate), To incorporate the Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), For the Relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—(Mr. McCarthy).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 3133 (ii).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5723 (iii).

Bill (No. 138) To amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 3290 (ii); 2°, 6189; in Com., and 3°*, 6190 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 3389; 2°*, 3482 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3390; 2°*, 3875 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 141) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 3390 (ii); 2°, 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii), 5934; 3°*, 5934 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), To incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3481; 2°*, 3625 (ii); in Com., 4754; 3°*, 4844 (iii).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Magrath).
1°, 3670 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 3829; 2°*, 3931 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 3914 (ii); 2°, 8405; in Com., 8406; 3°*, 8422 (v).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate), Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).
1°*, 4128; 2°*, 4246; ref. back to Ry. Com., 5235 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Archibald Laurie.—(Mr. Congdon).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) For the relief of Bernard Shea.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate) For the Relief of Clara Louise Holden.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to The Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Company.—(Mr. Reid, Restigouche).
1°*, 4402; 2°, 4842 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169; 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To provide for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 4402 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6600; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) To incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, Quebec).
2°*, 4754; in Com., 5722; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate), For the Relief of James Albert Green.—(Mr. Prowse).
1°*, 5103; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com.., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. W. H. White).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 4922 (iii); 2°, 6329; in Com., 6330; 3°*, 6332 (iv).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) To incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°* 4922; 2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) For the Relief of Cecilia Marie Pringle.—(Mr. Price).
1°*, 4922; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Ann Reed.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 5103; 2°, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 4996 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6187 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Sovereign Trust Company, and to change its name to 'The Federal Trust Company.'—(Mr. Nesbitt).
2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of Alexander Augustus Barthelmes.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°* 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 4996 (iii); 2°, 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072, 8389; 3°*, 8400 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 5103, 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) For the relief of Elmore Walker Scott.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 5557; 2°*, 5777 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 5617 (iii); 2°, 7940; in Com., 7942, 8459; 3°*, 8476 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 5617, 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming.—Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*,5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Co.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 173) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Years ending respectively, the 31st March, 1910, and the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com. on Ways and Means, 5606, 5626; 1° of B., 5626; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5627 (iii).

Bill (No. 174) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°, 5621 (iii).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 5620 (iii).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To incorporate the Laurentian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 5687 (iii); 2°* 6798; in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate the Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Company.—(Mr. Broder).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Perley).

1°*, 5759 (iii); 2°*, 6798 (iv); in Com., 8599; 3°*, 8618 (v).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) For the Relief of Helena Mellor Fleming.—(Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Royal Military College Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2633; in Com. on Res., 5783; 1°*, of B., 5791 (iii); 2°, 6098; in Com., and 3°*, 6099 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Public Lands, and the acquisition of certain other Lands, in or in the vicinity of the Cities of Toronto and Winnipeg, respectively.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2634; in Com. on Res., 5791; 1°* of B., 5793 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5941, 6003; 3°*, 6005 (iv)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada, and to promote the production in Canada of Zinc.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°* of B., 5801 (iii); 2e and in Com., 5935; 3°*, 6617 (iv).

Bill (No. 83, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin).

1°*, 5886 (iii); 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) To provide for the Testing of Glassware used in connection with Milk Tests.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5884 (iii); 2°, 6005; in Com., 6006; 3°*, 6007 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5885 (iii); 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3°, 6619 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To amend the Irrigation Act—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5886 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6200; 3°*, 6202 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To confirm and declare the rights of the Crown with respect to Water and Water Power, and relating to the diversion, acquisition and use of Water in the Railway Belt in British Columbia.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5887 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6375; in Com., 8435, 8706 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To amend the Act respecting the National Battlefield at Québec.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 5888 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6598; 3°*, 6600 (iv).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate) To incorporate the Protectorate Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 5929; 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) To incorporate the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°*,5921; 2°* 6798 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 191) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1°* of B., 5904; 2°, 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 192) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4708; in Com. on Res., 5906; 1°* of B., 5921 (iii); 2° and in Com., 8032, 8058; 3°*, 8072 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 5929; 2°, 6279; in Com., 6279; 3°, 6618 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Militia Pension Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).
Res. prop., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097; 1°* of B.. 6098; 2°, 6190; in Com., 6190; 3°*, 6194 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Currency Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 2632 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6188; 1°* of B., 6189; 2° and in Com,. 6620, 6641; 3°*, 6646 (iv).

Bill (No. 196) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 6397; in Com., 6397; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6398 (iv).

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 6100; in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° of B., 6389; 2° and in Com., 7313; 3°*, 7330 (iv).

Bill (No. 198) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.—(Mr. King).
Res. prop., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603; 1* of B., 6605 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8027; 3°*, 8032 (v).

Bill (No. 199) Respecting licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 200) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate) For the Relief of John Green.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Thornton Brownlee.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) Respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 204) To authorize the Erection of certain Wharfs and Buildings in the Harbour of St. John.—(Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 6934 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8120; 3°*, 8129 (v).

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6962; in Com., 7295 (iv); 3°*, 7528; Sen. Amts., 8772 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 206) Respecting Escheats.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974; 1°* of B., 6976 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8384; 3°*, 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 207) To amend the Judges Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; 1°* of B., 6985 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8383; 3°*, 8384 (v).

Bill (No. 208) To provide for the Payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6985; 1°* of B., 7009 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8129; 3°*, 8131 (v).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Murphy).
1°, 7181 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8381; 3°*, 8382 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate) To incorporate the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°, 7286; 2°, 7287 (iv); in Com., 7868, 8043, 8422, 8587; 3°*, 8599 (v).

Bill (No. 211, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pioneers Loan Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 7512; 2°*, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 213, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Sifton).
1°*, 7650; 2°, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7868; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) To incorporate the Buctouche Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7846; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 216, from the Senate) Respecting the British Northwestern Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 7867; 2°*, 8043; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 7867; 2° and in Com., 8382; 3°*, 8383 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 7975; 2°, 8055, 8380, 8618; 3°, 8652 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 219, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 7975; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 220, from the Senate) To incorporate the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 8213; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 221, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Alexander Hurst Forster.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 222, from the Senate) For the Relief of Emily Maud Nicoll.—(Mr. Osler).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 223, from the Senate), For the Relief of Edna Shibley De Mar.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 224, from the Senate) for the Relief of Clifford Buell Lillie.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 225, from the Senate) for the Relief of Rowland James Botterill.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 226) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Aid of the construction of Lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 7873, 8239; in Com. on Res., 8477: 1°*, 2°* of B., 8480; in Com., 8480; 3°*, 8679 (v).

Bill (No. 227) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, and to aid in the construction of its Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483; 1° of B.. 8487; 2°*, and in Com., 8487; 3°*, 8679 (iv).

Bill (No. 228) To assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian Press (Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8679; 1°* 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8687 (v).

Bill (No. 229) To encourage the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 6276 (iv); withdwn., 8003; res. prop., 8113; in Com. on Res., 8687; 1°* of B., 8697; 2°, and in Com., 8673; 3°* 8764 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 230) Respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 8697; 1°* of B., 8704; 2° and in Com., 8770; 3°*, 8771 (v).

Bill (No. 231) Respecting Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8362; in Com. on Res., 8705; 1°* of B., 8705; 2° and in Com., 8764; 3°*, 8770 (v).

Bill (No. 232) To amend the Government Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8733; 2° and in Com., 8772; 3°*, 8776 (v).

Bill (No. 233) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1907 (Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8705, 8742; in Com. on Ways and Means, 8757; 1°* of B., 8763; 2°, 8841; in Com., and 3°*, 8854 (v).

Bill (No. 234, from the Senate) To correct an error in the Telegraphs Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°. 8776; 2°*, 8777; in Com., 8777; 3°* 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 235) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. of Ways and Means, 8856; 1°*, 2°*, 8856; in Com.., 8856; 3°*, 8856 (v).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).

——— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).

Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).

Blue Rocks Islands Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sentence: Correction re Crown's Action (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

Board of Ry. Commissioners, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 104, 145.'

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re.*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii)

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N. S., Expenditure to date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).

See 'Toney.'

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
Bookmaking and Pool Rooms: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Botterill, Rowland James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 225.'
Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Bounties on Iron and Steel: *See* 'B. No. 231.
Bounties on Lead and Zinc: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Bounty to S. A. Volunteers: *See* 'B. No. 87 and 163.'
Bourgeois, Mr. B., Emplymt. by N. T. Ry., Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).
Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Seguin) 6394 (iv).
Bow River Coal Lands, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 3170 (ii).
Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3057 (ii).
Branch Lines on I. C. R., Requirement of: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6182 (iv).
—— Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Brandon Land Agencies, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 213.'
Brantford Telephone Memorial: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Bridges, Wharfs, &c., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
B. C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
—— Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
—— Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c., on M. to adjn: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5 (i).
—— Reply to Mr. Borden (Mr. Aylesworth) 11 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Recommendations from Liberal Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 382 (i).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 523 (i).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B.C. Ry. Belt, Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187'.
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
British North America Mining Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
British Northwestern Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 6799 (iv).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brown, Hon. George, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Brownlee, James Thornton: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brule Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— Debate: (Mr. Fielding) 1446; (Mr. Foster) 1474; (Mr. Miller) 1507; (Mr. Sproule) 1601; (Mr. Fowke) 1613; (Mr. Staples) remarks, 1616; (Mr. Thoburn) remarks, 1621; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1626; (Mr. Stratton) 1636; (Mr. McCall) 1655; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 1662; (Mr. Barnard) 1673; (Mr. E. Roy) 1678; (Mr. Sinclair) 1690; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1701; (Mr. Schell) 1804; (Mr. Lake) 1828, (Mr. Rivet) 1842; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1858; (Mr. Low) 1864; (Mr. Sexsmith) 1868; (Mr. M. Clark) 1880; (Mr. Crothers) 1894; (Mr. Congdon) 1903; (Mr. Magrath) 1920; (Mr. E. Paquet) 1929; (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 1935; (Mr. Arthurs) 1946; (Mr. Thornton) 1949; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1952 (i); (Mr. Paterson) 2061; (Mr. Sproule) 2065; (Mr. Burrell) 2067; (Mr. J. Haggart) 2067; (Mr. Wallace) 2069; (Mr. Hughes) 2069; A. Currie) 2076; (Mr. Lalor) 2079; (Mr. Armstrong) 2080; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2081; Ques of Order, 2085; (Mr. Speaker) Ruling, 2084; (Mr. Foster) 2082; (Mr. Boyce) 2093, 2102; (Mr. Turriff) 2127; (Mr. Wilcox) 2163; (Mr. Loggie) 2178, 2215, 2222; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2218; (Mr. Edwards) 2227; (Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2229; (Mr. Owen) 2246; (Mr. Nesbitt) 2246; (Mr. Campbell) 2259; (Mr. Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2267; (Mr. Robert Smith) 2269 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1002 (i).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
See 'Lake St. Peter.'

Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7872 (v).
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Business of the Hse., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 118 (i).
Buttonshaw, George Robert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3878 (ii).
Cable Co.'s Rates: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 234.'
Cable Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii), 8810 (v).
Canada Gazette, French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 8585 (v).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
See 'Germany.'
Canada and G. B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8809 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Can. Handicrafts Guild: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Can. Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Canadian Attache at Washington: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1582 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4708 (iii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount of U. S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).
See 'Currency.'
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Canadian Exhibit in London: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Canadian Flag: *See* 'Flags.'
Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (iv).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
See 'de la Ronde.'
Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2717 (ii).
——— Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5782 (iii).
——— Purchase, by Govt. of Vessels, O.C's. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2930 (ii).
——— Names of Cruisers, &c., purchased, description, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3931 (ii).
See 'Naval,' &c.
Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lake Shipyards and Rush-Bagot Treaty: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 844 (i).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co., Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
——— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
——— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 15, 74, 77.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
CANALS.
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).

——— Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).

Canals, Arbitrations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Canal Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 5759 (iii).

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

——— Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

——— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

——— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

——— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s, &c. *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).

——— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

——— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).

——— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c. Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).

——— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

——— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).

——— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).

——— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).

——— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).

——— Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).

——— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).

Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

CANALS—*Con*

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).

Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

——— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).

——— Slope Trimming, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3105 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, L. F., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).

——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii).

——— Instructions, Payments, &c. as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6391 (iv).

——— Payments to re Trent Canal Floods: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7516 (v).

Trent Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

——— Damages to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

——— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

——— Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).

——— Floods in twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).

——— Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (ii).

Trent Canal, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).

Trent Canal—Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

——— Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).

——— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

Trent Canal, Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure re Surveys, &c. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).

——— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Elevators, Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).

——— Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

———Right of Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Welland Canal, Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).

——— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).

Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

Cape de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3888 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Capital Cases, Action of Crown: Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

Capital Offences: *See* 'B. Nos. 14, 71.'

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 642 (i).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).

See 'Frontenac.'

Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming: *See* 'B. No. 170.'

Cattle Guards on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Chambers of Commerce, P.Q., Federation: *See* 'B. No. 220.'

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

See 'Canals.'

Chambly River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).

Champlain Monument: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).

Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Charlottetown, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).

——— Increased Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: Motion for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).

——— Shareholders: Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).

See 'Finance.'

Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii)

Chatham, Diversion of I.C.R. Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).

Chaudiere Junction, I. C. R. Signals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Mr. Monk) 636 (i).

Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).

Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).

Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax. Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 7870 (v).

China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).

Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, Rate of Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1201 (i).

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
——— Original Field Notes: M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Cement Merger: *See* 'Combines Bill 101.'
Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2296 (ii).
——— Protection *re* Combine: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 106 (i).
Cement Trust: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Census: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Census, Decennial, Date of taking: Ques. (Mr Boyer) 1371 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373, 7763 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Central Park Post Office, Action *re* Pet.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Change of Location, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
——— Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 631 (i).
Cirkle, Mr. Fritz, Emplymt. in Dept. of Mines, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stratton) 5497 (iii).
——— Unprofessional Conduct, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. Smith) 5502 (iii).
Civil Employees, Salaries *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Civil Engineers: *See* 'Engineers,' &c.
Civil Govt. Expenditures, Increases of: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 212 (i). *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Servants, in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Rivet) 845 (i).
Civil Service Act (garnisheeing of wages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Civil Service Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Civil Service Amt Amt. Bill: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beauparlant) 7066 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts., Number of passing Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2256 (ii).
——— Apptmts. under C. S. Act, Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 3170 (ii).
Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 4315 (iii).
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 1730 (i).
Civil Service, Outside, Legislation *re* Reorganization: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 6947 (iv).
Claims Adjudication Treaty Ratification: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5278 (iii).
Claims against Govt. Rys., Adjudication: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Claims for Damages on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5209 (iii), 6391 (iv), 7516 (v).
——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii). *See* 'Canals—Trent.'
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).
Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5000 (iii).
Coal Oil Lands, Acres sold, Leased, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 277 (i).
Coal Oil: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c.. Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v). *See* 'Lightkeepers.'
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Coins, Minting of: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Coins, Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii). *See* 'Can. Coins.'
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).
Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1972 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products. in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade: Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1363 (i).
Combines, Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Combines Bill: Personal Explanation (Mr. King) *re* Speech, 7188 (iv).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).
Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
Committee, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5, 22 (i).
—— Lists: Presented(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 155 (i).
—— M. to add Names, 1001 (i).
Committee on Standing Orders: M. (Mr. McCraney) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6605 (iv).
Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 5104 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Congregational Union of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Conservation of Natural Resources: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.'
Conservation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
—— Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1590 (i).
—— Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4845 (iii).
—— Regulations re Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3486 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Consideration of Bill: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6140 (iv).
Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 853 (i).
See 'Can. Attache.'
Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Miller) 1378 (i).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
Controverted Elections, P.E.I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 142 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Co-operative Societies B. 26, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8205 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
—— Discrimination *re* Postage: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
—— Postal Regulations, P.M.G.'s Answers, Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Courtenay Bay—Marsh Road: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Criminal Code Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 14, 41, 71, 75, 81, 85.'
Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4616 (iii).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 4, 145.'
Crown, Escheats to: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1529 (i).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Currency Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation. Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).
Customs Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Customs Act (reporting of vessels) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Customs Tariff Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'
CUSTOMS.
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Customs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Customs and Excise Revenue for 1909-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8109 (v).
Customs Outside Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i), 8803 (iv).
Incubators, Total Number imported from U.S., 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 169 (i).
——— M. for Ret.*: (Mr. G. V. White) 414 (i).
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Dale, Sydney J., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 4790 (iii).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 985 (i).
Daylight Saving: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 514 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 2424; M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 3052 (ii).
——— Translators, Apptmt. of: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
de la Ronde, Major and Capt., Charges of Malfeasance in Army Service Corps: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
——— Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i).
——— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Delisle Postmaster Alfred Gagné, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
De Mar, Edna Shibley, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 223.'
Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 631 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour, Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation: Inquiry for Reps. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Distilleries, Extra Duty, Payments for: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
Distribution Office, H. of C., Salary Increases: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Divorce: *See* 'Bills, Nos. 117, 134, 140, 144, 147, 148, 149, 153, 157, 158, 162, 165, 179, 201, 202, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225.'
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
——— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dollar Bills: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
See 'Currency.'
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Bank: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 2285 (ii).
Dominion Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7384 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94 and 143.'
Dom. Lands Act B. 94, Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).
Dom. Lands Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,' 'Interior,' 'N. E. Section.'
Dom. Millers' Association: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Dom. Police sent to Thunder Bay, Rainy River &c. during Election 1909: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 1007 (i).
Dominion Traffic Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3165 (ii).
Doukhobors, Comparison *re* h. m. for Dauphin, Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 5532 (iii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
See 'Bathurst' &c.
Dredging, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780, 5608 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
Dredging Plant, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
——— Ont and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii); 6124 (iv).
——— St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
See 'Armouries.'
Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 104 (i).
See 'Port Arthur.'
Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 105 (i).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Dry Docks, Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 229.'
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
See 'H. of C. Members,' 'Representation,' 'Ottawa City,' &c.
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dubuc, Chief Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1975 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 2277 (ii).
See 'Judges, Man.,' &c.
Dufferin Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620, 1731 (i).
——— Date of: Remarks(Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).
——— Representation of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
Duncan Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3170 (ii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).

Du Tremblay, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecutions: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).
Easter Adjournment: M. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Eastern Deptl. Bldg., Ottawa, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Edmonton-Athabaska Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 21, 109.'
Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 167 (i).
Electric Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Electrical Measuring: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i).
Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Engineers' Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. Warburton) 2019 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Escheats to the Crown: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Fortificatons, Dismantling of, Imp-Conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Estimates, Delay in Bringing down: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).
——— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).
——— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).
Estimates, Suppl.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3987 (iii).
Evers, Mr. T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Excise Bonding Warehouses, Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Excise, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
——— Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
——— Surveys, Special Pay for Extra Hours: in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Exhibition at Charlottetown: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (v).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 5728 (iii).
Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re*, Expenditure by Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor 2294 (ii).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv.
——— Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).
Experimental Farms Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).
Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).
Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Robb) 172 (i).
Explosives, Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Extension, B.C., Mining Disaster, Medals Awarded, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
External Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i).
Factories Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).
'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).
Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Federation of Chambers of Commerce of P.Q.: *See* 'B. No. 220.'
Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3207 (ii).
Federal Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Fences along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 789 (i).
——— Recognition of Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 7068 (iv).
——— Request *re* Indemnity: Ques. (Mr. Papineau) 5560 (iii).
See 'Volunteers Bills Nos. 87 and 163.'
Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7289 (iv).
Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv), 8190 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
Fielding, Hon. W. S., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers of the Crown.'
Fighting Island Channel Improvement: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
FINANCE.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. I. and III.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
FINANCE—*Con.*
——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).
Aud. General's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (iv).
Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).
——— Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).
Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).
Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).
——— Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount of U.S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).
Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).
Coins Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).
Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).
——— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).
——— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).
Finance and Treasury Board Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).
Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).
Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
——— Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).
Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1st, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (iv).
Temporary Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions re: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
——— since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).

Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Fires caused by Govt. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fish Industry of Can. and Combines: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Fisheries Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Fish used as Fertilizers: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fishing Vessels, Licenses to: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
FISHERIES.
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
B.C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Chambly River Dam, and Fishing Right: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8515 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8515 (v).
—— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Fish Contract for Penitentiary: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6798 (iv).
Fish Fry, Application Forms: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 3058 (ii).
Fish Prices in B.C., 7884 (iv).
Fish Transportation and Conservation: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).
Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Jameson) 4811 (iii).
—— Fisheries Commission, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Fisheries Revenue, Alberta and Sask., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1021 (i).
Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid for Storage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1015 (i).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).
Fishing Licenses in B. C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3933 (ii).
Fishways Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishment for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost: (Mr. Bradbury) 632 (i).
Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 384 (i).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
—— Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
—— Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i).
—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i), 2153 (ii).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
—— Letters from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).
——— Changes in Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).
——— Evidence and Rep., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 276 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).
——— Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).
——— Regulations in Man.: Inquiry for (Mr Bradbury) 3480 (ii), 5894 (iii).
——— Signing of Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries (lobster industry) Com.: M. to conc. in Rep. (Mr. Sinclair) 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii), 8509 (v).
Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 133 (i).
Fleming, Helena Mellor, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).
Forests. Conservation of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Forest and Timber Protection: in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Forster, James Alexander Hurst, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 221.'
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Franking Privilege, Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1207 (i).
Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784, (amt.) 7792, neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).
Fraser River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Freight Rates, Guarantee against Loss: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
French Canadian Party in Parlt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blondin) 8115 (v).
French Floods Relief Fund: Grant to, 3059; Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie: Read (Mr. Fielding) 3295 (ii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
See 'Militia.'
French Treaty Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 12 and 126.'
French Treaty, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R .L. Borden) 6 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8664 (v).
——— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Provisions *re* Termination: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 276 (i).
——— Similar Treatment to Germany: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
See 'German,' &c.
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).
——— Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).
Frontenac Mail Contracts, Payments, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3937 (ii).
Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 5502 (iii).
Garrison Artillery Guns, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799; Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).
Garrison Artillery Regiment, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
—— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Gas Inspection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Gas Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Gaspe Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments to Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487; Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' &c., 'Mar. Dredging Co.'
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Geological Survey, Purchase of Books, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Georgetown Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s., &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. G. V. White) 6616 (iv).
—— Ret.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8734 (v).
German Surtax, Error in Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4712 (iii).
—— Explanations *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3679 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement wtih Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3829 (ii).
Germany and Canada Trade Relations, Similar Treatment as France: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 785, 1196 (i).
See 'Can. and Germany,' 'Customs,' &c.
German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald': Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 2635 (ii).
—— Value of Exports. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 261 (i).
Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6178 (iv).
Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6934 (iv).
Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Glassware used in Milk Tests, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Glover, Robert, Pet.: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1586 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 3933 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).
Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).
Gordon, Mrs. John, Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 5616 (iii).
Govt. Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6099 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr Foster) 926 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3829 (ii).
—— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2221 (ii).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 4315 (iii).
—— Remarks on Easter Adjournment (Mr. Sproule) 5893 (iii).
—— Unopposed Motions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4308 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
See 'Dredges.'
Govt. Employees, Garnisheeing Wages: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright: *See* 'Frontenac.'
Govt. Rys. Act (damages by fire) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).
Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2184 (ii).
Govt. Weigher at Montreal, Apptmt. of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 1546 (i).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.
Grain Exports from Montreal for Ten Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 782 (i).
Grain Inspection Board: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William, &c., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 5933 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West: M. for Papers (Mr. McCarthy) 1687 (i).
Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Fort William, &c., Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Grain Survey Board: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Grain Trade, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8584 (v).
—— Letter of Mr. R. McKenzie: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
—— Over-classification of Grades: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 8343; Reply (Mr. Oliver) 8363 (v).
—— Terminal Elevator Co., Tel., &c., Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8240 (iv).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Grand Bend Pier: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mere Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
G. T. R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. N. 164.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.
Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2137 (ii).
Bonds guaranteed, Total Amount to 31st March, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1366 (i).
Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
—— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2139 (ii).
—— Classifications submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 261 (i).
——Written Objections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* Sub-letting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 383 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 643 (i)
—— Provision *re* Forfeits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 387 (i).
—— Corrected Answer, 447 (i).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
Eastern Div. Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1687 (i).
Engineers' Complaints against Arbitrators: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2141 (ii).
Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3159 (ii).
Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
—— Payments to Counsel, Total Cost.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
Land Sales along Lines: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1966 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
—— Adjustment of Disputed Item ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O. C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
—— Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
—— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors claims *re* over-classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
—— Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lennox) 643 (i).
N.T. Ry. Commission: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682 (ii).
——— Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
——— Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
——— Rep.: M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
——— Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
National Transcontinental Ry. Construction, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii); 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
——— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup., 8242 (Amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
N.T. Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
——— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).
——— Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Lumsden, Hugh, Resignation, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 97 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
——— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
——— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
——— Additional Letter to Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
——— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
——— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
——— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 5820 (iii), 6015 (iv).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (iii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup. (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
——— Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
——— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
———Payment of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
N.T.Ry. and G.T.P. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 260 (i).
——— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).
——— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
———M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
N. T. Ry., Objections *re* Classification, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3291, 3490 (ii).
——— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shops: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (iv).
——— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
——— Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).
N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior, Date of Opening for Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 165 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from Throne: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost, Verification of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1783 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2140 (ii).
Remuneration to Govt. Directors: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Terminals, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Winnipeg to Edmonton Section, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 129, 623 (i).
Grande Vallée Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gratuitiies *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures acting as Insurance Agent: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6505 (iv).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates *re* French Language: Remarks (Mr. E. Roy) 8240 (v).
Green, James Albert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Green, John, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2427 (ii).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).
Grist Mills, &c., Indians in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
—— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496, 8169 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendation of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
—— Location since January, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir. Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).
—— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr Worthington) 1010 (i).
See 'Esquimalt,' 'Militia.'
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).
Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2430 (ii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Halifax and Liverpool SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Hansard, Analytical Index, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Hansard Debates, Omission from: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7880 (v).
See 'Debates,'
Harbour Commissioners of Montreal: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Harbours and Rivers, Bridge Work, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers—B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276, 4715 (iii).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 2697, 3391 (ii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 976, 992 (i).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 3455, 3833 (ii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 4210 (iii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1363 (i).
Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 (ii).
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishments for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
See 'Wood.'
Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa.'
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Herring Fisheries, Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).
See 'Life Saving,' 'Old Proprietor.'
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).
Highways Protection, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 790 (i).
Hodgins Investigations, Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
See 'G. T. P.'
Holden, Clara Louise, Relief of: *See* 'B. 149.'
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865, 7881 (v).
Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (i).
Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).
Homesteading Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homesteads Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Total Acreage in Alta and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Homesteading on Sections 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4080 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Horses exported from Ont. into N. W. Ter., Disinfecting stockyards: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4812 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) on M. for Sup., 4209 (iii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 81.'
Horse-racing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 6617 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
See 'Labour.'
Hours of Ry. Men: *See* 'B. No. 66'
House of Commons Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
—— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
Dufferin, Electoral District, Representations of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
—— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
—— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1731 (i).
—— Date of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
House of Commons and Senate Officials residing in Buildings, Estimate of Rents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain 1023 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3058, 3296 (ii).
House of Commons, Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).
Library: in Com, of Sup., 8802 (v).
Library of Parlt.: Rep. presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
Mar. Provs. Representation in H. of C., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act.: Prop. Res., 2718 (ii).
Member introduced, 413, 1001 (i).
Members, Names of 221 *re* Dom. Statutes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell) 1547 (i).
Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B.N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Districts, Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).
—— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).
—— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).
Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation, Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
—— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).
—— Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).
Ottawa Electoral District, Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).
Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536, 1545 (i).
—— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).
—— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299 (i).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i), 8365 (v).
—— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).
Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in Jan.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Best) 5502 (iii).
Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).
Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).
Staff Reorganization: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6389 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).
—— M. to disch. Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7872 (v).
—— Notice (Mr. Speaker) to withdraw, 7977 (v).
—— Staff Increases: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8830 (v).
Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (i).
Hudson Bay Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii), 8820 (v).
—— Estimates, &c.: Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).
—— Number of Acres of Land sold: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
—— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).
'Hudson' Str., Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).
Hunting and Homicide: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Hydro-Electric Legislation, Disallowance: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv). *See* 'Disallowance.
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Hydrographic Surveys, Irrigation Report: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 5103 (iii).
Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
Icebreakers, Thunder Bay District: in Com. of Sup., 8526 (v).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 135.'
IMMIGRATION.
Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 171 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2222, 2797 (ii).
Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Paquet) 1022 (i).
Agents in Canada and G. B., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8195 (v).
Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 101 (i).
—— Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Wiallard: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 790 (i).
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Immigration Buildings, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
Immigration Contingent Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 128 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 637 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 7872 (v).
Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7872 (v).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 2294 (ii).
Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 8109 (v).
Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 6609 (iv).
—— Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Immigration Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8494 (v).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 6945 (iv).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B. C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan., 1908: M. for Copy* (Mr. Paquet) 1380 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
SS. Passengers at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976 (iv).
—— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
U. S. Immigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Immigrants from, Remarks of Bruce Walker: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
—— Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 206 (i).
—— Instruction to Canada's Representative: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 923 (i).
Imperial Conference, Distribution of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Paquette) 276 (i).
—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c.: M. for Copy of Cor. (Mr. Foster) 388 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Cost. Conversion into Canadian Currency: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 856 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 639, 783 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Applications *re* Service between Can. and Australia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1100 (i).
Improved Paper Machinery Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6937 (iv).
Increased Facilities, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Incubators and Brooders, Total Number imported in Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. G. White) 414 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. G. White) 169 (i).
Independent Order of Rechabites: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Index to Hansard: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
INDIANS.
Agricultural Implements to Indians in Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (v).
Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
—— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).
B. C. Indians, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7858 (v).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
—— Location since Jan. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 345, 414 (i).
Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 119 (i).
—— Irregularity of Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 119 (i).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 783 (i).
Indian Schools, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7861 (v).
—— Industrial Schools, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
—— Industrial School, Regina, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
—— La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Indian Land Management Fund: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Indians, Man., Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
—— Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 7851 (v).
—— General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
—— Grist Mills, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Indians, Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (v).
—— Live Stock: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
—— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
—— Supplies to Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
—— N. B., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7846 (v).
—— N. S., Roads, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7845 (v).
—— Oka, Settlement of: Remarks: (Mr Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
—— Ont. and Que., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (v).
—— Ont. and Que., Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (v).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Peigan Reserve, Open for Homesteading, Purposes, Disposal of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
P. E. I., Relief, Seed Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
See general heading.
Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Indiantown and Blackville Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 168 (i).
Industrial Disputes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Industrial Disputes B. 23: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) *re* Discussion, 6941 (iv).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).
Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
—— Legislation *re* Amt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).

Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 and 131.'
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
——— Minor Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Insects, Pests, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Inspection and Sale Act Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 40 and 54.'
Inspection Act (pure food) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Inspection of Glassware in Milk Tests: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Inspection of Meat: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Inspection of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Inspection of Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Inspection and Sales Act, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce Bill: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act, Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Insurance Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5893 (iii).
——— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
I. C. R., Adjudication of Claims: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
I. C. R., Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
I. C. R., Damages by Fire: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
I. C. R.: Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
I. C. R. Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
Accidents, Number, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 5501 (ii).
Air-Brakes to Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).
Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).
——— Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 2840 (ii).
Beresford Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Board of Commissioners, Names, Dates of Apptmt. Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 99 (i).
——— Additional Powers: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 627 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Board of Commissioners, Dismissals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3091 (ii).
——— Dismissals by Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 128, 164 (i)
——— Dismissals by Board of Management, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
——— French Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7519 (v).
——— Rep. to Hse: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2791 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Chatham, Diversion of Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).
Chaudiere Junction, Signals, &c.: in Com. Sup., 2873 (ii).
Derailments, Number during 1909: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 2141 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Talbot) 2298 (ii).
Dismissals for each month from Oct., 1908, to March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1776 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars: in Com .of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Employees, Number in 1907-8-9: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 835 (i).
Employees, Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2716 (ii).
Employees, Payments to: Names, Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1021 (i).
Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipt, &c: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1367 (i).
Halifax Increased Accomodation: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Line: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 1208 (i).
I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2299 (ii).
Lac au Salmon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Locomotive and Carshops Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
Low Rates: Inquiry for Information (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
Moncton Cut-off: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Passes, alleged to be stolen, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay Lists on Windsor Branch: M. for Papers* (Mr. Foster) 801 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2634 (ii).
Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 276 (i).
———Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 4812 (iii).
Pintsch Gas, Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Purchasing Agent, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 272 (i).
Repairs to Car No. 37: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2286 (ii).
Riviere du Loup, Coal Shed, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4128 (iii).
——— Crossing Protection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
——— Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
——— Workshops, Electrical Development, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 6182 (iv).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Safety of Travel: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2278 (ii).
Side Ladders for Box Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 4847 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5105 (iii).
——— Instructions to Sleeping Car Conductors *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 4512 (iii).
Standard Pay for Machinists: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 259 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3171 (ii).
Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 1303
Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 332, 343 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 344 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Wire Fencing, Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilcox) 2150 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.' 'P.E.I.' 'Railways,' &c.
Interest Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 8, 73, 122.'
Interest by Banks: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
INTERIOR.
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Brandon Agency, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Hay and Wood Permits in Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S.W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
——— Total Acreage in Alta. and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4080 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 8194 (v).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8194 (v).
Interior and Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
—— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
—— Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
Peace River Land Co., Disposal of Lands by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1535 (i).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).
—— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932 (iv), 6181 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).
International Commission, St. John River, Obstructions, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
See 'Waterways.'
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Iron Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4083 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 3935 (ii).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B.C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Japan Trade Commission, Cor. Reps., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 328 (i).
Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canadian Rights: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5761 (iii).
'J. G. Witherbee' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Joggin's Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4844 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3734 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2189 (ii).
Judges' Act (Man. and Que.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
See 'Man. King's Bench.'
Judicial Apptmts. in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 623 (i).
See 'B.C.'
Judicial Business, Montreal District: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1792 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Juniper Island, Stony Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Justice, Administraton of: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Kamloops to Fennels Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops to Okanagan Valley, Telephone Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) 851 (i).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
—— Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783, 1970 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
—— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Kilmant and Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
King, Chief Astronomer: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7519 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 835 (i).
Labelle Settlers Grievances: Remarks (Mr. Major) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).
Labour Dept., Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
—— Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Labour, Hours on Public Works, Com. on B. 21: 1st Report presented (Mr. King) 1586 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2887; Agreed to (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).
Labourers' on Rys., Pay: *See* 'B No. 39.'
La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
—— Letter from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).
—— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).
—— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).
—— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).
—— Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).
Lachine Canal, Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).
—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).
—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137; 3483 (ii); 5689
Lac au Saumon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Lafontaine, Sir L. H., Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
La Have River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).
—— Stmnt. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1194 (i).
Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands Compensation, &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).
Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6164 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).
——Piers: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii)
Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
(Mr. Campbell) in Sup., 8540 (v).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
See 'Baby Farm B.'
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 1022 (i).
L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
'Lansdowne, Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Laplante, Mr., Salary Increase: Remarks Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).
Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Latchford Dam, Montreal river: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).
Laurentian Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Laurie, Archibald, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
——— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
Lead Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 640 (i).
'Leebro' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 788 (i).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lemieux, Ed., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
Le Petit Débarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i), 7781 (v).
——— Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1380 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office, Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Level Crossings Across Rys.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 145.'
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
Lévis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 6102 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Library, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Library of Parlt. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
Licenses to Fishing Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Coal Supply: Stmnt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).
See 'Coal.'
Lightkeepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).

Lillie, Clifford Buell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 224.'
Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. quarter 32-7-5, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6936 (iv).
Limerick to Gravelburg, Wood Mountain Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre-Dame des Missions: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
Lion's Head Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).
Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques: (Mr Monk) 641 (i).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).
See 'Temporary.'
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Canning Plant, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8101, 8214 (v).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Locomotive and Car Shops Machinery, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Long Sault Rapids Dam. Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1194 (i).
——— Deputation *re* Building of a Dam: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2060 (ii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5933 (iv).
Long Sault Rapids Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 8586 (v).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
McArthur, Frederick Joseph Gustin, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491
McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iv).
McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon trip: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5890 (iii).
McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4081 (iii).
Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7289 (iv).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS. Service, Tenders, Susbidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7065 (iv).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
Mails addressed to Street Numbers, Free Delivery, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).

Mails between G. B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt, Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery Free, Closing or Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).

Mail Delivery Free in Sydney: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).
See 'Sydney.'

Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).
See 'Franking.'

Mail Services, Supts. of Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8808 (v).

Malbaie (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Main-a-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Manitoba Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; Amt. 8141, neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Molloy) 4315 (iii).

—— Cor., &c. with Man. Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Roche) 644 (i).

—— Extension, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).

Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.'

Manitoba Fisheries Commission Report, Changes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).

—— on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 3480 (ii).

—— Regulations, Amts re: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 4846 (iii).
See 'Judges.'

—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4309 (iii).

—— Subsidy re School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4310 (iii).

Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

MARINE.

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v).

—— Stmt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).

Duncan Cove Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c. of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).
See 'Life Saving.'

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).

—— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).

'Lansdowne,' Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
—— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
—— Sel. Com.: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pintsch and Acetylene Gas, Accidents *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 802 (i).
Port Stanley Life-Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).
Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).
Seal Cove Life Boats, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).
Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).
Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
—— Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2718; (Mr. Turriff) 2730; (Mr. Warburton) 2735; (Mr. Daniel) 2746; (Mr. McCraney) 2756; (Mr. Crocket) 2761; (Mr. Richards) 2767; (Mr. Pugsley) 2768; (Mr. McKenzie) 2773; (Mr. Fraser) 2777; (Mr. Jameson) 2779; (Mr. Sproule) 2785; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2788 (ii).
Markham Post Office Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).
—— Completion, and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary: *See* 'B. No. 144.'
Mayes Contract, Charges against Min. of Pub. Works: Ques of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 589 (i).
See 'Bathurst,' &c.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Meat, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Member introduced, 413, 1001, 1731 (i).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Merchants Bank of Canada, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Merchants and General Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Mergers, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates for 1909-10: Read (Mr. Speaker) 154 (i).
—— Suppl. Estimates, 1910; Read (Mr. Speaker) 377 (i).
—— Suppl. Estimates: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex.: Suppl. Estimates, 1911: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7519 (v).
—— Internal Economy Commission: Read (Mr. Speaker) 97 (i).
—— Prorogation (Mr. Speaker) 8833 (v).
—— Supply Bill Read (Mr. Speaker) 5557 (iii).
Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 849 (i).
See 'Race Track,' &c.
Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).
Military Lands, Purchase of: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Militia Pension Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
MILITIA.
Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446, 1369 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2119 (ii).
See 'Drill Halls.'
—— Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Army Service, Ottawa Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Brandon Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).
See 'Frontenac.'
Charlottetown Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
De la Ronde, Major and Captain, Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i), 2288 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
—— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Place for Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii).
See 'Armouries.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.
Engineers Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*, M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
—— Dismantling of, Imp. conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Frontenac County, Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).

Garrison Artillery, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799 (i); Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).

Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).

——— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).

Gratuities *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Guelph Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 8169 (v).

Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).

——— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).

——— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1010 (i).

Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).

See 'Artillery.'

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).

Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).

See 'R. M. C.'

Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).

Militia Camps, Instructions to: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).

Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Fixed Life, Issue of New Material: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1018 (i), 2927 (ii).

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 275 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).

Militia and Defence: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8573 (v).

Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1778 (i).

Militia Field Allowances, Expenses of Staff Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1201 (i).

Militia Govt. Police *re* Armouries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).

Militia Harness and Saddlery, Tenders, &c., for 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).

Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).

Militia Pay and Aloowances, Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1377 (i).

Militia Properties: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Militia Provisions *re* Arms for active War Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 842 (i).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 639 (i).

Militia Uniforms, Clothing, Free Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2927 (ii).

See 'Highland,' &c.

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).

Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).

——— Total Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).

Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).

——— Damage by Fire, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 386 (i).

——— Insurance *re* Fire: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 967-975 (i).

——— Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).

——— Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 845 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay Lists of 18th Regt., Personations, &c.: Ques.(Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Permanent Force, Annual Cost per Man, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
——— Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
——— Increase of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 813 (i).
——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
——— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
——— Requirements *re* Instuctions, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
——— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 4129, 5279 (iii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Provisional School Allowances: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1019 (i).
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N. W. M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rifle Shooting, Standard *re* Emciency: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).
Ross Rifle, Marks I and II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Ques. of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
——— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifles, Mark II**, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
——— Number received, Contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
——— Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
——— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
——— Regulation of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn re Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii)
——— Weight of, &c.: Ques. Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3491 (ii).
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
——— Servants' Quarters, Completion of, Total Cost, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
——— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii).
——— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Regt., Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (v).
Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Topographical Surveys, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Milk Standards, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Milk Tests and Glassware: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 336 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, Acceptance of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).
Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
See 'Ottawa Mint.'
Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).
Moncton Cut-Off, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
—— Locomotive and Carshops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Mond Nickel Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Monopolies, Investigation of: See 'B. No. 101.'
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5498 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 703 (i).
Montreal River, Contract *re* Improvements, Name, Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1014 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmnt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1580 (i).
Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Monuments, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).
Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Co.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Motions to Adjn., Rulings of Mr. Speaker: Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1600 (i).
Motors injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Motors, 'Use of' and 'Joy Rides': *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Mounted Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1206 (i).
Mounted Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Saskatchewan, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Mounted Police Force, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
—— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Lourier) 1730 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1022 (i).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Go. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Music, Copyright of: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
——— Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3208 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).
National Park, Sask., Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 790 (i).
National Resources Commission, Names of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY.
Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
Adjustment of Disputed Item, ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
——— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors' Claims *re* Over-Classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: (M.) Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel *re* Lumsden Charges: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
——— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
——— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i)
——— Letter to Prime Minister: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
——— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
——— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
——— Payments of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
——— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden 697 (i).
——— Classification, Lumsden Charges, Rep., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr.R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
——— Resignation: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
——— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
——— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
——— Classification, 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Lennox) Notice of M. to consider, 5820 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 6015 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).
——— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (ii).
——— Changes in Report: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup., (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682
——— M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificate: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
Construction, prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup. 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii), 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
——— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
——— Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 447 (i).
Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
——— Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*
Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).
Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).
Objections *re* Classifications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).
O'Brien & Fowler, Contract to, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3490, 3291 (ii).
Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).
Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shop: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (v).
Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).
Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 165, (i); 2284 (ii).
Naturalization Act: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).
Natural Resources, Conservation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.' *See* 'Conservation.'
Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1971 (ii).
Naval Defence Conference, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).
—— Information from New Zealand: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).
Naval Service of Canada, Establishment B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1° m., 1732 (i).
Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 1738; (Mr. Jameson) 1762; (Mr. Monk) 1769; (i)); 2° m. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2952 (ii).
Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979; (amt.) 2991; (Mr. Monk) 2991; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3002; (Mr. Lemieux) 3023; (Mr. Middlebro) 3210; (Mr. Fowke) 3236; (Mr. Burrell) 3245; (Mr. Clark) 3269; (Mr. Sproule) 3281; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3296; (Mr. Foster) 3344; (Mr. Macdonald) 3386, 3575; (Mr. Roche) 3619; (Mr. Sealey) 3649; (Mr. Goodeve) 3659; (Mr. Beauparlant) 3683; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3697; (Mr. Congdon) 3720, 3748; (Mr. Hughes) 3760; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 3798; (Mr. Broder) 3822; (Mr. Warburton) 3946; (Mr. Cowan) 3962; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 3982 (ii); 3987 (iii); (Mr. Schaffner) 4012; (Mr. Rivet) 4036; (Mr. Edwards) 4061, 4083; (Mr. Béland) 4108; (Mr. Doherty) 4125, 4129; (Mr. Turgeon) 4161; (Mr. Barnard) 4182; (Mr. Devlin) 4197, 4316; (Mr. Magrath) 4328; (Mr. McKenzie) 4343 (Mr. Daniel) 4367; (Mr. Verville) 4383; (Mr. Best) 4392; (Mr. Demers) 4396; (Mr. Lewis) 4403; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4413; (Mr. Armstrong) 4423; (Mr. Geoffrion) 4444; (Mr. Blondin) 4453; (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4457; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4475; (Mr. Boyer) 4490; (Mr. Nantel) 4535; (Mr. C. Roy) 4570; (Mr. Crothers) 4583; (Mr. Dubeau) 4611; (Mr. Donnelly) 4618; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 4622; (Mr. Porter) 4639; (Mr. E. Roy) 4667; (Mr. E. Paquet) 4678; (Mr. Lachance) 4848; (Mr. Perley) 4863; (Mr. Crocket) 4873; (Mr. McAllister) 4879; (Mr. Herron) 4888; (Mr. J. Turcotte) 4893; (Mr. Marshall) 4910; (Mr. Molloy) 4913; (Mr. Clare) 4922; (Mr. Neely) 4931; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4947, (Mr. Gervais) 4951; (Mr. Wm. R. Smyth) 4975; (Mr. Gladu) 4983; (Mr. Beattie) 4989; (Mr. Séguin) 4991; (Mr. Emmerson) 5005; (Mr. Lancaster) 5016; (Mr. Lalor) 5031; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5042; (Mr. Lortie) 5069; (Mr. Owen) 5079; (Mr. Proulx) 5082; (Mr. Meighen) 5081; (Mr. MacNutt) 5091; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; (Mr. Thoburn) 5097; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; (Mr. Northrup) 5102; (Amt.) 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193; (Mr. Staples) 5133; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5142; (Mr. Wallace) 5149; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5152; (Mr. Lake) 5158; (Mr. Campbell) 5175 (iii).
In Committee:
(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Amt., 7393-7495; (Mr. Sproule) 7396; (Mr. Northrup) 7396-7495; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7396-7495; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7398; (Mr. Hughes) 7399; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7400; (Mr. Aylesworth) 7403; (Mr. Congdon) 7417; (Mr. Lancaster) 7418; (Mr. Doherty) 7419; (Mr. Daniel) 7434; (Mr. Blain) 7435; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7441; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7442; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 7443; (Mr. Boyce) 7444; (Mr. Armstrong) 7452; (Mr. J. Haggart) 7454; (Mr. Fielding) 7467; (Mr. Burrell) 7472; (Mr. Macdonald) 7474; (Mr. Edwards) 7481; 3° m., 7528 Agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7528; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7529; (Mr. Fielding) 7536; (Mr. Burrell) 7540; (Mr. Cowan) 7543; (Mr. Bristol) 7544, 7567; (Mr. Middlebro) 7545 (v).
Naval Defence Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 520, 1100, 1600 (i).
—— on Order for Com.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 6948 (iv).

Naval Defence, Personal Eplanation (Mr. Edwards) *re* 'Globe' report, 4533 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Sir Frederick Borden's Speech, correction, &c., 4710 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) *re* 'Round Robin,' 4305 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) 5002 (iii).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Documents: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2797 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Defence, Land Available for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1367 (i).
Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1546 (i).
Naval Service of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8838 (v).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8495 (v).
—— Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
—— Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Expenditure *re* 'upkeep,' &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3738 (ii).
See 'Niobe.'
Naval Service Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
See 'Wireless.'
Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1972 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Negro Clergyman in House: *See* 'Parliamentary Corridors.'
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).
—— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspaper Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Newspaper, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks: (Mr. Blain) 6141 (iv), 8818 (v); List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
Newspaper Postage to U.S., Classification, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1973 (ii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 788 (i), 3169 (ii).
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary Fish Contract: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
New York State Canals, Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).
—— Reciprocal Use of by Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).
—— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nickel Deposits in Canada, Control of by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2490 (ii).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson *re* Control by Americans: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2189 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Nicoll, Emily Maud, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 222.'
'Niobe,' Purchase of, without Parliamentary Authority: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3481 (ii).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 850 (i).
—— Payments to, for 1908-9. Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 2718 (ii).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Moneys, Fiat, &c. granted: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 640 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 644 (i).
—— Pet. of Right, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1547 (i).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
—— Inspector: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

N.E. ¼ Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c.: M. For Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5502 (iii).
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Northern Mortgage Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2711 (ii).
See 'Arctic.'
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
North Thompson Valley Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).
Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1373 (i).
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B. N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Oaths: *See* 'B. Nos. 1 and 100.'
Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill,' &c.
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Offences against the Person: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Oka Indians, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* Drainage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 8582 (v).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
See 'Finance.'
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com., 4798; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4798 (iii).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Militia Stores Building, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).
Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Original Construction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).
—— Design Competition: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6180 (iv).
—— Sussex Street, Architect's Plans: in Com. of Sup., 7166 (iv).
—— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa City Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
—— New: in Com. of Sup., 548 (i).
Ottawa Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission: *See* 'B. No. 230.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8662 (v).
Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Ottawa Mint, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
See 'Mint.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
See 'Committee,' 6605 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Ottawa Parliament Grounds Driveway: in Com. of Sup., 8173, 8191 (v).
Ottawa Printing Bureau Building: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons : Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).
——— Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).
——— Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (ii).
——— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).
——— Prime Minister's Resignation : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).
——— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).
Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ottawa River Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Ottawa Standardizing Building: in Com. of Sup., 572 (i).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Ottawa Victoria Museum: in Com. of Sup., 566 (i).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarack Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870, 8834 (v).
Oyster Barrels: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parliamentary Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1 (i).
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i), 5758 (iii).
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
Patents, Relief Bills: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-39-9: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1686 (i).
Patronage Distribution: Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 3134 (ii).
See 'Party.'
Partridge Island Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 595 (i), 3450 (ii).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Patronage List and Tory Whip, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blain) 7070 (iv).
Party Patronage, System: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2432 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 1792 (i).
——— on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2151 (ii).
See 'Patronage.'
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Paul, Mr. William, Purchase from by Govt. of Gasolene Boat: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay-lists of 18th Regiment, Personations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1376, 1535 (i).
Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
——— Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
Peat Bogs, Operation: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Peat Testing Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal of Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations : Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2427 (ii).
Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7516 (v).
Pension Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.
See 'Finance.'
Pension Fund of Merchants Bank: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pensions to Militia: *See* 'B. No. 194.'

Permanent Corps, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
—— Annual Cost Per Man, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
—— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
—— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
—— Requirements *re* Instructions, Payments, &c., Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
—— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
—— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266, 843 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 5279 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Petroleum, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Petroleum Fields in N. W., Royalty Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3493 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Piche Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i)
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (i).
Pilotage Dues: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pine Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
—— Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) *re* Par. in 'Globe,' 3476 (ii).
—— Par. in 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3739 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3744 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).
Pintsch Gas Apparatus, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Pioneers Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 211.'
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 274 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
See 'Franking.'
Polytechnic School, Montreal: in Com. of Sup., 8822 (v).
Population, Method of Estimating *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 4846 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3136 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks,' &c.
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729, 6101 (iv).
See 'Fort William,' &c.
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
—— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).
—— Right of Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
—— Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Port Stanley Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Post Office Act (inspectors' salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Post Office Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6955 (iv).
POST OFFICE.
'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).
Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).
—— Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii).
Camborne Postmaster, B. C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).
Central Park Postal Service, B.C., Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
—— Pets. *re* Closing; Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Charleston or Kelmont P.O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
—— P. M. G.'s Answers: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Route, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i); 8814 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865; 7881 (v).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Kilmant & Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
——— Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
——— Cor., Reps. &c. with Depts.: M. for copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1380 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i); 7781 (v).
Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Mails between G.B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).
Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).
Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).
Mail Delivery Free, Closing of Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii); 8808 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).
Markham Post Office Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B. Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 763 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
North Bay Post Office Inspector: Remarks (Mr. G. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Parry Sound Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Arthur) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i); 5758 (iii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
Postal Regulations during Recess of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2486 (ii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., where situated, Number accommodated, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 447 (i).
Postal Violations, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2292 (ii).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 267 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Post Office Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
——— Outside Service Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii); 7863 (v).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
——— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 3672 (ii). *See* 'Winnipeg.'
Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2931 (ii).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
Post Offices Generally, Policy of Building: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
Post Office Guide, Index, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3167 (ii).
Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 625 (i).
Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3682 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to Question 4: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2290 (ii).
Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
——— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
——— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
Rivière du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
——— List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
——— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
——— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
——— Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
St. Catherines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Scotsburn-Loganville, Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Sydney, N.S., Free Mail Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137
Toronto Sub-post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i).
Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
——— *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
See 'Post Offices, &c.'
Potatoes, Sale and Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Potvin, P. A., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Powassan—Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 3489 (ii).
Press Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4712-13 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps *re* Libel Suits: M. for Copy (Mr. McKenzie) 656 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 3102 (ii).

——— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).

——— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3170 (ii).

——— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, Surveys *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 277 (i).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Change of Route, &c.: M. for Cor., 3171 (ii).

Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 8238 (v).

Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'

Printing Outside of Govt. Bureau, Payments re &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 414 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2713 (ii).

Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7287 (iv).

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'

Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8364, 8380 (v).

——— M. to extend time: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1597 (i).

——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Miller) 8361 (v).

See 'Bills,' 'Senate Amts.'

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Legal Work to Toronto Lawyers, 8362 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Barker) *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare *re* debate on Naval Bill (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5200 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Prime Minister's Speech (Mr. Lake) 2430 (ii).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).

See 'Representation,' &c.

Prorogation: Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).

——— Round Robin *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4305 (iii).

Protection Piers, along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).

Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8509 (v).

Protectorate Life Ins. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 189.'

Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).

Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to Provs. of N.B. and N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3166 (ii).

Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).

Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602; Amt. (Mr. Blain) 612 (i).

Public Accounts Com. and N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5502 (iii).

See 'G. T. P.' &c.

Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).

Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS:

Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).

Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).

Aylmer Post Office, Additions: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).

Bathurst Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).

See 'Loggie.'

Bathurst Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).

Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).

Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).

Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Bécancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).

Belfast, Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bout de l'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Séguin) 6394 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bridges, Dominion Traffic: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
B.C., Expenditures by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brulé Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 596 (i).
——— Que. Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See general heading.
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com., of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup. 3878 (ii).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).
Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Cap de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Collingwood Harbour Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
Dredging, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
—— Plant, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
—— Plant, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4738, 5608 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
—— Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Dredging Plant, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging Plant, St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup.. 3833 (ii).
Fighting Island Channel Improvements: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Fraser River, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Gaspé Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments for Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487 (ii).
—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mère Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grande Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
Grande Vallée Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re*, Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: *See* general heading.
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Joggins Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i)
Juniper Island, Stoney Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783 (i), 1970 (ii),
—— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
—— Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup. 995 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3483 (ii); Remarks (Mr. Perley) 5689 (iii).
LaHave River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).

Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).

Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).

Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).

Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).

Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).

Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).

Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).

Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

Le Petit Debarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Lévis Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).

Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).

Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).

Lion's Head Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).

Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).

Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).

Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5622 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'

Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).

McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).

McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).

Main-à-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (ii).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).

—— Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'

Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).

Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).

Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).

Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).

Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley): in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).

Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).

Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).

Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).

Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (ii).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).

Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).
Napanee River, Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspapers, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 8818; List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
See 'Public Works—Advertising.'
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Ottawa City Buildings, Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
—— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
—— Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
—— Departl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
—— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
—— Govt. Building (Y. M. C. A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
—— Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
—— Labour Dept., Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
—— Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
—— National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
—— Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).
—— Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
—— Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
—— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
——Steps and Walks to House of Commons, Matting Covering: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 448 (i).
—— Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
—— Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
—— Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Ottawa River Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parrsboro' Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Partridge Island Quarantine Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Piché Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (ii).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
See general heading.
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
——— Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Protection Piers along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Public Works Advertising, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 8118 (v).
See 'Newspapers.'
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i).
——— Employees during Ottawa Bye-Election Campaign: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2489 (ii).
——— Engineering Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
——— Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2293 (ii).
——— Engineers, Inspectors, &c., Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Public Works Generally in Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3865 (ii).
Public Works Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
——— Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Harbour, Levis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
——— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Rivière aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (iii).
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
——— Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (v).
——— Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).
Shawinigan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Shelburne Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).
Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Souris, Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
—— Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
Tracadie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii)., 6123 (iv).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Dept., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach Harbour, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wolfe Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Saguenay Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7871 (v).
Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 836 (i).
Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion: Remarks (Mr. German) 3986 (iii).
Pure Foods, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2429, 3292 (ii).
Quarantine Inspectors, Apptmts. of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1208 (i), 5561 (iii).
Quarantine Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Quebec, Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 103 (i).
——— Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 260 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s Finances at time of Collapse, Payment to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3485 (ii).
——— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 3390 (ii).
——— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1969 (ii).
——— Tenders for New Piers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 840 (i).
——— Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3486 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 4315 (iii).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
Quebec Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Lévis, Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Provincial Immigrant Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Invasion of, Protection: Ques. (Mr. J. P Turcotte) 7513 (v).
Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1369 (i).
Quebec Water Lots, Sale of, to Private individulas, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 430 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6941 (iv).
Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re*: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1799 (i).
Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2926 (ii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Race Tack Gambling: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Race Track Gambling B. 6: Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6404; agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 6406 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) *re* Letter of Minister of Justice, 6715 (iv).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 3. 4. 5, 24, 39, 48, 53, 66, 104, 145, 174.'
Railway Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Ry. Belt, B.C., Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Ry. Commission, Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Ry. Commission, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Contracts with Municipalities: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Ry. Employees, Right to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Railways and Fires: *See* 'B. No. 48,'
Ry. Labourers' Pay: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Railways, Locations of, without Consent: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Mail Service, Superintendents: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Operators' Hours: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Railway Rates, Commutation Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Railways, Speed of Trains over Level Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Ry. Subsidies from Municipalities: *See* B. No. 5.'
Railway Subsidies. *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Railway Act Amt. Bills: Delay in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 925 (i).
Railway Rep. of Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7190 (iv).
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8374 (v).
—— Rules *re* Bills: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8833 (v).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
—— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
—— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 678 (iv).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378 (i).
RAILWAYS:
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievances *re* Operation by G.T.Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 192 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 5.'
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
—— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
—— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii); 8820 (v).
—— Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
—— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378
P.E.I. Railway: in Com. of Sup., 3063, 3102 (ii).
—— Branch thorugh New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).
—— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).
—— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.; M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Borden) 3170 (ii).
—— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2718 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).
—— Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Statistics Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1729 (i).
Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4309, 4846 (iii).
Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i)
—— Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).
Railway Commission, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Maintenance of Board: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
—— Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).
Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 277 (i).
St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
—— Rules *re* Emp'oyment of Railway Men: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8586 (v).
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1570 (i).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids; in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Rainy River Radial Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Rates of Cable Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104 and 234.'
Rechabites, Order of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Reed, Ada Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Representation in H. of C. in Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 3935 (ii).
Residents in H. of C.: Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt, of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).
Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Retail Merchants' Association of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Returns, Careless Arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4812, 5624 (iii); (Mr. Daniel) 924 (i); (Mr. Foster); 8580; (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3209 (ii).
—— Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 4208 (iii).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 7592, 7650; Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7600, 7632 (v).
Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
—— Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Ross.'
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John's: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N.W.M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co.: Ques. (Mr. Major) 1777 (i).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
—— Crossing Protection: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Riviere du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii), 8810 (v).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release from Imprisonment: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 924 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 170 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Rondeau Park Forest, Removal by Provl. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. McCoig) 6944 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
—— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
Ross Rifle Marks I. and Marks II.**, Defects, Issue of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).
—— Ques of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
—— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifle Mark II.**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
—— Number received, contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Regulations of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
—— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
—— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn. *re* Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii).
—— Weight of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N.T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthingon) 3491 (ii).
Royal Guardians: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Royal Military College Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
—— Cadets, Visit to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8584 (v).
—— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
—— Servants' Cottages, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
Royal Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i)
Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
See 'Mint, &c.'
Royal Society Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536. 1545 (i).
—— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299, 1441 (i).
—— Progress of Committee: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).
—— Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).

Rules of the House, Rep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8365 (v).
——— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).
Rural Free Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
——— Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
——— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
——— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
——— Routes, Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of *re* War Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5762 (iii). 7520 (v).
See 'U. S.,' 'Warships.'
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor)8239 (v).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids Locks, Tel. Read: in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).
St. Andrews Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
St. Catharines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office, Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 129 (i).
——— Sale of to Private Individuals: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 625 (i).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5820 (iii).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
St. John Harbour, N. B., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
St. John Harbour Wharfs: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv), 8118, 8580 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Daniel) 8737 (v).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).
St. John Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii)
——— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
——— —Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
St. Lawrence, North Shore Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with Act of Incorp.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Application: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1529 (i).
——— Original Reps. of Engineers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 5617 (iii).
St. Leonard, N.B., and Van Buren, Me., International Bridge.: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
St. Peters' Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 129 (i).
——— Instruction sent to Agent *re* Surrender, M. for Copy* (Mr. Bradbury) 643 (i).
——— Instructions to Chief Justice Howell: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2279, 2636 (ii).
——— Instructions to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents: M. for Papers* (Mr. Bradbury) 1380 (i).
——— Letter from Rainway *re* Details of Expenditure: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 1802 (i).
——— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 1963 (ii).
——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1022 (i).
——— Negotiations with Wm. Frank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7065 (iv).
——— Payments to E. Raynor: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7520 (v).
——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1976 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Williams: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165, 7071 (iv).
——— Investigation by A. S. Williams, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Bradbury) 3494 (ii).
——— Rep. of A. S. Williams: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5689, 5762 (iii).
——— Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 2296 (ii).
——— Treatment *re* Surrender of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bradbury) 414 (i).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Ste. Thérèse Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Saguenay District, Booms, Tugs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers; Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Salaries of Civil Service: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies Aggregate Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3167 (ii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Accident, June, 1909, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 4315 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 837 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 3833, 3945 (ii), 5278 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks.'
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
Savard, Lt. Col. 18th Regiment, Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Savings Banks Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5930 (iv).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).

School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., defaulting payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).
See 'Militia.'

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 1444 (i).

Scott, Elmore Walker, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 165.'

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).

Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i), 7767 (v).

Section 29, Twp. 9, Range 22, Applications *re* Right of Way: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Magrath) 643 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'

Seeds and Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iv).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 629 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price, Additional Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1002 (i).

——— to Homestead Holders, Quarter Section 24: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1195 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sel. Standing Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 343 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop. Address to His Maj. (Mr. Lancaster) 1977; Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule *re* Consideration: (Mr. Speaker) 5776 (iii).

Senate Chamber, Redecorating: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).

Senate and H. of C. Residents: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3296 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.

Senate Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).

Senate Vacancies in N.S., Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 386 (i).

Senate Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. Ferguson: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1376 (i).

Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).

Sessional Employees, Number on 25th January last, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

Shawenegan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).

Shea, Bernard, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Shelburne Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).

Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).

Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).

——— Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).

Ships, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 10.'

Ships, Masters' Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Ships, Seizure of: *See* 'B. No. 138.'

Ships: *See* 'Vessels.'

Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).

Side Ladders for Box Cars, I. C. R.,: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 8527 (v).

Silver Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6506 (iv).

Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, Detention of Books: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attny. Gen. for Ont.: Read (Mr. Boyce) 8345 (v).

——— Par. in Can. Municipal Journal: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 7068 (iv).

——— Further Explanation: (Mr. Aylesworth) 7183 (iv).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
——— Slope Trimmings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
Souris-Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Souris Life Saving Station, Ownership of Site: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7065 (iv).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
S.A. Veteran's Association, Military Reserve: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2149 (ii).
S.A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1204 (i).
S.A. Patriotic Fund, Control of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
——— Issue of to Relatives: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8580 (v).
——— Locations in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1590 (i).
——— Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
——— Number of Warrants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 107 (i).
South African Volunteers, Bounty: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
S.A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3732 (ii).
S.A. War, Expenditure for Imp. Govt. by Canada: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 632 (i).
S.A. War, Aud. Gen.'s Messenger re-instatement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Decription of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Sovereign Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 1177 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Steamer for River St. Lawrence, Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976, 8477 (v).
——— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Stipendiary Magistrates in N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
Stone Industry Protection: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Strikes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Subsidies: *See* 'Bounties, &c.'
Subsidy to Can. Northern Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 332 (i).
See 'Judges,' &c.
Supply Bills: *See* 'Bills Nos. 173, 196 and 235.'
SUPPLY—
Committee:
Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 1345 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 7284 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 7373 (iv), 7763 (v).
Cold Storage for Food Products, 7362 (iv)

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—*Con.*
Cold Storage for Fruit, 7383 (iv).
Dairying Industry, 7362 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 7381 (iv).
Exhibitions, 5728 (iii), 7389 (iv).
Experimenal Farms, 5724 (iii), 7333, 7392 (iv), 7764 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 7377 (iv).
Fumigation Stations, 7380 (iv).
Grant to Charlottetown Exhibition, 7766 (v).
Health of Animals, 7755 (v).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 7380 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 7748 (v).
Patent Record, 7371 (iv).
Public Works Health Act, 7392 (iv)
Seed Control Act, 7389 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 7380 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7391 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 5607 (iii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 219 (i), 7764 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 7768 (v).
Customs, 243 (i).
Depts., Generally, 8811 (v).
External Affairs, 337 (i).
Finance, 335 (i).
Indian Affairs, 344, 414 (i)
Inland Revenue, 229 (i).
Interior, 7767, 8193 (v).
Justice, 253 (i).
Labour, 235 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 250 (i).
Militia, 7767 (v).
Mines, 336 (i).
Mounted Police, 415 (i).
Naval Service, 8514 (v).
Post Office, 5607 (iii), 6650, 6675 (iv).
Public Works, 333 (i).
Railways and Canals, 246 (i).
Secretary of State, 337 (i), 7767 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 415 (i), 8808 (v).
Customs:
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1358 (i), 8803, 8807 (v).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 8488 (v)
Timber Protection, 8491 (v).
Water Power Investigations, 8496 (v)
Excise:
Extra Duty at Distilleries, 1331, 1333, 1336 (i).
L. A. Frechette, Translation, 1343 (i)
Methylated Spirits, 1344 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 1344 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1331 (i).
Stamps, 1342 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 1341 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Electric Power Export, 1356 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1354-5 (i).
Travelling Expenses, 1356 (i).
Fisheries:
B. C. Claim *re* Fish Licenses, 8552 (v).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 8544 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c., 8545 (v).
Dog Fish Works, 8545 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con*
Committee—*Con.*
Fisheries—*Con.*
Fish-breeding Establishments, 5750 (iii), 8540 (v).
Fresh Fish, Transportation, &c., 5747 (iii).
Intelligence Bureau, 8547 (v).
Legislation, &c., 8543 (v).
Licenses, 8547 (v).
Oyster Culture, 8545 (v).
Protection Service, 5752 (iii).
Provincial Rights, &c., 8546 (v).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 8536 (v)
Geological Survey:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7769 (v).
Explorations, &c., 8555 (v).
General Expenses, 8556 (v).
Maps, &c., 8556 (v).
Mines Branch, Ore Deposits, 8553 (v).
Peat Bog at Alfred, 8553 (v).
Storage of Explosives, 8556 (v).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 8556 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Depy. Administrator's Salary, 5615 (iii).
General Expenses, 8487 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 8195, 8494 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
W. T. R. Preston, Rent, &c., 8213 (v)
Indians:
British Columbia, 7858 (v).
Indian Education, 7861 (v).
Man. and N. W. T., &c., 7848, 7858 (v)
New Brunswick, 7846 (v).
Nova Scotia, 7845 (v).
Ont. and Que., 7835 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 7846 (v).
Justice:
Salary to N. W. T. Magistrate, 8799 (v).
Supreme Court, 8798 (v).
Labour Dept.:
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 8799 (v).
Technical Education Commission, 8800 (v).
Legislation:
Indemnity to Absent Members, 7771 (v).
Library, 8801 (v).
Senate, 7771 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 8525 (v).
Ice Breaking, 8526 (v).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers, 8528 (v).
Pensions to Pilots, 8527 (v).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 8523 (v).
Signal Service, 8527 (v).
Wireless Stations, 8513 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
General Vote, 5690, 5711 (iii), 8808-8810, 8811 (v).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 8564 (v)
Engineers' Services, 8569 (v).
Grant to 65th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
5th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
Gratuities, 8571 (v).
Maintenance of Properties, 8571 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Monument at Stoney Creek, 8575 (v)
Ordnance, &c., 8556 (v).
Pay and Allowances, 8573 (v).
Salaries, &c., 8573 (v).
Topographical Survey, 8574 (v).
Minor Revenues:
General Vote, 1358 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Handicrafts Guild, 7866 (v).
Conservation Commission, 7866 (v).
Naturalization Act, 7865 (v).
Royal Mint, 7866 (v).
Royal Society, Printing, &c., 7865 (v)
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8802 (v).
Rifle Range, Regina, 8802 (v).
Naval Service:
Construction, Maintenance, &c., 8495 (v).
Fisheries Protection Service, 8509 (v).
Hydrographic Surveys, 8511 (v).
Steamer to replace 'La Canadienne,' 8510 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Inspection, 8519 (v).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 8514 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 8521 (v)
Rewards for Saving Life, 8515 (v).
Schools of Navigation, 8518 (v).
Tidal Service, 8512 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 8519 (v).
Post Office:
Additional Amount, 8818 (v).
Mail Service, 5752 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 7865 (v).
R. G. Mercer, Appmnt., 5755 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 7863 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 416, 536 (i).
Eastern Block, 571 (i).
New Buildings, 548 (i), 7166 (iv),
Royal Mint, 557 (i).
Testing Building, &c., 572 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 563 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
Port Arthur, &c., Improvements, 5729 (iii); 6101 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, 6102 (iv).
Red River Improvements, 6103 (iv), 8819 (v).
St. John Harbour, 6106 (iv).
Tiffin Harbour, 5746 (iii); 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Harbour, 6122 (iv).
Victoria, Harbour, B.C., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 5747 (iii); 6123 (iv).
Marine Department:
Permanent Piers, 8523 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 8521 (v)
Dredging Plant, 8523 (v).
Sorel Property, 8523 (v).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia, 8190-91 (v)
Generally 596 (i); 8191 (v).
Manitoba, 8182-8185 (v).
New Brunswick, 580-596 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 573-579 (i).
Ontario, 597 (i); 7173-7181 (iv); 7495 8169-8181 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 580 (i).
Quebec, 661-704, 823-833, 926-975 (i); 8814 (v).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 8191-93 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 5607 (iii); 8185-8189 (v).
Dredging:
British Columbia, 6138, 6141 (iv).
Manitoba, 6137 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).
New Plant, 4738, 4755-4780 (iii).
Ont. and Que., 4809 (iii), 6124 (iv).
Repairs, 4731, 5716 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 4276-4305, 4715-4730, 5608 (iii).
Generally, 4731 (iii).
Manitoba, 4254-4272 (iii).
Maritime Provinces, 3452 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2697-2710, 3391-3430, 3438-3452 (iii).
Northwest Territories, 4276 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 976-1001, 1158-1192 (i); 8816, (v).
Ontario, 3455-3475, 3833-3862 (ii), 5608 (iii), 8818 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 2693-2697 (ii).
Quebec, 3862-3872, 3875-3914 (ii), 4210-4254 (iii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 4272-4276 (iii).
Yukon Territory, 4730 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Compensation, S. J. Dale, 6167 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6163 (iv).
Lake Nipissing Dams, 6164 (iv).
Memorial *re* Telephone at Brantford, 6161 (iv).
Sir Leonard Tilley, 6161 (iv).
Monument, Late Hon. Geo. Brown, 6158 (iv).
Late Sir L. H. Lafontaine and R. Baldwin, 6160 (iv).
Late D'Arcy McGee, 6159 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 6158 (iv).
Richelieu River Survey, 5720 (iii).
River St. John International Commission, 6163 (iv).
Salaries, Engineers' Branch, &c., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 5719 (iii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 6162 (iv).
Roads and Bridges:
Chapeau Bridge, 6150 (iv).
Courtenay Bay, Aboiteau, 6150 (iv).
Dom. Bridges, Generally, 6152 (iv).
International Bridge, St. Leonard, N.B., 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Hawkesbury, 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Metapedia, 6152 (iv).
Ottawa City Bridges, 6152 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice District, 6149 (iv).
Saguenay District, 6149 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 5614 (iii), 6156-58 (iv).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 6153 (iv).
Moosejaw-Wood Mountain, &c., 6154 (iv).
Sask and Alta., 5614 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Quarantine:
Steamers, 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Chambly, 3122 (ii).
Cornwall, 3123 (ii).
Galops, 3124 (ii).
Lachine, 3103 (ii).
Quebec Canals, 3122, 3123 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 3106, 3124 (ii), 5616 (iii).
Soulanges, 3105 (ii).
Statistical Officers, 3131 (ii).
Trent, 3106, 3126 (ii).
Welland, 3120 (ii), 8821 (v).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 3127 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Car, 3127 (ii).
Polytechnic School, Montreal, 8822 (v).
Railway Commission, 3127 (ii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Railway, 3067 (ii), 8819 (v).
Intercolonial Railway, 2872-2887, 2933-2949, 3091 (ii).
National Transcontinental Railway, 3065 (ii), 5229, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3063-3065, 3102 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 8810 (v).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 5714 (iii), 8810 (v).
Old Age Pension Fund, 8811 (v).
Salaries, &c., 5713 (iii).
Concurrence:
Trent Canal, Construction, 5602 (iii).
Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).
Supreme Court, Purchase of Law Books: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).
Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).
Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2289 (ii).
See 'Privilege.'
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
—— Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).
Sydenham River: *See* 'Martin Island.'
Sydney Free Mail Delivery: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Talbot, Capt. Réné, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
Tariff Changes Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'
Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1020 (i).
Tariff with U.S., Importations, &c.: Inquiry for (R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5891 (iii).
—— Intermediate Tariff: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5892 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U.S.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5759 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 5942; Resolutions laid on Table, 5967 (iv).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5278 (iii), 6100 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5690 (iii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).
Technical Education: in Com. of Sup., 8800 (v).
—— Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1023; Amt. (Mr. King) to adjn. Debate, 1076; agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1098 (i).
—— Replies from Provl. Premiers: Read (Mr. King) 3160 (ii).
—— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3208 (ii).
—— Letters of Premiers: Read (Mr. King) on M. for Sup., 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 104, 105 and 234.'
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii), 6156 (iv).
Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Telephones, &c.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104, 145.'
Telephone Memorial at Brantford, Contribution: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
—— since beginning of present Session, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i). *See* 'Finance.'
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tents, Militia, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i). *See* 'Militia.'
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 626 (i).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup.. 8512 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Tilley, Sir Leonard, Memorial at St. John, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii). *See* 'Boat,' &c.
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Topographical Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8574 (v).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Toronto Harbour, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
—— Extension, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii)
—— Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Toronto 'World,' Ownership by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5993 (iv).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i)
Tracadie and D'Arcy Island Quarantine Lazarettos: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv.)
Tracadie Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
Trachoma in Regina Schools: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 3390 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 621 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 8808 (v).
—— Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Trade Commissioners, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun': Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6393 (iv).
Trade Relations: *See* 'U. S. Trade,' 'Tariff.'
Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 5278 (iii). *See* 'Germany.'
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Treaties with U. S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 268 (i).
Tremblay, Mr. J., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
—— Damage to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

Trent Canal, Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).
——— Floods, Charges against L. F. Clarry: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).
Trent Canal, Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).
——— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
——— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Trusts, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1380 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (iv).
——— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932, 6181 (iv).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i)
Union Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
U. S. Canals: *See* 'New York State.'
U. S. Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6942 (iv).
U. S. Minimum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3058 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2153, 3480 (ii).
U. S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4712 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'
U. S., Trade Relations with, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8742 (v).
U. S. Training Vessels in Great Lakes, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 132 (i).
——— Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 108 (i).
——— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. Edwards) 135 (i).
——— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 103 (i).
See 'War Vessels,' &c.
U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 791 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Veilleue, Charles, Payments to: Ques. (Mr Girard) 8836 (v).
Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com of Sup., 8170 (v).
Vessels, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Vessels, Reporting of to Customs: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Veteran Land Grants, Number taken Up, Assignments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 447 (i).
See 'S. A. Veterans.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2188 (ii).
Veterinary Service, B. C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 132 (i).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii), 6123 (iv).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants' Burying Ground, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 5889 (iii).
Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (i).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Walton, Mr. George, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3734 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5501 (iii).
War Ships on Great Lakes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8737 (v).
See 'Rush-Bagot,' 'U. S.,' &c.
War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2713 (ii).
—— O. C.'s *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1367 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'
Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Water Powers in B. C. Ry. Belt: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: *See* B. Nos. 84, 115, 119, 143, 150 and 185.'
Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Waterways Commitee, Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 3390 (ii).
Waterways International Commission Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 209 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3481 ii), 6100 (iv).
—— Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3159 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).
—— Printing of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7187 (iv).
—— on Order for Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1536 (i).
—— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Watson, R. J. Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 2488 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).
Ways and Means, Procedure *re* Supply Bill: M. (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).
—— U.S. Tariff Negotiations, M. for Com., 5942 (iv).
See 'U. S. Trade Relations.'
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hedomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Weighing of Cargoes: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Weights and Measures Inspection, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).
—— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).
—— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
See 'Canals.'
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup.,1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup.. 1180 (i).
Western Canada Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Western Grain Trade: *See* 'Grain,' &c.
Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weyburn Security Bank: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred from P.W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Depts., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 3494 (ii).

Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6935 (iv).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Williamshead Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Winding-up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1370 (i).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 8364 (v).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Winnipeg Beach, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
——— Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wire Fencing, I. C. R., Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
Wireless Stations in Canada, 7395 (v).
——— Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 3135 (ii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Wolfe's Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4079 (iii).
See 'Hay.'
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Woollen Industry, Reps. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
——— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts: M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Rivers, Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Year Book, Amount of Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1020 (i).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).
Yukon Govt., Administration: in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iii), 8487 (v).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Zinc Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'